

Open Letter Of The CPSU To All

NEW AGE

COMMUNIST PARTY WEEKLY

SUPPLEMENT TO VOL. XI, NO. 29

JULY 21, 1963

Party Organisations And All Communists Of USSR

Following is the full text of the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to all party organizations and all the Communists of the Soviet Union, that was carried by Pravda on July 14, 1963:

DEAR comrades,
The Central Committee of the CPSU deems it necessary to address an open letter to you in order to set out its position on the fundamental questions of the international communist movement in connection with the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China of June 14, 1963.

The Soviet people are well aware that our Party and Government, expressing the will of the entire Soviet people, spare no effort to strengthen fraternal friendship with the peoples of all the socialist countries, with the Chinese people. We are united by common struggle for the victory of communism, we have the same aim, the same aspirations and hopes.

For many years the relations between our Parties were good. But some time ago, serious differences came to light between the CPC on the one hand, and the CPSU and the other fraternal parties, on the other.

At the present time the Central Committee of the CPSU feels increasingly concerned over the statements and actions of the leadership of the Communist Party of China which are undermining the cohesion of our Parties, the friendship of our peoples.

The CPSU Central Committee, for its part, has been doing everything possible to overcome the differences which came to light and proposed in January this year that open polemics in the communist movement be stopped so that the disputed issues are discussed calmly and in a businesslike manner, and solved on a principled Marxist-Leninist foundation. This proposal of the CPSU met with support among all the fraternal parties.

Afterwards, agreement was reached on a meeting between representatives of the CPSU and the CPC, which is now taking place in Moscow.

CPSU Hope

The CPSU Central Committee hoped that the Chinese comrades, like ourselves, would display goodwill and would contribute to the success of the meeting in the interests of our peoples, in the interests of strengthening the

unity of the communist movement. To our regret, when agreement was reached on a meeting of representatives of the CPSU and CPC in Moscow, when the delegations were appointed and the date of the meeting was agreed upon, the Chinese comrades, instead of submitting the divergences for discussion at the meeting, unexpectedly found it possible not only to set out the old differences openly, before the entire world, but also to advance new charges against the CPSU and the other Communist Parties.

This was expressed in the publication of a letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14 this year, which gave an arbitrary interpretation of the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties, distorted the basic principles of these historic documents. The letter of the CPC Central Committee contained groundless, slanderous attacks on our Party and on the other Communist Parties, on the decisions of the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses and on the Programme of the CPSU.

CPC Letter

As you know from the statement by the CPSU Central Committee published in Pravda on June 19 this year, the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee, having studied the letter, arrived at the conclusion that publication of the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14 in the Soviet press at that time would be inexpedient. Publication of the letter would naturally have required a public reply on our part, which would have led to a further aggravation of the polemics and inflamed the passions, and thereby worsened the relations between our Parties.

Publication of the letter of the CPC Central Committee would have been the more untimely since a meeting was to be held between representa-

tives of the CPSU and the CPC whose purpose, in our opinion, is to contribute through the examination of the existing differences in a comradely spirit to better mutual understanding between our two Parties on the vital questions of world development today, to the establishment of a favourable atmosphere for the preparation and holding of a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

At the same time the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU deemed it necessary to acquaint the members of the CPSU Central Committee and all the participants in the Plenary Meeting with the letter of the CPC Central Committee, and informed them of the substance of differences between the CPC leadership and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

Unanimous Approval

In its unanimously adopted decision the Plenary meeting of the Central Committee fully approved the political activity of the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee, the First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR N. S. Khrushchev in the further rallying of the world communist movement, and all the steps taken by the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee in its relations with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

The Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee instructed the Presidium of the Central Committee unswervingly to follow at the meeting with representatives of the CPC the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of our Party, the line which was approved at the meetings of representatives of the Communist Parties and set out in the Declaration and Statement, the line which was fully confirmed by life, by the course of international developments.

Emphatically rejecting as groundless and slanderous the attacks of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on our Party and other Communist Par-

ties, on the decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses, on the Programme of the CPSU, the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, expressing the will of the entire Party, declared its readiness and determination consistently to pursue the course of rallying the fraternal parties, overcoming the existing differences.

The Plenary Meeting declared that our Party would strive, in future too, to strengthen unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism, fraternal friendship between the CPSU and the CPC in the interests of struggle for our common cause.

Unfortunately, recent events have shown that the Chinese comrades interpret our restraint in their own way. They depict our sincere striving to avoid a sharpening of the polemics in the communist movement as almost an intention to hide the views of the Chinese leaders from the Communists, from the Soviet people. Mistaking our restraint for weakness, the Chinese comrades, contrary to the standards of friendly relations between fraternal socialist countries, have begun with increasing impudence and persistence unlawfully to spread in Moscow and other Soviet cities the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14, which was published in Russian in a mass edition.

Not content with this, the Chinese comrades began sedulously to popularize and spread this letter and other documents directed against our Party throughout the world, not scrupling to use imperialist publishing houses and agencies for their distribution.

Matters Aggravated

Matters were aggravated by the fact that when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR drew the attention of the Chinese Ambassador in the Soviet Union to the impermissibility of such actions, crudely violating the sovereignty of our state, the Chinese representatives, far from stopping them, declared in a demonstrative way that they regarded it as their right to

continue to spread the letter in the USSR.

On July 7, when the meeting had already begun in Moscow, a mass meeting was held in Peking at which officials welcomed as heroes the Chinese expelled from the Soviet Union for the unlawful distribution of materials containing attacks on our Party and the Soviet Government. Whipping up among the fraternal Chinese people sentiments and feelings unfriendly to the USSR, the Chinese officials sought at the meeting to prove again their right to violate the sovereignty of our state and the standards of international relations.

On July 10, the CPC Central Committee issued another statement in which it justified these actions and, in effect, tried to arrogate the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union which the Soviet Government, naturally, will never allow. Such actions inevitably only aggravate relations and can do nothing but harm.

In its leading article on July 13, the newspaper Jenmin Jihpao (People's Daily) repeatedly attacked our Party and distorted the fact that the Soviet press did not publish the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14.

Unfriendly Actions

The openly unfriendly actions of the CPC leaders, their persistent striving to sharpen the polemics in the international communist movement, the deliberate distortion of the position of our Party, the wrong interpretation of the motives for which we temporarily refrained from publishing the letter, impel us to publish the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14, 1963, and to give our appraisal of this document.

All who read the letter of the CPC Central Committee will see behind the fine phrases about unity and cohesion unfriendly, slanderous attacks on our Party and the Soviet country, a striving to play down the historic significance of our people's struggle for the victory of communism in the USSR, for the triumph of peace and socialism throughout the world. This document is full

Text As Released By Novosti Press Agency

of charges, overt and covert, against the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

Unworthy Fabrications

The authors of the letter permit themselves unworthy fabrications insulting to Communists about "betrayal of the interests of the international proletariat and all the peoples of the world," "departure from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism," hint at "cowardice in face of the imperialists," "a step back in the course of historic development" and even at "organizational and moral disarming of the proletariat and all the working people," tantamount to "doing a service to the restoration of capitalism" in our country.

How can they tell such a thing about the Party of the great Lenin, about the motherland of socialism, about the people who were the first in the world to accomplish a socialist revolution, upheld its great gains in fierce battles against international imperialism and domestic counter-revolution, display miracles of heroism and dedication in the struggle for the building of communism, honestly fulfilling their internationalist duty to the working people of the world?

For nearly half a century the Soviet country under the leadership of the Communist Party is leading a struggle for the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, in the name of the freedom and happiness of the working people throughout the world. From the very first days of the existence of the Soviet state, when the great Lenin stood at the helm of our country, till the present day our people have rendered, and are rendering, tremendous unselfish aid to all the peoples fighting for their liberation from the yoke of imperialism and colonialism, for the building of a new life.

World history knows no example when one country would render such wide-scale aid to other countries in the development of their economy, science and technology.

The working people of China, the Chinese Communists, felt in full measure the fraternal solidarity of the Soviet people, of our Party both in the period of their revolutionary struggle for the liberation of their homeland and in the years of the construction of socialism. Immediately after the forming of the People's Republic of China the Soviet Government signed with the Government of People's China a treaty of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance, which is a mighty means of rebuffing the encroachments of imperialism, a factor of consolidating peace in the Far East and the whole world.

The Soviet people generously shared with their Chinese brothers all their many-year long experience on socialist construction, achievements in the field of science and technology. Our country has rendered and is rendering substantial aid to the development of the economy of People's China.

With the active assistance of the Soviet Union, People's China built 198 industrial enterprises, shops and installations equipped with up-to-date machines.

With the assistance of our country such new branches of industry as the automobile, tractor, aircraft and others were created in China. The Soviet Union handed over to the PRC more than 21,000 sets of scientific and technical documentation including more than 1,400 projects of big enterprises.

We have invariably assisted China in consolidating the defence of the country and the setting up of a modern defence industry. Thousands of Chinese specialists and workers have been trained in Soviet higher schools and at our enterprises.

Now too, the Soviet Union continues rendering technical assistance to the People's Republic of China in the construction of 88 industrial enterprises and projects.

We speak about all this not to brag but only because of late the leaders of the CPC are striving to belittle the significance of Soviet aid, and we do not forget that the Soviet Union in its turn received the goods it needed from the PRC.

What Chinese Leaders Forget

Only a short time ago the Chinese leaders spoke justly and eloquently about the friendship of the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, about the unity of the CPSU and the CPC, highly appreciated Soviet aid and urged the people to learn from the experience of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in 1957: "In the course of struggle for national liberation the Chinese people met the fraternal sympathy and support of the Soviet people. After the victory of the Chinese revolution the Soviet Union is also rendering an all-round assistance to the cause of construction of socialism in China. The Chinese people will never forget all this."

One can only regret that the Chinese leaders began to forget this.

Our Party, all Soviet people rejoiced at the successes of the great Chinese people in the building up of a new life and took pride in them. Speaking at a reception in Peking on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the People's Republic of China, N. S. Khrushchov said:

"The heroic and hard-working people of China demonstrated under the leadership of its glorious Communist Party what a people is capable of when it takes power into its own hands... Now everybody admires the successes of the Chinese people, the Communist Party of China.

"The peoples of Asia and Africa see by what way, under what system, can the talents, the creative forces of the peoples be fully developed, when a people can demonstrate both in width and depth its mighty creative force."

Beginning Of Retreat

This was how things stood until the Chinese leaders began retreating from the general course of the world communist movement.

In April 1960 the Chinese

comrades openly revealed their disagreements with the world communist movement by publishing a collection of articles called Long Live Leninism! This collection, based on distortions, truncations and inaccurately interpreted propositions, of the well-known works of Lenin, contained propositions actually directed against the foundations of the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, which was signed on behalf of the CPC by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, against the policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, against the possibility of preventing a world war in the present-day epoch, against the use both of the peaceful and non-peaceful road of the development of socialist revolutions. The leaders of the CPC began imposing their views on all the fraternal parties.

In June 1960, during the session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which took place in Peking, the Chinese leaders held without the knowledge of the leadership of fraternal parties a meeting of representatives of several parties, which were then in Peking, and started criticizing openly the positions of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties, the Declaration adopted by the Moscow Meeting in 1957.

Furthermore, the Chinese comrades took their differences with the CPSU and the other fraternal parties to the open tribune of a non-Party organization.

Such steps of the leadership of the CPC caused serious anxiety among the fraternal parties. Considering this, an attempt was made at the Bucharest Meeting of Communist Parties in 1960 to discuss with the leaders of the CPC the differences that had arisen. Representatives of 50 Communist and Workers' Parties subjected to comradely criticism the views and actions of the Chinese leaders and urged them to return to the road of unity and cooperation with the international communist movement in conformity with the principles of the Moscow Declaration.

Unfortunately, the CPC leadership disregarded this comradely assistance, continued to pursue its erroneous course and deepen its differences with the fraternal parties.

Striving to prevent such a development of events, the CPSU Central Committee came out with a proposal to hold talks with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. These negotiations took place in Moscow in September 1960. But even then it was impossible to overcome the differences that had arisen due to the stubborn unwillingness of the CPC delegation to heed the opinion of the fraternal party.

At the Meeting of Representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties which took place in November 1960, the absolute majority of the fraternal parties rejected the incorrect views and concepts of the CPC leadership. The Chinese delegation at this Meeting stubbornly upheld its own particular views and signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its full isolation.

Now it has become absolutely obvious that affixing its signature under the Statement of 1960, the CPC leaders were only manoeuvring

Shortly after the Meeting they resumed the propaganda of their course, using as the mouthpiece the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. Behind the back of our Party they launched a campaign against the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government.

CPSU Initiatives

In October 1961 the CPSU Central Committee undertook new attempts to normalize relations with the CPC. Comrades N. S. Khrushchov, F. R. Kozlov, and A. I. Mikoyan had talks with Comrades Chou En-lai, Peng Chen and other leading officials, who had come to the 22nd Congress. Comrade N. S. Khrushchov set forth to the Chinese delegation in detail the position of the CPSU Central Committee on the questions of principle, which were discussed at the 22nd Congress, stressed our invariable desire to strengthen friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of China.

In its letters of February 22 and May 31, 1962, the CPSU Central Committee drew attention of the CPC Central Committee to the dangerous consequences for our common cause, which may be brought about by the weakening of unity of the communist movement. We then suggested that the Chinese comrades should take steps in order not to give the imperialists an opportunity to use in their interests the difficulties which arose in the Soviet-Chinese mutual relations.

The CPSU Central Committee also moved to take more effective measures on such questions as exchange of internal political information, coordination of the positions of fraternal parties in the international democratic organizations and in other spheres.

In the autumn of last year before departure from Moscow of the former PRC Ambassador in the Soviet Union Comrade Liu Hsiiao, the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee had a lengthy talk with him. In the course of this conversation the members of the Presidium of the Central Committee once again displayed initiative in the matter of strengthening Chinese-Soviet friendship.

Comrade N. S. Khrushchov asked Comrade Liu Hsiiao to forward to Comrade Mao Tse-tung our proposal: "To throw aside all disputes and differences, not to try and establish who is right and who is wrong, not to stir up the past, but to start our relations with a clear page."

But we have not even received an answer to this sincere call.

Deepening their ideological differences with the fraternal parties, the leaders of the CPC began carrying them over to relations between states. The Chinese bodies began curtailing economic and trade relations of the PRC with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

On the initiative of the PRC Government the volume of China's trade with the Soviet Union was cut almost 87 per cent in the past three years; the delivery of industrial plant dropped forty times. This reduction took place on the initiative of the Chinese leaders.

We regret that the PRC leadership has embarked on such a road. We have always believed and believe now that it is necessary to go on developing Soviet-Chinese relations, to develop cooperation. This would have been mutually beneficial for both sides, and above all to People's China, which received great assistance from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Union developed extensive relations with China before, and it comes out today too, for their expansion and not curtailment.

It seems that the CPC leadership should have displayed primary concern for the development of economic relations with the socialist countries. However, it began acting in the opposite direction, disregarding the damage caused by such actions to the PRC economy.

The Chinese leaders did not tell their people truthfully through whose fault these relations were curtailed. Broad propaganda aimed at discrediting the foreign and domestic policy of the CPSU, at stirring up anti-Soviet sentiment was started among the Chinese Communists and even among the population.

The CPSU Central Committee called attention of the Chinese comrades to these incorrect actions. We told the Chinese comrades that the people should not be prompted to praise or anathemise this or that party depending on the arising disputes and differences. It is clear to every Communist that disagreements among fraternal parties are nothing more than a temporary episode, whereas relations among the peoples of the socialist countries are now being established for ages to come.

But the Chinese leaders every time ignored the comradely warnings of the CPSU, further straining the Chinese-Soviet relations.

Since the end of 1961 the Chinese representatives at international democratic organizations began openly imposing their erroneous views. In December, 1961, at the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council the Chinese delegation opposed the convocation of the World Congress for Peace and Disarmament.

In the course of 1962 the activity of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Movement of Peace Champions, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation and many other organizations was endangered as a result of the splitting actions of the Chinese representatives.

They came out against the participation of representatives of Afro-Asian Solidarity Committees of the European socialist countries in the 3rd Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi. The leader of the Chinese delegation told the Soviet representatives that "the white people" had nothing to do here."

At the journalists' conference in Jakarta the Chinese representatives followed the line of preventing So-

International Organisations

viet journalists from participating as full-fledged delegates on the plea that the Soviet Union is not an Asian country.

It is strange and surprising that Chinese comrades accuse of splitting activities and erroneous political line the overwhelming majority of the recent World Congress of Women, while during the voting on all continents only representatives of two countries—China and Albania—out of 110 countries represented at the Congress, voted against. Indeed, the entire multi-million army of freedom-loving women is marching out of step and only two are marching correctly, keeping the ranks!

Such is in brief the history of the differences of the Chinese leadership with the CPSU and other fraternal parties. It shows that the CPC leaders counterpose their own special line to the general course of the communist movement, trying to impose on it their own diktat, their deeply erroneous views on the key problems of our time.

clearer becomes the weakness of the positions of the CPC leadership, the more zealously it resorts to such camouflage.

If this method of the Chinese comrades is not taken into consideration, it may seem from outside that the dispute has acquired a scholastic nature, that separate formulas, far removed from vital problems, are the points in question.

In point of fact, however, the issues which bear on vital interests of the peoples are in the centre of the dispute.

These are the questions of war and peace, the questions of the role and development of the world socialist system, these are the questions of the struggle against ideology and practice of the "personality cult," these are questions of strategy and tactics of the world labour movement and the national-liberation struggle.

These questions have been advanced by life itself, by the deep-going changes that have occurred in the socialist countries, throughout the world, the changes in the balance of forces in recent years between socialism and imperialism, the new possibilities for our movement. The communist movement had to give and gave replies to these questions by elaborating the general line with due consideration to the conditions and demands of the present stage of world development.

The unanimous opinion of the Communist Parties is that a tremendous role in this was played by the 20th Congress of the CPSU which ushered in a new stage in the development of the entire communist movement. This appraisal was recorded in the 1957 Declaration and in the 1960 Statement, the documents of the Communist Parties worked out collectively and formulating the general political course of the communist movement in our epoch.

But the CPC leaders have now advanced a different course as a counterbalance to it, their positions more and more diverge from the common line of the communist movement on basic issues.

This refers, first of all, to the question of war and peace.

In the appraisal of problems of war and peace, in the approach to their solution there can be no vagueness or reservation, for this involves the destinies of peoples, the future of all mankind.

The CPSU Central Committee considers it to be its duty to tell the Party and the people with all frankness that in questions of war and peace the CPC leadership has cardinal, based-on-principle differences with us, with the world communist movement. The essence of these differences lies in the diametrical opposite approach to such vital problems as the possibility of averting a world thermonuclear war, peaceful co-existence of states with differential social systems, interconnection between the struggle for peace and the development of the world revolutionary movement.

Chinese Method

Our Party in the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses, the world communist movement in the Declaration and Statement, set before Communists as a task of extreme importance the task of struggling for peace, for averting a world thermonuclear catastrophe. We realistically

appraise the balance of forces in the world and hence draw the conclusions that though the nature of imperialism has not changed and the danger of the beginning of war has not been averted, in modern conditions forces of peace, of which the mighty community of socialist states is the main bulwark, can through their joint efforts avert a new world war.

We also soberly appraise the radical, qualitative change of the means of waging war and, consequently, its possible aftermaths. The nuclear rocket weapons, that were created in the middle of our century, changed the old notions about war. These weapons possess an unheard-of devastating force. Suffice it to say that the explosion of only one powerful thermonuclear bomb surpasses the explosive force of all ammunition used during all previous wars including the First and the Second World Wars. And many thousands of such bombs have been accumulated.

Nuclear War

Do Communists have the right to ignore this danger? Must we tell the people the whole truth about the consequences of a thermonuclear war? We believe that undoubtedly we must. This cannot have a "paralyzing" effect on the masses, as the Chinese comrades assert. On the contrary, the truth about modern war mobilizes the will and energy of the masses to the struggle for peace, against imperialism—this source of military danger.

The historic task of Communists is to organize and head the struggle of the peoples for averting a world thermonuclear war.

To prevent a new world war is quite a real and feasible task. The 20th Congress of our Party came to the extremely important conclusion that in our times there is no fatal inevitability of war between states. This conclusion is not a fruit of good intentions, but the result of a realistic, strictly scientific analysis of the balance of class forces in the world arena; it is based on the gigantic might of world socialism.

Our views on this question are shared by all the world communist movement. "A world war can be averted," "A real possibility to exclude world war from the life of society will emerge even before the complete victory of socialism on Earth, while capitalism remains in a part of the world," the Statement stresses.

Under this statement also stands the signature of the Chinese comrades.

And what is the position of the CPC leadership? What can the theses they disseminate mean: "an end cannot be put to wars as long as imperialism exists; peaceful co-existence is an illusion, it is not the general principle of foreign policy of the socialist countries; struggle for peace hinders revolutionary struggle."

These theses mean that the Chinese comrades are acting contrary to the general course of the world communist movement in questions of war and peace. They do not believe in the possibility of preventing a new world

war, they underestimate the forces of peace and socialism and overestimate the forces of imperialism, and actually ignore the mobilisation of the masses in the struggle against the war danger.

Destruction Of Imperialism: How?

It is permissible to ask the Chinese comrades, do they realise what sort of "ruins" a world nuclear rocket war would leave behind?

The CPSU Central Committee and we are convinced the entire Party and the Soviet people unanimously support us in this—cannot share the views of the Chinese leadership about the creation "of a thousand times higher civilization" on the corpses of hundreds of millions of people. Such views are in crying contradiction with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

What Chinese Path Means

To embark upon the road proposed by the Chinese comrades means to alienate the masses from the Communist Parties that have won the sympathies of the peoples by their insistent and courageous struggle for peace.

Socialism and peace are now inseparable in the minds of the broad masses!

The Chinese comrades obviously underestimate all the danger of a thermonuclear war. "The atomic bomb is a paper tiger," it "is not terrible at all," they contend. The main thing, they say, is to put an end to imperialism as quickly as possible, but how and with what losses this will be achieved seems to be a secondary question.

For whom, it may be asked, is it a secondary question? Is it for hundreds of millions of people who are doomed to death in the event a thermonuclear war is unleashed? Is it for the states that will be razed from the face of the earth in the very first hours of such a war?

No one, not even the big states, has the right to play with the destinies of millions of people. Those who do not want to exert efforts so as to exclude world war from the life of the peoples, to avert the mass annihilation of peoples and the destruction of the values of human civilization deserve condemnation.

The letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14 says much about "inevitable sacrifices" allegedly in the name of the revolution. Some responsible Chinese leaders have also declared that it is possible to sacrifice hundreds of millions of people in war. "The victorious peoples," it is asserted in the book Long Live Leninism! that was approved by the CPC Central Committee, "will create with tremendous speed on the ruins of destroyed imperialism a civilization one thousand times higher than under the capitalist system, and will build their really bright future."

We would like to ask the Chinese comrades who offer to build wonderful future on the ruins of the old world destroyed by a thermonuclear war, if they have consulted on this matter the working class of the countries where imperialism dominates? The working class of the capitalist countries would be sure

It is permissible to ask the Chinese comrades, do they realise what sort of "ruins" a world nuclear rocket war would leave behind?

The CPSU Central Committee and we are convinced the entire Party and the Soviet people unanimously support us in this—cannot share the views of the Chinese leadership about the creation "of a thousand times higher civilization" on the corpses of hundreds of millions of people. Such views are in crying contradiction with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished by class struggle, and as soon as possible. Who should decide this historic question? First of all the working class guided by its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party, the working people of each country.

What Chinese Path Means

The Chinese comrades propose another thing. They openly say: "On the ruins of destroyed imperialism," in other words, as a result of the unleashing of war "a bright future will be built."

If one is to agree with this then, indeed, there is no need for the principle of peaceful co-existence, for the struggle for strengthening peace. We cannot agree to such an adventurist path: it contradicts the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

It is generally known that under present conditions a world war would be a thermonuclear war. The imperialists will never agree to withdraw from the scene voluntarily, to lie in the coffin of their own free will without having used the extreme means they have at their disposal.

Apparently the people who refer to the thermonuclear weapon as a "paper tiger" are not fully aware of the destructive force of this weapon.

We soberly consider this. The thermonuclear weapon and have manufactured it in sufficient quantity. We know its destructive force full well. And if imperialism starts a war against us, we shall not hesitate to use this formidable weapon against the aggressor. But if we are not attacked, we shall not be the first to use this weapon.

The Marxist-Leninists strive for ensuring durable peace not by soliciting it from imperialism but by rallying the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Parties, by rallying the working class of all countries, by rallying the peoples fighting for their freedom and national independence, by relying on the economic and defence might of the socialist states.

We would like to ask the Chinese comrades who offer to build wonderful future on the ruins of the old world destroyed by a thermonuclear war, if they have consulted on this matter the working class of the countries where imperialism dominates? The working class of the capitalist countries would be sure

to tell them: Do we ask you to trigger off a war and destroy our countries while annihilating the imperialists? Is it not a fact that the monopolists, the imperialists, are only a comparatively small group while the bulk of the population of the capitalist countries consists of the working class, working peasantry, working intelligentsia?

The atomic bomb does not distinguish between the imperialists and working people, it heats the squares and therefore millions of workers would be destroyed per one monopolist. The working class, the working people will ask such "revolutionaries": What right do you have to settle for us the questions of our existence and our class struggle—we are also in favour of socialism but we want to gain it in the class struggle and not by unleashing a world war.

Some Other Aims?

Such posing of the question by the Chinese comrades may engender a well-justified suspicion that this is no longer a class approach in the struggle for the abolition of capitalism but has some entirely different aims. If both the exploiters and the exploited are buried under the ruins of the old world, who will build the "wonderful future"?

In this connection it is impossible to pass unnoticed the fact that instead of the class internationalist approach expressed in the call "Workers of all countries, unite!" the Chinese comrades stubbornly propagate the slogan devoid of any class meaning: "The East wind prevails over the West wind."

On the question of the socialist revolution our Party firmly adheres to the Marxist-Leninist class positions being of the opinion that revolutions in every country are carried out by the working class and the working people, without military interference from outside.

It is doubtless, of course, that if the imperialist madmen do unleash a war, the peoples will wipe capitalism out and bury it. But the Communists, representing the peoples, the true advocates of socialist humanism, are to do everything they can to prevent another world war in which hundreds of millions of people would perish.

No party to which the interests of the people are truly dear can fail to realize its responsibility in the struggle for averting another world war, for ensuring peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems.

Expressing the line of our Party Comrade N. S. Khrushchov said: "There will be liberative wars as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars, such wars are not only permissible but even unavoidable since the colonialists do not grant independence to people voluntarily. Therefore it is only through struggle, including armed struggle, that the peoples can win their freedom and independence."

The Soviet Union is rendering broadest support to the national liberation movement. Everybody is familiar with the practical assistance our country rendered the peoples of Viet Nam, Egypt, Iraq,

Algeria, Yemen, the Cuban and other peoples.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union proclaimed the Leninist principles of peaceful co-existence as the general line of the Soviet foreign policy and is following it unwaveringly. Since 1953 and particularly after the 20th Congress of the CPSU there has been sharp increase in the activity of our peaceful policy and in its influence on the course of international relations in the interests of the popular masses.

Chinese Distortion

The Chinese comrades allege that we proceed from the premise that the concept of "peaceful co-existence" exhausts all principles of our relations not only with the imperialist countries but also with the socialist countries and the countries that have recently got rid of the colonial yoke. They know well that it is not the case, that we were the first to proclaim the principle of friendship and comradely mutual assistance as the most important principle in the relations between the countries of socialism and adhere to it firmly and consistently, that we render all-round and many-sided assistance to the liberative peoples. And yet for some motives they find it advantageous for themselves to present all this in an entirely distorted light.

The Soviet Union's persistent struggle for peace and international security, for general and complete disarmament for the elimination of the vestiges of the World War II, for negotiated settlement of all disputed international issues has yielded its results. The prestige of our country throughout the world stands higher than ever. As never before solid is our international position. We owe this to the steadily growing economic and military might of the Soviet Union, of other socialist countries, their peaceful foreign policy.

The CPSU Central Committee declares that we have been and will be pursuing the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence. In this our Party sees its duty both to the Soviet people and the peoples of all other countries. To ensure peace means to contribute most effectively to the consolidation of the socialist system, and, consequently, to the growth of its influence on the entire course of the liberation struggle, on the world revolutionary process.

The deep difference in the views of the CPSU, other Marxist-Leninist Parties, on the one hand, and the CPC leaders, on the other hand, on the questions of war, peace and peaceful co-existence was manifested with particular clarity during the 1962 crisis in the Caribbean Sea. It was a sharp international crisis: never before did mankind come so close to the brink of a thermonuclear war as it did in October last year.

The Chinese comrades claim that in the period of the Caribbean crisis we made an "adventurist" mistake by supplying rockets to Cuba and then, allegedly, "capitulated" to the American imperialism when we withdrew the rockets from Cuba. (Such allegations were made in the leading article in Jenmin Jihpao on March 8, 1963, "On the state-

ment of the Communist Party of the USA".)

Such assertions utterly contradict the facts. What was the actual state of affairs? The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government possessed trustworthy information that an armed aggression of United States imperialism against Cuba was to start shortly. We realised with sufficient clarity that to rebuff aggression, to defend the Cuban revolution effectively we had to take the most resolute measures, Curves and warnings—even if they are called "serious warnings" and are repeated two and a half hundred times—have no effect on the imperialists.

Proceeding from the need of defending the Cuban revolution, the Soviet Government and the Government of Cuba reached agreement on the stationing of missiles on Cuba, because this was the only effective method of preventing aggression on the part of American imperialism. The delivery of missiles of Cuba signified that an attack on her would meet with a resolute rebuff with the employment of rocket weapons against the organisers of the aggression. Such a resolute step on the part of the Soviet Union and Cuba was a shock to the American imperialists, who felt for the first time in their history that in case they undertake an armed invasion of Cuba, they will receive in reply a shattering blow at their own territory.

Effective Defence Of Cuba

Inasmuch as the point at issue was not simply a conflict between the United States and Cuba, but a clash between two major nuclear powers, the crisis in the area of the Caribbean Sea would have turned from a local into a world clash. A real danger of a world thermonuclear war arose.

There was one alternative in the prevailing situation: either to follow in the wake of the "madmen" (that is how the most aggressive and reactionary representatives of American imperialism are called) and embark upon the road of unleashing a world thermonuclear war or, using the opportunities offered by the delivery of missiles, to take all measures to reach agreement on the peaceful solution of the crisis and to prevent aggression against the Cuban Republic.

We have chosen, as is known, the second road and we are convinced that we have done the right thing. We are confident that all our people are unanimous on this score. The Soviet people have proved more than once that they know how to stand up for themselves, how to defend the cause of the revolution, the cause of socialism. And nobody knows better than they do how much sorrow and suffering a war brings, what hardships and sacrifices it costs the peoples.

Agreement on the removal of missile weapons in reply to the United States Government's commitment not to invade Cuba and to keep its allies from doing this, the heroic struggle of the Cuban people, the support rendered to them by the peace-loving nations have made it possible to frustrate the plans of the extreme adventurist circles of

American imperialism, which were ready to go the whole hog. As a result it was possible to defend revolutionary Cuba and save peace.

The Chinese comrades regard as an "embellishment of imperialism" our statement that the Kennedy Government has also displayed a certain reasonableness, a realistic approach in the course of the crisis around Cuba. Do they really think that all bourgeois governments lack all reason in all their doings?

Major Victory Of Reason

Thanks to the courageous and farsighted position of the USSR, the staunchness and restraint of the heroic Cuban people and their Government, the forces of socialism and peace have proved that they are able to curb the aggressive forces of imperialism, to impose peace on the war advocates. This was a major victory of the policy of reason, of the forces of peace and socialism: this was a defeat of the forces of imperialism, of the policy of military ventures.

As a result of this, revolutionary Cuba is living in peace and is building socialism under the leadership of her United Party of the Socialist Revolution and the leader of the Cuban people Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz.

When agreement was reached with the President of the United States of America and the beginning was thereby laid for the liquidation of the crisis in the Caribbean area, the Chinese comrades were particularly zealous in their insults and abuses against the Soviet Union, arguing that the imperialists cannot be believed in anything.

We are living in an epoch when there are two worlds, two systems: socialism and imperialism. It would be absurd to think that all the questions inevitably arising in relations between the countries of these two systems must be solved only by force of arms, ruling out all talks and agreements. Wars would never end then. We are against such an approach.

The Chinese comrades argue that the imperialists cannot be believed in anything, that they will definitely deceive. But this is not a case of faith, but of sober calculation. Eight months have passed since the liquidation of the crisis in the Caribbean area and the United States Government is keeping its word—there is no invasion of Cuba. We too have assumed a commitment to remove our missiles from Cuba and have fulfilled it.

But it should also not be forgotten that we have given a commitment to the Cuban people too: If the United States imperialists do not keep their promise and invade Cuba, we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people. Every soberminded person understands well that in case of an aggression of American imperialists we shall come to the assistance of the Cuban people from Soviet territory just as we would have helped them from Cuban territory, too. True, in this case the rockets would be in flight slightly longer, but their precision would not be impaired by this.

Why then do the Chinese comrades stubbornly ignore

the assessment which the leaders of the Cuban revolution themselves give to the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union, as a policy of fraternal solidarity and genuine internationalism? What are the Chinese leaders dissatisfied with? Is it, perhaps, the fact that it was possible to prevent the invasion of Cuba and the unleashing of a world war?

And what was the line of behaviour of the CPC leadership during the Caribbean crisis? At this critical moment the Chinese comrades opposed the realistic and firm stand of the Soviet Government by their own position. Guided by some sort of their own particular concepts, they concentrated the fire of their criticism not so much on U.S. aggressive imperialism but rather on the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

Stand Of Provocateur

The CPC leadership, which argued prior to that, that imperialism may unleash a world war at any time, assumed the stand of a critic, not of a militant ally and comrade, at the most responsible moment. Nobody had heard statements from the Chinese leaders in those days about their practical actions in defence of the Cuban Revolution. Instead of this, the Chinese leaders obviously endeavoured to aggravate the already critical situation in the Caribbean area and added fuel to the smouldering fire of the conflict.

The true position of the CPC leadership is manifested very clearly in questions of war and peace, in its full underestimation—and what is more, deliberate ignoring—of the struggle for disarmament. The Chinese Communists object even to the very raising by Communists of this question, going to such length as making references to Marxism-Leninism and trying to prove in every way the "infeasibility" of disarmament, on the one hand, and its needlessness, on the other. Juggling with quotations, they try to prove that general disarmament is possible only when socialism triumphs all over the world.

Must the Marxists sit idle, waiting for the victory of socialism all over the world, at a time when mankind suffocates in the clutches of the arms race, when imperialists, stock-piling nuclear arms, threaten to plunge mankind into the abyss of a world war?

No, this would be criminal inaction in face of the imperative call of the time.

This truth has long been understood by all true Marxist-Leninists, who realise their responsibility to the peoples and who wage for several years already—and will go on waging—a stubborn and persistent struggle for general and complete disarmament, for the stopping of tests and the banning of nuclear weapons.

In fighting for peace, in advancing the slogan of universal disarmament, we proceed from the vital interests of the peoples, take account of the actual situation and do not shut our eyes to difficulties. The imperialists are naturally doing everything to delay and wreck agreement on disarmament—they stand to gain by this. They use the

arms race to enrich themselves and to hold the people in capitalist countries in fear.

But must we go with the stream, must we follow in the wake of imperialism, and refuse to mobilise all forces to struggle for peace, for disarmament?

No. To do this would be to capitulate to the aggressive forces, to militarists and imperialists. And we consider that the working class, the working people of all countries can force the imperialist governments to consent to disarmament, can prevent war. For this they must above all realise their strength and unite.

To the forces of imperialism and war it is necessary to oppose the organized might of the world working class. It nor has the advantage that it relies on the material power, the defensive might, of the socialist countries opposed to imperialism. The times have gone for ever when imperialism exercised complete sway. The situation has also changed sharply compared with the first decades after the October Revolution, when our country was alone and much weaker than today. In our days the balance of forces in the world arena has become entirely different. This is why, to hold now that war is inevitable is to show want of faith in the forces of socialism.

One can repeat endlessly that war is inevitable, passing this view off on one's "revolutionary spirit." In actual fact, this approach merely indicates "unbelief in one's revolutionary spirit." In actual fact, this approach merely indicates "unbelief in one's strength, a fear of imperialism."

There still are powerful forces opposed to disarmament in the imperialist camp. But it is precisely to compel these forces to retreat that we must arouse the peoples' wrath against them, force them to comply with the will of the peoples. The peoples want disarmament and believe that it is the Communists that are the vanguard and the organizers of the peoples' struggle for this.

Disarmament, Guarantee Of Peace

Our struggle for disarmament is not a tactical expedient. We sincerely want disarmament. And here we stand four square on Marxism-Leninism. As far back as the end of the last century Friedrich Engels pointed out that disarmament was possible, and he called it a "guarantee of peace." In our time the slogan of disarmament was first advanced as a practical task by V. I. Lenin, and the first Soviet proposals on complete or partial disarmament were submitted as early as 1922, at the Genoa Conference, and the disarmament proposals were formulated by him.

The struggle for disarmament is a most important factor of averting war. It is an effective struggle against imperialism. In this struggle the socialist camp has on its side the absolute majority of mankind.

The Chinese comrades advanced the slogan of "spearpoint against spearpoint," opposing it to the policy of other socialist countries aimed at relaxing the international situation and ending the "cold war." This slogan, in effect, adds grist to the mill of the imperialist policy of brinkmanship, and helps the champions of the arms race.

The impression arises that the leaders of the CPC consider it to their advantage to preserve and intensify the international tension, especially in the relations between the USSR and the USA. They apparently believe that the Soviet Union should reply to provocations by provocations, to fall into the traps set by the "mid men" from the imperialist camp, should accept the challenge of the imperialists to a competition in adventurism and aggressiveness, that is, in competition not for ensuring peace but for unleashing war.

To take this road means to jeopardize peace and the security of peoples. The Communists, who hold dear the interests of the peoples, will never follow this path.

The struggle for peace, for the implementation of the principles of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, is one of the most important forms of struggle of the peoples against imperialism, against new wars which are being prepared by it, against the aggressive actions of the imperialists in the colonial countries, against the military bases of imperialists on foreign territories, against the arms race, etc. This struggle is in the interests of the working class, of all the working people, and in this sense it is a class struggle.

Our Party, all fraternal parties, remember the conclusion in the Statement that the struggle against the danger of a new world war should be developed without waiting for atomic and hydrogen bombs to begin to fall, and they are guided by this conclusion in their work. This struggle should be waged now and intensified daily. The main thing is to curb the aggressors in time, to prevent war, to prevent it from breaking out.

To fight for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, tirelessly to expose the policy of imperialism, vigilantly to watch the manoeuvring and machinations of the war incendiaries, to enhance the organization of all peace forces, constantly to step up mass action in defence of peace, to strengthen cooperation with all states which are not interested in new wars.

The struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence weakens the front of imperialism, isolates its most aggressive circles from the people, and helps forward the revolutionary struggle of the working class and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples.

The struggle for peace, for peaceful co-existence, is organically linked with the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. "In conditions of peaceful co-existence," the 81 Communist Parties stated, "favourable opportunities are created for the development of class struggle in the capitalist countries and of the national-liberation movement of the people in the colonial and dependent countries. In

turn, the successes of the revolutionary class struggle and national-liberation struggle help to strengthen peaceful co-existence."

In conditions of peaceful co-existence new important victories have been scored in recent years in the class struggle of the proletariat and in the struggle of the peoples for national freedom. The world revolutionary process is developing successfully.

This is why to separate the struggle for peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems from the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for independence and socialism, to counterpose them as the "Chinese comrades do, means to reduce the principle of peaceful co-existence to a mere phrase, to emasculate it, to ignore in effect the need for resolute struggle against imperialism, for peace and peaceful co-existence, which would be to the benefit of the imperialists only.

A Monstrous Fabrication

In its letter of June 14, the CPC Central Committee accuses Communist Parties of allegedly extending peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems to the relations between the exploiters and the exploited, between the oppressed and the oppressing classes, between the working people and the imperialists. This is a truly monstrous fabrication and slander on the fraternal parties which lead the proletariat in its class battles with capital, which always support the revolutionary struggle and the just wars of liberation against imperialism.

The CPC leaders have such weak arguments in the struggle against the CPSU and other fraternal parties that they have to resort to all sorts of ruses. They begin by ascribing to us "absolutely groundless positions" of their own invention and then they accuse us and fight against us, by exposing these positions. Such precisely is the case with their absurd allegation that the CPSU and other fraternal parties renounce revolution and substitute peaceful co-existence for class struggle.

It is well known in any political study group in our country that when we speak of peaceful co-existence we mean the inter-state relations of the socialist countries with the countries of capitalism. The principle of peaceful co-existence, naturally, can in no way be extended to the relations between the antagonistic classes in the capitalist states; it is impossible to extend it to the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie for its class interests, to the struggle of the oppressed peoples against the colonialists. The CPSU resolutely comes out against peaceful co-existence in ideology. This is a truism which all who regard themselves Marxist-Leninists should have mastered.

III

There are serious differences between the CPC and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties on the ques-

tion of struggle against the consequences of the Stalin personality cult.

The CPC leaders took upon themselves the role of the defenders of the personality cult, the disseminators of Stalin's erroneous ideas. They are trying to impose upon other parties the order, the ideology and morals, the forms and methods of leadership which flourished in the period of the personality cult. We must say outright that this is an unenviable role which will bring neither honour nor glory. No one will succeed in persuading the Marxist-Leninists, the progressive people to take the road of defending the personality cult!

The Soviet people, the world Communist movement duly appreciated the courage, boldness, the truly Leninist firmness of principle demonstrated by our Party, by its Central Committee headed by N. S. Khrushchov in the struggle against the consequences of the personality cult.

Everybody knows that our Party did so in order to remove the heavy burden that fettered the powerful forces of the working people and thus to speed up the development of Soviet society. Our Party did so in order to purify the ideas of socialism bequeathed to us by the great Lenin from the stigma of abuses of personal power and arbitrariness. It did so in order to prevent recurrence of the tragic events that accompanied the personality cult, to make all fighters for socialism derive lessons from our experience.

The entire communist movement correctly understood and supported the struggle against the personality cult which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, against its harmful consequences. At one time it was approved by the Chinese leaders too. They spoke about the tremendous international significance of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Opening the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of China in September 1956, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said: "The Soviet comrades, the Soviet people acted in accordance with Lenin's instructions. They achieved brilliant successes in a brief space of time. The recent 20th Congress of the CPSU also worked out many correct political positions, denounced the shortcomings in the work of the Party. It can be said with confidence that in the future their work will get exceptionally great development."

In the political report of the CPC Central Committee made at the Congress by Comrade Liu Shao-chi this appraisal was developed further:

"The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held in February this year is a most important political event of world-wide significance. It not only outlined the magnificent sixth five-year plan and a number of most important political directives aimed at the further development of the cause of socialism and condemned the personality cult which had led to serious consequences in the Party, but also advanced proposals for the further promotion of peaceful co-existence and international co-operation and made an outstanding contribution to

the relaxation of international tension."

Comrade Teng Hsiang-ping in his report about the changes in the Party Rules at the same Eighth Congress of the CPC said:

"Leninism demands, that decisions on all important questions should be taken in the party by an appropriate, collective and not individually. The 20th Congress of the CPSU provided convincing explanation of the most important significance of the unwavering observance of the principle of collective leadership and the struggle against the personality cult. This explanation had a tremendous influence not only on the CPSU but also on other Communist Parties in all countries of the world."

In the well-known editorial in the newspaper Jenmin Jihpao "Once More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of Proletariat," (December 1956) Chinese comrades wrote:

"The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union displayed tremendous determination and courage in eliminating Stalin's cult, in exposing Stalin's serious mistakes and in liquidation of the consequences of Stalin's mistakes. Throughout the world the Marxist-Leninists and the persons sympathising with the cause of communism support the effort of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union directed towards corrections of the mistakes and wish the efforts of the Soviet comrades to be crowned with complete success."

And this is really the case. Any unbiased person who compares these pronouncements of the Chinese leaders with what is said in the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14 will become convinced that they have made a 180 degree turn-about in the evaluation of the 20th Congress of our Party.

But are any vacillations and fluctuations permissible on such questions of principle? Of course, they are impermissible. Either the Chinese leaders had no differences with the CPSU Central Committee on these questions of principle before or all these statements were false.

Test Of Life

It is well-known that practice is the best criterion of truth.

It is precisely the practice that proves convincingly the wonderful results in the life of our country brought about by the realisation of the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU. In the course of the ten years that have passed since the time when our Party made a sharp turn towards restoration of the Leninist principles and norms in the Party life the Soviet society achieved truly majestic results in developing economy, promoting culture and science, in raising the people's welfare, in consolidating the defence potential, in successes of foreign policy.

The atmosphere of fear, suspicion, uncertainty which poisoned the life of the people in the period of the personality cult became a thing of the past. It is impossible to deny the fact that the Soviet people now live better,

enjoy the benefits of socialism. Ask the worker who got a new apartment (and there are millions of them!), ask the pensioner who is well provided for in his old age, the collective farmer who is now well-to-do, ask thousands upon thousands of people who wrongly suffered from reprisals in the period of personality cult and to whom freedom and good repute has been restored, and you will know what the victory of the Leninist course of the 20th Congress of the CPSU practically means for the Soviet people.

Ask the people whose fathers and mothers became the victims of reprisals in the period of the personality cult what it means for them to get the recognition that their fathers, mothers and brothers had been honest people and that they themselves are not the outcasts of our society but worthy, fulfilled sons and daughters of the Soviet Homeland.

Industry, agriculture, culture, science, art—no matter where we turn our eyes, everywhere we shall witness rapid progress. Our space-ships are furrowing the expanses of the Universe and this also provides a brilliant confirmation of the correctness of the course along which our Party leads the Soviet people.

Of course we do not hold that we have done everything for Soviet man, for improving his life. The Soviet people understand that the achievement of this principle depends not only on our wish. We have to build a communist society, to create an abundance of material benefits. That is why our people are stubbornly working to create faster material and spiritual values, to bring closer the victory of communism. Everybody can see that we are following a correct course, that we clearly see the prospects of our development.

The CPSU Programme maps out a concrete plan of the construction of communism. Its implementation will ensure the Soviet people the highest living standard, will mean the beginning of the gradual transition to the cherished communist principle, "From each according to his ability to each according to his needs."

The Soviet people find it strange and fantastic that the Chinese comrades are trying to smear the Programme of the CPSU, this grandiose plan of building a communist society.

Alluding to the fact that our Party proclaims as its task the struggle for a better life for the people, the CPC leaders hint about some sort of "bourgeoisification" and "degeneration" of the Soviet society. According to their logic if people walk in bask sandals, and eat watery soup from a common bowl—this is communism, and if a working man lives well and wants to live even better tomorrow—this is nearly tantamount to the restoration of capitalism!

And they want to present this philosophy to us as the latest revelation in Marxism-Leninism! This fully discloses the authors of such "theories" as people who do not believe in the strength and capabilities of the working class, that took power into its own hands and created its own socialist state.

If one turns to the history of our country, to the CPSU Programme, one can easily see where we began when under the leadership of Lenin we took power into our hands, and what summits the Soviet people have achieved. Our country has become a great socialist power. In volume of industrial production the Soviet Union is the first in Europe and the second in the world, and will soon surpass the United States and emerge to the first place. The Soviet working class, the Soviet collective farm peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia are the creators of all our victories.

We are convinced that not only the Soviet people but also the peoples of other countries of socialism are capable of great labour exploits—all that is necessary is that correct guidance of the working class and peasantry be ensured, that the people implement this guidance think realistically and make decisions that would make it possible to direct the strength and energy of the working people along the correct path.

In an attempt to justify the personality cult the Chinese leaders have filled their letter with arguments about a class struggle in the USSR, about the allegedly erroneous theses of the CPSU Programme about a State for the whole people and Party of the whole people—that is far from Marxism.

In this letter we do not intend to analyse all their arguments in detail. Anyone who reads the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14 will undoubtedly pay attention to the arguments about the utter helplessness and isolation from life of the Soviet people contained in the letter of the CPC Central Committee. We are being taught that hostile classes still remain in the Soviet society and therefore, you see, the need remains for the dictatorship of the proletariat. What are these classes? One can see from the letter of the CPC Central Committee that they are "bourgeois hangers on, parasites, blackmarketers, embezzlers, idlers, hooligans, and thieves."

Class Struggle, An Original Notion

The Chinese comrades certainly have an original notion about classes and class struggle. Since when are these parasitic elements considered a class? And what a class? A class of idlers or class of hooligans, a class of embezzlers of public property or a class of parasites? In no society do criminals constitute a class. Even a schoolchild knows this. Neither do these elements constitute a class in socialist society, of course. These are manifestations of the survivals of capitalism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not necessary for the struggle with such people. The state of the entire people can quite cope and is coping with this task. We know from our own experience that the better is the educational work of Party, trade union and other public organisations, the higher the role of the public, the better the work of the Soviet militia; the more effective is the struggle against crime.

It is impossible to refute the fact that the present Soviet society is made up of two main classes—the workers and the peasants, as well as the intelligentsia; that not a single class of the Soviet society occupies a position when it could exploit other classes. Dictatorship is a class concept over whom do the Chinese comrades propose to effect the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union—over the collective farm peasantry or over the people's intelligentsia? One cannot discount the fact that in socialist society the "class of

workers and the class of peasants have undergone considerable changes, the differences, distinctions between them are disappearing more and more.

After the complete and final victory of socialism, the working class is effecting its guiding role already not through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working class remains the front-ranking class of society also in conditions of all-out construction of communism. Its front-ranking role is determined by its economic position, by the fact that it is directly connected with the highest form of socialist property, and by the fact that it is more steered by decades of class struggle and revolutionary experience.

The Chinese comrades refer to the pronouncement of Karl Marx that the content of the transitional period from capitalism to communism cannot be anything else than a dictatorship of the proletariat. But saying this Marx had in mind communism as a whole, as a single socio-economic formation (of which socialism is the first stage) to pass over to which without a socialist revolution and a dictatorship of the proletariat would be impossible.

There are a number of pronouncements of V. I. Lenin which absolutely clearly stress that the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed precisely to overcome the resistance of the exploiting classes, to organise socialist construction, to ensure victory of socialism—the first phase of communism. It is clear from this that the need of a dictatorship of the proletariat disappears after the victory of socialism, when only working people, friendly classes that have absolutely changed in their nature, remain in society, and there remains no one to suppress.

If one is to extract the genuine content of all this mass of pseudo-theoretical discourses contained in the letter of the CPC Central Committee on these questions, it boils down to the following: the Chinese comrades come out against the line of the CPSU aimed at developing socialist democracy that was proclaimed with such force in the decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of our Party, in the CPSU Programme. It is not fortuitous that nowhere in their worthy letter was there found place even for a mentioning of the development of democracy in conditions of socialism, in conditions of construction of communism.

It is difficult to judge in full measure the motives by which the Chinese comrades guide themselves upholding the personality cult. Actually for the first time in the history of the international communist movement we encounter an open exaltation of the personality cult. It must be said that even during the period of the flourishing of the personality cult in our country Stalin himself was forced, at least in words, to refuse to have anything to do with this petty-bourgeois theory and said that this theory stems from the socialist-revolutionaries.

The attempts to use Marx and Lenin to defend the ideology of the personality cult can evoke nothing but surprise. Do the Chinese comrades know nothing about the fact that Lenin as far back as in the period of the birth of our Party conducted a tremendous struggle against the Narodniks' theories about the heroes and the mob, that genuine collective methods of leadership in the Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet State were implemented under Lenin, that Lenin was an extraordinarily modest person and mercilessly lashed the slightest manifestations of toadyism and servility about him?

Of course, the struggle against the personality cult was never regarded by our Party or the other Marxist-Leninist Parties as negation of the authority of Party and government leaders. The CPSU stressed time and again,

the 20th and 22nd Congresses included, that the Party cherishes the authority of its leadership, that while debunking the personality cult and fighting against its consequences the Party put high the leaders who really express the interests of the people and give all their strength to the struggle for communism and for this reason enjoy deserved prestige.

IV

The next important question on which we differ is that of the ways and methods of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the countries of capitalism, the struggle for national liberation, and the ways of transition of all mankind to socialism.

As depicted by the Chinese comrades, the differences on this question appear as follows: one side—they themselves—stands for a world revolution, while the other side—the CPSU, the Marxist-Leninist parties—has forgotten the revolution, even "fear" it and, instead of revolutionary struggle, display concern for such things "unworthy" of a genuine revolutionary as peace, the economic development of the socialist countries, and improvement of the living standards of their peoples, and struggle for the democratic rights and vital interests of the working people of the capitalist countries.

The divergence of views of the CPC and the international communist movement lies actually in an entirely different plane: some—namely, leaders of the CPC—talk about a world revolution with and without reason, use the "revolutionary" phrase on any occasion and often without it, while others—those whom the Chinese comrades criticise—approach the question of revolution with all seriousness and, instead of phrasemongering, work hard, seeking to find the best ways to the victory of communism, ways which conform best to the present conditions, fight hard for national independence, democracy and socialism.

Let us consider the principal views of the Chinese comrades on the questions of the revolutionary movement of today.

Is the thesis of ceasing the struggle for peace in the name of "a world revolution," of renouncing the policy of peaceful co-existence and peaceful economic competition and the struggle for the vital interests of the working people and for democratic reforms in the capitalist countries, conducive to the transition of countries and peoples to socialism? Is it true that in coming out for peace and pursuing a policy of peaceful co-existence the Communists of the socialist countries think only of themselves and have forgotten of their class brothers in the countries of capital?

Everyone who has pondered over the meaning of the present struggle for peace, against a thermonuclear war, realises that by their policy of peace the Soviet Communists, the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries give inestimable aid to the working class, the working people of the capitalist countries. And this is not only because prevention of a nuclear war means saving from death the working class, the peoples of whole countries and even continents, though this alone is enough to justify our policy.

The other reason is that this policy is the best way of helping the international revolutionary working-class movement to achieve its principal class aims. Is not this a tremendous contribution to the working-class struggle when, in conditions of peace they themselves have won, the socialist countries score brilliant successes in economic development, make ever new achievements in science and technique, constantly improve the living and working conditions of the people, develop and improve socialist democracy?

Seeing these successes and victories, every worker in a capitalist country will say: "Socialism proves by deeds that it is superior to capitalism. This system is worth fighting for." Socialism is now winning the hearts and minds of the people not only through books, but primarily by its deeds, by its example.

The Statement of 1960 sees the main distinctive feature of our time in that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor of mankind's development. All Communist Parties which took part in the 1960 meeting arrived at the common conclusion that in the centre of our age stand the international working class and its creation—the world system of socialism.

The solution of all other tasks of the revolutionary movement depends to a tremendous extent on the consolidation of the world socialist system. This is why the Communist and Workers Parties have pledged themselves "to strengthen tirelessly the great socialist community of peoples whose international role and influence on the course of world developments is growing from year to year." Our Party regards the fulfilment of this overriding task as its supreme internationalist duty.

V. I. Lenin taught that we exert our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy. In this field the struggle is waged on a worldwide scale. If we accomplish this task, we shall win on an international scale, finally and forever." (Works, Vol. 32, page 413)

This behest of the great Lenin has been firmly mastered by the Soviet Communists. It is followed by the Communists of other socialist countries. But now it turns out that there are comrades who have decided that V. I. Lenin was wrong.

Why This Stand?

What is this—lack of faith in the ability of the countries of socialism to defeat capitalism in economic competition? Or is this the position of people who, having encountered difficulties in building socialism, have become disappointed, do not see the possibility of exerting the main influence on the international revolutionary movement by their economic successes, by the example of the successful building of socialism in their countries? They want to achieve the revolution sooner by other ways which they regard as shorter.

But the victorious revolution can consolidate its successes and prove the superiority of socialism over capitalism by the work of the people, and only by it. True, this is not easy, especially if the revolutions are accomplished in countries which have inherited an underdeveloped economy. But the example of the Soviet Union and of many other socialist countries proves convincingly that in these conditions, too, if correct leadership is provided, it is possible to score great successes and demonstrate to the entire world the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Further, what situation is more propitious for the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries—the situation of peace and peaceful co-existence or the situation of constant international tension and the cold war?

There is no doubt as to the answer to this question. Who does not know that the ruling circles of the imperialist states use the situation of the cold war to fan chauvinism, war hysteria, unbridled anticommunism, to put in power the most rabid reactionaries and profascists, to abolish democracy, to do away

with political parties, trade unions and other mass organizations of the working class.

The struggle of the Communists for peace greatly consolidates their ties with the masses, their authority and influence and, consequently, helps to create what is called the political army of the revolution.

The struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, far from delaying, makes it possible to develop in full measure the struggle for the attainment of the ultimate aims of the international working class.

It is hard to believe that the Chinese comrades, who are people of experience, who have themselves accomplished a revolution, do not understand the main thing: that the world revolution today develops through the consolidation of the world system of socialism and through the revolutionary class struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries, through the struggle for national liberation, the strengthening of political and economic independence of the recently liberated countries of Asia and Africa, through the struggle for peace, against the wars of aggression, through the anti-monopoly struggle of the masses, and through many other ways, which should not be opposed to each other but united and directed towards the same goal—the overthrow of the rule of imperialism.

The Chinese comrades haughtily and humiliatefully accuse the Communist Parties of France, Italy, the United States and other countries of nothing less than opportunism and reformism, of "parliamentary cretinism" and even of slipping down to "bourgeois socialism." On what grounds? On the ground that these Communist Parties do not advance the slogan for an immediate proletarian revolution, although the Chinese leaders too must realise that this cannot be done without the existence of a revolutionary situation.

Every well-versed Marxist-Leninist knows that to advance a slogan for an armed uprising, when there is no revolutionary situation in the country, means to doom the working class to defeat.

It is common knowledge how very serious was V. I. Lenin's approach to this question, with what political perspicacity and knowledge of the concrete situation he approached the selection of the time for revolutionary action. On the very eve of the October Revolution Lenin pointed out that it was too early to act on October 24, and it would be too late on October 26, everything could be lost, and consequently, power must definitely be taken on October 25.

Who determines the intensity of class contradictions, the existence of a revolutionary situation, chooses the moment for the uprising? This can be done only by the working class of each given country, its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party.

The history of the international working class movement shows that a party is bad, if, calling itself a working class party, deals only with economic questions, does not educate the working class in a revolutionary spirit, does not prepare it for political struggle, for the seizure of power. In such a case it inevitably slips to the positions of reformism. But equalty bad is a party which sets the tasks of political struggle in isolation from the struggle for better economic conditions of the working class, the peasantry and all the working people. Such a party inevitably becomes divorced from the masses.

Only with the correct use of all forms of class struggle, and their skilful combination can a party become a really revolutionary,

Marxist-Leninist party, the leader of the masses, and successfully lead the working class in the storming of capitalism; the achievement of power.

The Chinese leaders regard as a terrible sin of many Communist Parties of the developed capitalist states the fact that they see their direct tasks in the struggle for economic and social interests of the working people, for democratic reforms feasible even under capitalism and facilitating the living conditions of the working class, peasantry, and petty-bourgeois sections of the population contributing to the establishment of a broad anti-monopoly front, which will serve as a basis for further struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution, that is, precisely what is recorded in the Moscow Statement of 1960.

Having come out against everything the Communist Parties of the developed capitalist countries are doing, the Chinese comrades did not display either an elementary sense of solidarity with the Communists fighting against capitalism on the frontlines of class struggle, or an understanding of the concrete conditions in these countries, the specific ways along which the revolutionary movement of the working class is proceeding there. Actually "for the sake of the revolution" they reject precisely the ways leading to revolution, and impose a course which would isolate the Communist Parties from the masses, and lead to the working class losing its allies in the struggle against monopoly domination, against capitalism.

The Chinese comrades haughtily and humiliatefully accuse the Communist Parties of France, Italy, the United States and other countries of nothing less than opportunism and reformism, of "parliamentary cretinism" and even of slipping down to "bourgeois socialism." On what grounds? On the ground that these Communist Parties do not advance the slogan for an immediate proletarian revolution, although the Chinese leaders too must realise that this cannot be done without the existence of a revolutionary situation.

Forms of Transition

The Chinese comrades have disagreed with the world Communist movement also on the forms of the transition of different countries to socialism.

It is common knowledge that the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties, as is clearly pointed out in the documents of the Moscow Meetings, in the Programme of the CPSU, proceed from the possibility of a peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism. Despite this the Chinese comrades stubbornly ascribe to our Party and the other fraternal parties recognition of the peaceful method alone.

In its letter of March 30, 1963, the CPSU Central Committee has again outlined its position on this score:

"The working class and its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist Parties, endeavour to carry out socialist revolutions in a peaceful way without civil war. The realisation of such a possibility is in keeping with the interests of the working class and all the people, and with the national interests of the country. At the same time the choice of the means of developing the revolution depends not only on the working class. If the exploiting classes resort to violence against the people, the working class will be forced to use non-peaceful means of seizing power. Everything depends on the particular conditions and on the distribution of class forces within the country and in the world arena.

"Naturally, no matter what forms are used for the transition from capitalism to socialism, such a transition is only possible by means of a socialist revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat in various forms. Appreciating highly the selfless struggle of the working class headed by the Communists in the capitalist countries, the CPSU considers it its duty to render them every kind of aid and support."

We have repeatedly explained our viewpoint and there is no need of outlining it in greater detail here.

And what is the position of the Chinese comrades on this question? It keynotes all their statements and the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14.

The Chinese comrades regard as the main criterion of revolutionary spirit the recognition of an armed uprising always, in everything and everywhere. Here, by the Chinese comrades actually deny the possibility of using peaceful forms of struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution whereas Marxism-Leninism teaches that the Communists must master all forms of revolutionary class struggle—both violent and non-violent.

Liberation Movement

Yet another important question is that of relationship between the struggle of the international working class and the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The international revolutionary working class movement, represented today also by the world system of socialism and the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America—these are the great forces of our epoch. The correct relationship among them constitutes one of the main requisites for victory over imperialism.

How do the Chinese comrades solve this question? This is seen from their new "theory", according to which the main contradiction of our time is, you see, contradiction not between socialism and imperialism, but between the national-liberation movement and imperialism. The decisive force in the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades hold, is not the world system of socialism, not the struggle of the international working class, but again the national-liberation movement.

In this way the Chinese comrades, apparently, wish to win in the easiest way popularity among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But let nobody be deceived by this "theory". Whether the Chinese theoreticians want it or not, the essence of this theory actually means the isolation of the national-liberation movement from the international working class and its offspring—the world socialist system.

But this would have constituted a tremendous danger to the national-liberation movement itself. Indeed, could the numerous peoples of Asia, despite all their heroism and selflessness, win if the October Revolution and then the formation of the world system of socialism, had not shaken imperialism to the very foundation, had not undermined the forces of the colonialists?

And now that the liberated peoples have entered a new stage of their struggle, concentrating their efforts on the consolidation of their political gains and economic independence, do they not see that it would have been immeasurably more difficult to solve these tasks, or may be impossible altogether, without the assistance of the socialist states?

The Marxist-Leninists always stress the epochal significance of the national-liberation movement and its great future, but they regard as one of the main requisites for its further victories the solid alliance and cooperation with the countries of the world system of socialism as the main force in the struggle against imperialism, the solid alliance with the labour movement in the capitalist countries.

This position was laid down in the Statement of 1960. It is based on Lenin's idea of working class leadership (hegemony) as a requisite for victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. Only given such a hegemony can this movement assume in the final count a truly socialist character, culminating in transition to the lines of a socialist revolution.

This idea of Lenin was verified by the experience of the October

Revolution, by the experience of other countries, and it does not arouse doubts in anybody's mind. However, the Chinese comrades, it was observed, wish to "amend" Lenin and prove that it is not the working class, but the petty-bourgeoisie or the national-bourgeoisie, or even "certain patriotically minded kings, princes and aristocrats" that must be the hegemony of the world's struggle against imperialism. And after this the leadership of the CPC teaches the world communist movement that the proletarian class approach to the problems in hand must never, under no conditions, be forfeited!

The earnest of the future victories both of the international working class and the national-liberation movement lies in their solid alliance and cooperation, in their joint struggle against imperialism, dictated by their common interests, struggle in which the working class earns by its selflessness, by its loyal services to the interests of all peoples, the recognition of its leading role, convinces its allies that its leadership is a reliable guarantee both of its own victory and the victory of its allies.

Our Leninist Party regards the national-liberation movement as part and parcel of the world revolutionary process, as a mighty force coming out against imperialism.

The great call of the founders of scientific communism Marx and Engels "Workers of all countries, unite!", has become the battle standard of the international working class. The continuer of the cause of Marx and Engels, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, noted particularly in the new historical conditions, which emerged after the victory of the Great October Revolution, the inseparable bonds of the socialist revolution and the national-liberation movement.

The slogan "Workers of all countries, unite!" has been and remains the chief slogan of the struggle for the victory of the revolution. In the new conditions the content of this slogan has expanded. It is common knowledge that Lenin approved the slogan: "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" This slogan stresses the leading role of the proletariat and the increased significance of the national-liberation movement.

In all its activities our Party strictly abides by this Marxist-Leninist internationalist principle.

The question arises: What is the explanation for the incorrect propositions of the CPC leadership on the basic problems of our time? Either complete divorcement of the Chinese comrades from actual reality, their dogmatic, bookish approach to problems of war, peace and revolution, lack of understanding of the concrete conditions of the present epoch. Or does the rumpus about the "world revolution," raised by the Chinese comrades, conceal other goals, which have nothing in common with revolution.

All this shows the erroneous nature, the disastrous nature of the course imposed by the CPC leadership on the world communist movement. What the Chinese leaders propose under the guise of a "general line" is nothing but an enumeration of the most general tasks of the working class, made without due consideration for time and the real correlation of class forces, without due consideration for the peculiarities of the modern stage of history.

The Chinese comrades do not notice or do not wish to notice how the tasks of our movement change in conditions of the present epoch. Reducing the general line to general tasks, which are valid for all stages of transition from capitalism to socialism, they deprive it of its concreteness,

purposefulness, genuine effectiveness. Elaborating their present course, the fraternal parties have concretely analysed the distribution of class forces both in separate countries, and on a world scale, the peculiarities of the development of the two opposed systems and of the development of the national-liberation movement at the present stage.

A thorough analysis of changes taking place in the world situation has permitted the fraternal parties of the world to draw up a Marxist-Leninist definition of the epoch: "Our epoch, the essence of which consists of transition from capitalism to socialism, started by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is the epoch of struggle between two opposed social systems, the epoch of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, the epoch of the collapse of imperialism, liquidation of the colonial system, the epoch when ever new peoples embark upon the road of socialism, the epoch of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale."

Definition of the present epoch served as the basis for a correct approach in elaborating the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement.

General Line

The Marxist-Leninist Parties have determined their common line, the main provisions of which boil down to the following:

● The nature and substance of the world revolutionary process in the present epoch is determined by the merging into one stream of the struggle against imperialism waged by the peoples who are building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, the general democratic movements. In the alliance of the anti-imperialist revolutionary forces the decisive role belongs to the international working class and its main offspring—the world system of socialism, which exerts its principal influence on the development of the world socialist revolution by force of its example, by its economic construction.

● Due to the prevailing objective historical conditions (extreme growth of the aggressiveness of imperialism, emergence of weapons of tremendous destructive power, etc.) the central place among all tasks, facing the anti-imperialist forces in the present epoch, is held by the struggle to prevent a thermonuclear war. The primary task of the Communist Parties is to rally all the peace-loving forces to the defence of peace, to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

● The socialist revolution is effected as a result of the international development of class struggle in every country, and its forms and ways are determined by the concrete conditions of each given country. The general law is the revolutionary overthrow of the power of capital and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one or another form. It is the task of the working class and the Communist Parties to make maximum of the now available opportunities for a peaceful road of the socialist revolution, not connected with civil war, and to be at the same time ready for a non-peaceful path, for the armed suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie; the general democratic struggle is an indispensable part of the struggle for socialism.

● The goals of the working class and the Communist Parties in the national-liberation movement lie in carrying to the end the tasks of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution, in

the development and consolidation of the national front based on the alliance with the peasantry and the patriotically-minded national bourgeoisie, in the preparation of conditions for the setting up of a state of national democracy and transition to the non-capitalist road of development.

Relations of cooperation and mutual assistance between the socialist countries, the cohesion and unity of the international communist and labour movement, loyalty to the positions and evaluations which have been worked out jointly, the Leninist principles of the life of the parties and the relations between them, constitute the necessary conditions for a successful fulfilment of the historic task facing the Communists.

Such in our epoch are the main ways of the development of the world revolutionary process, such are the basic provisions of the general line of the international communist movement at the present stage. The struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism—such is in brief the essence of this general line. Consistent pursuance of this line in practice is the earnest of the successes of the world communist movement.

All these fundamental theses of the international communist movement in the present conditions, worked out collectively by the fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties in the Declaration and the Statement, found their expression in the new Programme of the CPSU which is fully based on the Marxist-Leninist generalisation of the revolutionary experience both in our country and on an international scale.

Undermining Activities

The erroneous views of the CPC leaders on the cardinal political and theoretical questions of our time are inseparably linked with their practical activities directed towards undermining the world socialist camp and the international communist movement.

The Chinese comrades recognise in words that the unity of the USSR and the People's Republic of China is the mainstay of the entire socialist community but in fact they are undermining contacts with our Party, with our country in all directions.

The CPC leadership often speaks of its loyalty to the community of the socialist nations. But the attitude of the Chinese comrades to this community refutes their high-sounding declarations.

The statistics show that in the past three years the People's Republic of China has cut the volume of its trade with the other socialist countries by more than 50 per cent. Some socialist countries sharply felt the results of this line of the Chinese comrades.

The actions of the Chinese leadership stand in glaring contradiction not only with the principles of mutual relations among socialist countries but, in a number of cases, with the generally recognised rules and norms which should be observed by all states.

Violation of agreements signed earlier caused serious damage to the national economy of some socialist states. It is quite understandable that the economy of China also suffers tangible damage from the curtailment of its economic contacts.

In an effort to justify its actions in the eyes of the people the CPC leadership recently advanced a theory of "relying on its own forces." Generally speaking, to build socialism in every country, relying primarily on the efforts of the people with the best use of the internal resources of the country, is a correct way of laying the material and technical basis of socialism. The construction of socialism in every country is primarily the concern of the people

of the country, its working class and the Communist Party.

The Soviet Union, which was the first country of socialism, had to build socialism relying only on its own forces and using its internal resources. And although there is now a system of socialist countries, this by no way means that the people of some country may sit with folded arms and rely exclusively on the assistance of other socialist countries. The Communist Party of every socialist country regards it as its duty to mobilise all internal reserves for successful economic development.

Therefore the statement of the CPC Central Committee about the construction of socialism mainly by its own forces would give rise to no objections in its direct meaning.

However, as the full text of the letter of the CPC Central Committee and the numerous statements in the Chinese press show, this thesis is actually given such an interpretation with which it is impossible to agree.

The formula of the "socialist construction mainly by our own forces" concealed the concept of creating self-sufficing national economies for which the economic contacts with other countries are restricted to trade alone. The Chinese comrades are trying to impose this approach on other socialist countries, too.

The proclamation of the course of "relying on our own forces", apparently was needed by the CPC leadership in order to weaken the bonds of close friendship among the socialist countries. This policy, of course, has nothing in common with the principles of socialist internationalism. It cannot be regarded otherwise as an attempt to undermine the unity of the socialist community.

Parallel to the line towards curtailment of economic contacts the CPC leadership took a number of measures aimed at aggravating the relations with the Soviet Union.

The Chinese leaders are undermining the unity not only of the socialist camp but also of the entire world communist movement, trampling under foot the principles of proletarian internationalism and grossly violating the norms of relations between fraternal parties.

The CPC leadership organises and supports various anti-Party groups of dissenters who come out against the Communist Parties in the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia, India.

For instance, in Belgium the CPC is rendering support to the group of Gripp expelled from the Party at the last congress. In the United States support is rendered to the subversive activities of the Left-wing opportunist group "Hammer and Steel" which set itself the main task of fighting against the Communist Party of the United States. In Brazil Chinese comrades support the factional groups expelled from the Communist Party (as for instance, the Amazonas-Grabois group).

In Australia the CPC Central Committee tried to organise splitting activities against the Communist Party and its leadership with the help of a former member of the leadership, E. Hill. Having visited the People's Republic of China at one time E. Hill came out publicly against the Communist Party of Australia and tried to organise a group of like-minded persons. After the Communist Party of Australia expelled Hill from the Central Committee of the Party, he demonstratively left for Peking.

In Italy Chinese representatives are encouraging the activity of the group of the former officials of the Padua federation of the Communist Party who issued leaflets with a provocative call for a "revolutionary" uprising.

Comrades from the CPC are making particular efforts to conduct subversive activities in the Communist and Workers' Parties

in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Glorifying the dissenters and renegades who found themselves outside the ranks of the communist movement, the Chinese leaders reprint in their newspapers and magazines slanderous articles from the publications of these renegade groups directed against the policy of the CPSU, against the course of the entire world communist movement.

Contact With Trotskyists

In Ceylon Chinese representatives are maintaining close contacts with the grouping of E. Samarakkodi, which is a tool of the Trotskyist "Fourth International".

The Trotskyists from the "4th International" are trying to use the position of the Chinese comrades for their own aims and even addressed an open letter to the CPC Central Committee in which they openly declared: "The 4th International which from the very first day of its creation is waging... a struggle with ideas against which you are coming out today, is standing on your side... The international secretariat of the 4th International welcomes this discussion that you have started in the entire communist movement. It urges you to develop it."

The Chinese leaders make sharp attacks on the fraternal Communist Parties and their leaders, who do not want to retreat from the general line of the international communist movement. They have published and circulated in many languages articles discrediting the activity of the Communist Party of the United States, the French, Italian and Indian Communist Parties.

What sort of foul expressions do not the authors of these articles use against prominent leaders of fraternal parties! Among them are "double-dealing" and "right-wing opportunism," "revisionism," "incompatibility with norms of communist morality," "social-democratic degeneration" and "faint-heartedness," "irresponsibility" and "parrot," "haughtiness and contempt in respect to the revolutionary peoples of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

The Chinese leaders accuse the Communist Parties of the United States and Western Europe of acting "at one with the most adventurist American imperialists." The leadership of the Communist Party of India is not termed otherwise as a "clique."

The leaders of the Communist Parties of France, Italy, India, the United States are hurled the horrible accusation of "solicitude for the destinies of imperialism and all reactionaries."

And in its letter of June 14 the CPC leadership sinks to insinuations, that the CPSU allegedly too "comes out in the role of a helper of imperialism."

No one, except Trotskyists, has yet dared, in view of the obvious absurdity, to level such slanderous accusations at the great Party of Lenin!

Is there any wonder that imperialist propaganda rejoices at such actions of the Chinese comrades? It is no accident that the bourgeois press now and again shouts about a "crisis" in the international communist movement and urges the imperialist governments to use the differences caused by the position of the CPC Central Committee in their own interests.

The representatives of the CPC left the Editorial Board of the magazine *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (*World Marxist Review*), the information and theoretical organ of the Communist and Workers' Parties, stopped publication of this magazine in the Chinese language, thus striving to deprive the Chinese Communists of an objective source of information on the

activities of the international communist movement.

The splitting activities of the Chinese leadership in the ranks of the international communist movement evokes rightful indignation and rebuff on the part of the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

The letter of the CPC Central Committee says that in relations with the fraternal Communist Parties it is "impermissible for a party to place itself above the other fraternal parties, it is impermissible to interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties." This is quite a good statement. But it is precisely the Chinese comrades who themselves resort to such impermissible actions. Flouting the interests of the world communist movement they act contrary to the norms and principles outlined in the Declaration and Statement, and try to subordinate the other fraternal parties to their influence and control.

A striking example of the special line of the CPC leadership in the socialist camp and the international communist movement is its position on the Albanian question. As is known, in the second half of 1960 the Albanian leaders came out openly with a Left-wing opportunist platform on the main questions of our times, and began to pursue a policy hostile to the CPSU and other fraternal parties. The Albanian leadership started an anti-Soviet campaign in the country that led to a rupture of political, economic and cultural ties with the Soviet Union.

The overwhelming majority of Communist and Workers' Parties resolutely condemned these anti-Leninist activities of the Albanian leaders. The CPC leaders took an absolutely different position and did everything to use the Albanian leaders as their mouthpiece. It is known now that the Chinese comrades openly drove them on the road of open struggle against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and fraternal parties.

Yugoslav Question

In their attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties, the CPC leaders allot a special place to the Yugoslav question. They try to present matters as though the difficulties in the communist movement are caused by an improvement in the relations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries with Yugoslavia. Contrary to facts they stubbornly contend that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country.

As is known, in 1955 the CPSU together with the other fraternal parties displayed initiative in normalizing relations with Yugoslavia so as to overcome the prolonged conflict, the main guilt for which lies with Stalin. At that time CPC leaders had no doubts as to the nature of the socialist system in Yugoslavia. Thus the newspaper *Jenmin Jihpao* noted that "Yugoslavia has already achieved important successes in the construction of socialism."

An objective analysis of the socio-economic processes in Yugoslavia shows that positions of socialism have consolidated there in the subsequent years. If in 1953 the socialist sector in industry amounted to 100 per cent, in agriculture to 6 per cent, and in trade to 97 per cent, now the socialist sector in industry amounts to 100 per cent, in agriculture to 15 per cent, and in trade to 100 per cent. A rapprochement of Yugoslavia's position with the position of the Soviet Union and other socialist states in foreign policy questions took place in the period after the normalization of relations began.

Why then have the Chinese leaders changed so drastically their position on the Yugoslav question? It is hard to find an

explanation other than they saw in this an advantageous pretext, in their opinion, to discredit the policy of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The Soviet Communists know that differences on a number of important ideological questions continue to remain between the CPSU and the Yugoslav League of Communists. We have openly stated this and continue to state this to the Yugoslav leaders. But it would be wrong to "excommunicate" Yugoslavia from socialism on this basis, to cut her away from the socialist countries and to push her into the camp of imperialism, as the CPC leaders are doing. This is precisely what the imperialists want.

Now there are 14 socialist countries in the world. We are profoundly convinced that in the nearest future the number will be considerably greater. The range of questions encountered by the fraternal parties that stand at the helm of state guidance, is increasing, besides each of the fraternal parties is working in different conditions.

There is nothing surprising in the fact that under these circumstances the fraternal parties may develop different approaches to the solution of this or that question. How should Marxists-Leninists act in this case? To declare that this or that socialist country whose leaders do not agree with them is no longer a socialist country? This would be real arbitrariness. Such method has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

If we were to follow the example of the Chinese leaders, we should have long ago proclaimed Albania to be a non-socialist country, because of our serious differences with the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour. But this would be an erroneous, subjective approach. Despite our differences with the Albanian leaders, the Soviet Communists regard Albania as a socialist country and, for their part, do everything to prevent Albania from breaking away from the socialist community.

We watch with regret how the leaders of the CPC undermine the traditional Soviet-Chinese friendship, weaken the unity of the socialist countries.

The CPSU stands and will stand for the unity and cohesion of the socialist community, of the entire world communist movement.

V

Let us recapitulate:

The time since the adoption of the Statement of 1960 has fully confirmed the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist programme of the world communist and working class movement. The Soviet Union's successes in building communism, the successes of socialist construction in the other countries of socialism, exert an ever greater revolutionising influence on the minds of the people throughout the world. Revolutionary Cuba has lit a torch of beacon of socialism in the Western hemisphere. Decisive blows have been struck at the colonial system which is close to complete liquidation. New victories have been scored by the working class of the imperialist countries. The world revolutionary movement is advancing inexorably.

All this shows that the Statement of 1960 set correctly the general line of the world communist movement. The task now is to work in accordance with this general line, to develop and specify it in accordance with the conditions in which each given Communist Party works. Therefore, all attempts to impose some new general line on the world communist and working class movement, as is done in the letter of the CPC Central Committee of June 14, are insolvent and harmful. To accept this general line would mean to depart

SEE PAGE 10