

### ***New Booklet Series***

A special series based on the main themes of the "Open Letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.," dealing with the points of difference with the Communist Party of China.

**GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT—WHAT IT MEANS FOR ASIA AND AFRICA.** V. Masyukevich. 4d.

**FRIEND AND ALLY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM.** V. Kudryavtsev. 6d.

**SOCIALISM AND IMPERIALISM, PEACE AND WAR.** N. Inozemtsev. 4d.

**PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE AND THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE.** V. Nedbayev. 4d.

**FOR THE TRIUMPH OF CREATIVE MARXISM-LENINISM—against the revision of the course of the world Communist movement.** Reprint of Editorial of the magazine *Communist*, No. 11, 1963. 6d.

**FORCE OF EXAMPLE, NOT WAR.** E. Rosental. 4d.

**ON INTERNATIONALISM AND NATIONALISM.** L. Volodin. 4d.

Also available: "**THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION TO PARTY ORGANISATIONS AND ALL COMMUNISTS OF THE SOVIET UNION.**" 6d.

**Annual subscription:** Soviet booklets are published at the rate of one or two each month. For 10s. a year you can receive a copy of each booklet as soon as published.

*From your bookshop or from*

**SOVIET BOOKLETS  
3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7**

# **A REPLY TO PEKING**

**—Soviet Government Statement**

---

**Full text of the statement issued by the Soviet Government on September 21st, 1963, replying to the Chinese Government statement of September 1st.**

Soviet Booklet  
No. 122

London,  
September, 1963  
**6d.**

480

Scanned / Transcribed by  
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



# A REPLY TO PEKING

—Soviet Government Statement

*Full Text of the Soviet Government statement which was published in Moscow newspapers on September 21st and 22nd, 1963. It replies to the statement made on behalf of the Chinese Government which was issued in Peking on September 1st, 1963.*

Soviet Booklet

No. 122

London

September, 1963

# A REPLY TO PEKING

## —Soviet Government Statement

*Full text of the Soviet Government statement which was published in Moscow newspapers on September 21 and 22, 1963. It replies to a "statement by a spokesman of the Chinese Government."*

**A**NOTHER "statement by a spokesman of the Chinese government" against the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water was issued in Peking on September 1, 1963.

On acquainting oneself with its contents, one immediately notices that on this occasion, too, a government statement is being used mainly in order to slander the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.) and the other Communist Parties in connection with a wide range of questions on which the leadership of the Communist Party of China (C.P.C.) has differences with the international communist movement.

In the new statement the government of the People's Republic of China actually leaves aside all the arguments put forward by the Soviet government and the governments of other socialist countries in favour of signing this treaty. The Chinese leaders apparently have nothing to say in justification of their opposition to the banning of nuclear tests and therefore make up for the lack of arguments with abuse and slander against the Soviet Union and its peaceloving foreign policy.

At the same time they again elaborate on their erroneous and adventurist platform on questions of war and peace, a platform which has been emphatically rejected by the peaceloving peoples. In addition, the Chinese leaders have openly attacked the agreed views and positions of the international communist movement

and, instead of stepping up the struggle against imperialism, have turned the front against the fraternal socialist states and the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Chinese government's statement of September 1, like the whole of the big propaganda campaign which was launched recently by the Chinese leadership, no longer constitutes comradely discussion between communists, but actions by persons who have set themselves the aim of discrediting the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union at all costs and of splitting the communist movement and undermining the unity of the anti-imperialist forces.

Being aware of the weakness of their ideological positions, the Chinese leaders are trying to drag the discussion on the principal questions of our times down to the level of a vociferous exchange of angry words and unfounded accusations. The Soviet government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will never set out on such a road—a road unworthy of communists.

We shall not trade abuse for abuse. At the same time we find it necessary to return once again to a detailed examination of the questions touched upon in the Chinese government's statement of September 1 and to declare our own position. This is all the more necessary since in this, the third statement, the policy of the Soviet Union is grossly distorted time and time again, facts which are common knowledge are misrepresented, and documents are even being falsified.

IN its statement the Chinese government asserts that the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water is a "deception," a "betrayal" of the interests of the socialist countries and of the peoples of the whole world.

Nothing could be more absurd than these claims. The reason the nuclear test-ban treaty has received such wide support throughout the world is that it meets the interests of all peace-loving peoples and is the first, though limited success, but a real success, for the struggle of the broad masses of the peoples of the whole world against the danger of nuclear war—a struggle which has been going on for many years. This success, far from lulling the vigilance of the peoples against the intrigues of imperialism, as the Chinese leaders assert, has infused new strength in the fighters for peace and strengthened belief in the possibility of forcing the imperialists to make concessions.

The peoples of the world see the practical significance of the treaty in the fact that its signing stops the contamination of the atmosphere with radioactive materials (strontium-90, caesium-137, etc.), which are dangerous to the health of the people, not only of the present but also of future generations. It is an open secret that the nuclear weapon tests held in the atmosphere, the total yield of which equals hundreds of millions of tons of T.N.T., have increased the level of radioactivity on our planet. Scientists have estimated that every new series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere places the health and the lives of hundreds of thousands of people in jeopardy.

It can be said with complete conviction—and the experience of the past years fully corroborates this—that if this treaty had not been signed, then this year or in the very near future, nuclear weapon tests would again have been held in the

atmosphere, spreading to new geographical areas and, undoubtedly, increasing the danger of radioactive contamination. Further nuclear tests in the atmosphere would have increased the harmful influence of radioactivity on human beings, as well as on the animal and vegetable world.

The signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty is directly beneficial to the cause of peace and the interests of the peoples in other respects as well. Assuming that the treaty is observed by all countries, it will, to a certain extent, slow down a further increase of the nuclear arms race.

Yet it is not only in this that the positive significance of the treaty lies. The fact that the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the United States and the United Kingdom, on the other, have succeeded in agreeing on the prohibition of nuclear tests in three environments, creates prerequisites for increasing trust between states with different social systems and, thus, also for new steps towards easing international tension.

It follows from what has been said above that the nuclear test-ban treaty is a good and useful thing for the people.

Of course, it would have been better if agreement had been reached, already at the present time, on the prohibition of all nuclear tests, including underground tests. It would have been still better to have arrived at the general prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons. And it would have been extremely good for mankind to have achieved general and complete disarmament already today. Precisely such a proposal was made by the Soviet government at the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1960. It is for this that the socialist countries, all the peace-loving forces, are striving. The nuclear test-ban treaty is precisely one of the links in this important struggle.

The attempts of the Chinese leaders

to present matters as though the signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty tends to weaken the defence potential of the socialist community are absolutely untenable. Is it not a fact that the test-ban treaty imposes identical obligations on all the parties to it?—None of the states that have signed this document obtains any unilateral military advantages. Try as they may, the Chinese leaders are quite unable to prove that the nuclear test-ban agreement has given any unilateral advantage to the United States of America. In the latest statement, for instance, they argue that the United States has superiority, so they allege, as regards underground testing and that this is the main point. Yet it is precisely this that exposes the completely lame character of the arguments of the Chinese leadership, because in reality the essence of the matter is quite different.

It is no secret that the core of the nuclear power of the Soviet Union which deters the imperialists from aggression, is by no means composed of those types of nuclear weapons which are perfected by means of underground tests, but precisely of those with regard to which the balance is in favour of the Soviet Union, as many American leaders are compelled to admit. That is the first point.

Secondly, the treaty that has been signed does not prevent the Soviet Union from carrying out underground nuclear tests, should this be necessary in order to ensure the security of our country, the security of all the socialist states. If we were to speak at all about who has lost and who has gained from the conclusion of the treaty, it might be definitely stated: It is the forces of aggression and war that have lost, and it is the cause of peace and progress, it is all mankind that have gained.

The most diverse forces are coming out in support of the test-ban treaty. Over 90 states have signed it already. Among them, together with the socialist countries, are all the major powers of the world, with the exception of France, whose ruling circles have

embarked on a plan for nuclear armament that has nothing to do with the interests of peace.

The overwhelming majority of the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America which have achieved national liberation, have acceded to the treaty. The treaty has been favourably assessed by international democratic organisations, trade unions, political parties and many progressive public organisations. Every day that goes by brings more and more reports of worldwide support for the treaty.

Fearing political isolation, even those for whom the treaty definitely goes against the grain have felt themselves compelled to join in the treaty. For want of anything better, the Chinese leaders are grasping at this fact in their hopeless attempts to compromise the treaty. Yet has the cause of peace suffered from the fact that the treaty has been signed, for instance, by the government of Western Germany, or by the government of Franco Spain? The fact that even those governments, hostile as they are to the cause of peace, have not dared to evade signing the treaty, shows its tremendous power of attraction for the masses of the people, which the ruling circles of the capitalist countries are compelled to take into account.

The worldwide referendum which has swept all continents following the conclusion of the treaty, has demonstrated that by coming out against the prohibition of nuclear tests, the Chinese leaders have suffered a serious moral and political defeat.

The unseemly attitude of the Chinese government with regard to the nuclear test-ban treaty does not have the support of the peoples, a fact which was amply demonstrated at the recent meeting of the executive committee of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation in Nicosia. Hard as the Chinese delegates tried to induce those who took part in that meeting to refrain from passing a resolution approving the Moscow treaty, they had no success.

So as not to find themselves completely isolated and also in order to "save face," the Chinese representatives were compelled to dodge and wriggle in every way. They did not dare to vote against the resolution which voiced support for the Moscow treaty, although behind the scenes they conducted all kinds of intrigues against the treaty, and before they left Nicosia made a special statement on this question. An unenviable situation for those who try to pose as the only exponents of the views of the peoples of Asia and Africa!

The attempts of the Chinese leaders to appeal to the international communist movement and allege that their obstruction of the nuclear test-ban treaty follows from the documents of the Moscow meetings of Communist and Workers' Parties (!), are completely untenable. One can easily satisfy oneself that the position of the Chinese government amounts to complete apostasy from the common, collectively-formulated line of the communist movement on these questions. As is well known, the 1957 Moscow meeting of Communist Parties, together with the Declaration, approved a Peace Manifesto, which solemnly appealed to all people of good will, urging them to demand "prohibition of the manufacture and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and, as a first step, an immediate end to the testing of these weapons." Under this document there is also the signature of the leader of the delegation of the Communist Party of China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

Is it a fact that the events of the subsequent period have compelled the world communist movement to change its attitude to the problem of banning nuclear weapon tests and drop from the agenda the task of struggling for the implementation of this demand? By no means—life itself has confirmed that this task confronts the peoples just as sharply as before, and this found expression in the decisions of the second inter-

national meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960.

The Statement adopted at the meeting of representatives of 81 parties says:

*"The meeting considers that the implementation of the programme for general and complete disarmament, put forward by the Soviet Union, would be of historic importance for the destinies of mankind. To realise this programme means to eliminate the very possibility of waging wars between countries. It is not easy to realise, owing to the stubborn resistance of the imperialists.*

*"Hence it is essential to wage an active and determined struggle against the aggressive imperialist forces with the aim of carrying this programme into practice. It is necessary to wage this struggle on an increasing scale and to strive perseveringly to achieve tangible results—the banning of the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons, the abolition of military blocs and war bases on foreign soil and a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments, all of which should pave the way to general disarmament."*

That document also bears the signature of the delegation of the Communist Party of China.

This shows that the leadership of the Communist Party of China was coming out a short time ago, together with all the fraternal parties, in favour of banning nuclear weapon tests, regarding this as a first and necessary step towards general and complete disarmament.

Three years have gone by since then and the struggle of the peoples against nuclear weapon tests has mounted more and more. And now that it has been crowned with success, now that the first step has been taken and a test-ban treaty has been signed, the Chinese leaders have turned completely round and declared it to be "deception," "treason," "a

conspiracy of the imperialists." What is the logic of this, may we ask?

Isn't it clear that we have here a complete renunciation by the Chinese leaders of decisions adopted by the fraternal parties, a complete departure by them from the jointly co-ordinated positions and commitments?

The Chinese leaders can issue a thousand and one more statements on the nuclear test-ban treaty, but they will not be able to whitewash their treachery and hypocrisy in the eyes of communists, in the eyes of all mankind.

Mankind's age-old dream of ruling out war from the life of society has been expressed by Marxist-Leninists in the slogan: "A world without armaments, a world without wars." The communists are consistently fighting for this great goal, rallying round their banner the broadest masses of the people of the entire world. This struggle does not at all signify, as the Chinese leaders claim, a departure from class positions but, on the contrary, fully accords with the class interests of the proletariat and all the working people, with the tasks of the social and national liberation of the peoples. This struggle strengthens the positions of the anti-imperialist forces and weakens imperialism.

Imperialism props up its domination by force of arms. To achieve disarmament means to deal a blow against the forces of imperialist aggression. It is not difficult to understand why the struggle for disarmament, for a world without armaments, is one of the most important directions of struggle against imperialism and against the aggressive policy it pursues.

The Chinese leaders pretend not to understand this. They deliberately present the struggle for disarmament as pacifism, thereby depriving it of its class essence and ignoring the fact that the broadest masses of the working people, above all, are interested

in the solution of the problem of disarmament.

As a matter of fact, the arguments of the Chinese theoreticians place them right in a vicious circle, from which there is no way out. According to their logic, wars can be done away with and disarmament achieved only after imperialism has been abolished. At the same time the abolition of imperialism is directly linked with the need for the working class and all the masses of the people to undermine its militarist foundation. But this is precisely a struggle which the Chinese leaders denigrate in an arrogant way, calling it pacifism.

The fallacy of this position stems from the inability or unwillingness of the Chinese leaders to see the realistic ways of struggling against imperialism which are opening up in the present epoch. Their bombastic revolutionary phrases about the need to put an early end to imperialism, really cover up their lack of confidence in the forces of world socialism, in the forces of the working class and the national liberation movement, and their fear of difficulties in the struggle.

It should not cause surprise when such points of departure lead the Chinese leadership to capitulation on the most important questions of foreign policy, including the possibility of solving the problem of disarmament.

The world communist movement maintains that in our day the solution of the disarmament problem is a realistic and feasible goal. The possibility of achieving disarmament was already foreseen by the founders of scientific communism and, what is more, in an epoch when capitalism dominated the entire world. For instance, in describing the conditions in Europe at the end of the last quarter of the last century, Engels wrote in 1893 about the mad arms race, about the desire of every great power to outstrip the others in military preparedness. "Is it a fact

that there is no other way out of the blind alley than a devastating war, the like of which has not been seen by the world?" he asked, and he replied: "I insist: disarmament, and thereby a guarantee of peace, is possible. . . ."

On the basis of what premises did Engels proceed in reaching this conclusion? Primarily on the basis of the fact that "in all countries the broad sections of the population with whom the obligation to supply the mass of the troops and to pay the bulk of the taxes almost exclusively lies, are calling for disarmament." (*Marx and Engels, Works, second Russian edition, vol. 22, p. 387*).

It will be seen from what has been said above that Engels regarded disarmament as a problem with a most direct bearing on the interests of the broad masses of the people, and, if only because of this fact, as a profoundly political and, therefore, a class problem. This, of course, is a far cry from what the Chinese "theoreticians," who are so prone to pose as the most righteous of Marxists, have to say about disarmament.

In our day the prerequisites for success in the struggle for disarmament and peace have increased immeasurably.

The appearance of weapons of mass destruction has made disarmament a truly vital task of the broadest masses of the people. The forces of the international working class, the forces of the fighters for disarmament and peace have increased many times over. These forces now lean for support on the might of the world socialist system; they are led by the most influential political force of our times—the international communist movement. Their demand for disarmament is supported by dozens of peace-loving states, by peoples fighting for national liberation, by trade unions and by many political parties and democratic organisations.

Clearly, in such conditions, the

question of whether or not there is to be war, whether or not it will be possible to achieve disarmament, depends to an increasing extent on the peoples themselves, on the peace-loving forces throughout the world, on the activity and scale of their struggle, and not on the imperialists.

It is a truism that as long as imperialism exists, it will retain its aggressive nature, its contradictions; it is fraught with war. Proceeding on this basis, the Chinese leaders claim that war is inevitable. Communists cannot adopt such a fatalistic attitude. We realise that the struggle against a new world war and for disarmament is not an easy task. But we clearly see the possibility of accomplishing this historic task, and we have done and are doing everything necessary to mobilise the peoples for the struggle against the arms race, the struggle to prevent a new world war.

Nor is it possible to ignore the fact that the leaders of the People's Republic of China have recently been attempting to use questions of disarmament for an unseemly political game.

Together with the other fraternal parties, the Chinese leaders signed the Statement of the 1960 Moscow meeting, which expresses support for the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament. But only a short time later they declared disarmament to be an illusion and launched a campaign against those proposals—a campaign which they have already been waging for some years. Suddenly, on July 31, 1963, the Chinese government loudly and solemnly proclaimed a programme for the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and all means of delivering them to their targets. It was with a feeling of surprise that the public throughout the world saw that this programme had actually been compiled from earlier Soviet proposals, which had only recently been described in Peking as "illusions."

The question naturally arose: For the sake of what aims has the Chinese government come out with this programme now? It is not difficult to see that the Chinese leaders carried out this manoeuvre in the hope of setting up the demand for the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons in opposition to the nuclear test-ban treaty. But this manoeuvre has failed because everyone, even persons who are not well-versed in politics, realises that the ending of tests of nuclear weapons is not in contradiction with, but on the contrary, facilitates the task of entirely prohibiting and destroying those weapons.

In its new statement of September 1, however, the Chinese government is, in actual fact, again sounding a retreat.

It is leaving aside the solemnly-proclaimed programme of nuclear disarmament which was copied from Soviet proposals, and is narrowing things down merely to a prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons "just as the use of poison gases was prohibited." It is thus going back on its previous demand for the stopping of the production of nuclear weapons and for destroying the stockpiles of

those weapons and the means of delivery.

The raising of the question of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons is not new, either, of course. This proposal has been put forward and upheld by the Soviet Union and many other states for many years already. As much as two years ago, thanks to the joint efforts of the socialist countries and states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it was possible to achieve the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a resolution on the need to conclude an international agreement prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of such an agreement would undoubtedly be useful. One cannot however, set up the task of achieving such an agreement in opposition to the nuclear test-ban treaty which has already been concluded, any more than one can reduce the entire struggle for disarmament to this—also partial—measure.

And so it is seen that the Chinese leaders do not have any programme for disarmament: they are not waging and do not want to wage a struggle for this great aim and if they do sometimes talk about disarmament, they do so only in order to cover up their real intentions.

2

THE Chinese government statement says that in "justifying" the nuclear test-ban treaty (as though this treaty needs any justification!), the Soviet Union has put forward "slandereous inventions" of some sort about China.

What is all this about? It has transpired that our statement of August 21 exposed the real motives guiding the Chinese leaders in their opposition to the nuclear test-ban treaty—it revealed their desire to acquire their own atom bomb at any cost. The Chinese leaders do not agree with this conclusion. In their statement of September 1 they even

call it "ludicrous," and in order to make their reply more biting, they quote a Chinese legend with the following moral: "Everyone has his own ideals, and it is not for dwarfs to measure with their own yardstick the deeds of giants."

It will be necessary to return once again to the motives that prompted the Peking "giants" to rush into battle against the nuclear test-ban treaty. What is said about this in their new statement? It actually confirms the conclusion we have drawn and proves once again that the negative attitude of the Chinese government to the nuclear test-ban

treaty is explained precisely by their desire to make their country a nuclear power. The Chinese statement again repeats the allegation that the treaty perpetuates the three-power "monopoly" of atomic and hydrogen weapons and is aimed at "tying the hands of socialist countries, with the exception of the Soviet Union, at tying the hands of all peaceloving countries."

In the first place it is profoundly provocative that the Chinese leaders should have posed the question of a "monopoly" of nuclear weapons in such a way that the Soviet Union, a socialist state, is placed on the same footing as imperialist states—the United States of America and Britain. The peoples of the countries of the socialist community and all the peoples of the world know full well whom the nuclear weapons at the disposal of the Soviet state serve, and whom the nuclear arsenal of the imperialists serves.

But this is not the only point. The Chinese leaders also found it necessary to talk about "monopoly" in order to justify their right to nuclear weapons. But in vain do the authors of the statement try to speak for the socialist and all peaceloving countries. As is well known, not one of them has proclaimed that it is its intention to obtain nuclear weapons. Far from that, the governments of socialist states have more than once made statements to the effect that they do not intend to create their own nuclear weapons, being convinced that the nuclear rocket shield at the disposal of the Soviet Union offers them reliable protection.

This time, however, the Chinese government revealed its intentions even more openly, proclaiming for everyone to hear that in spite of all the economic difficulties experienced by its country, it was prepared to work, even if it took 100 years, to create its own atomic weapons. So we see that the schemes of the Peking "giants" are quite transparent.

Naturally, the question of whether or not China is to develop nuclear weapons is one for the People's Republic of China itself to decide. But the other socialist countries are entitled to say what they think about the Chinese government's attitude, which obstructs the nuclear test-ban treaty that has the unanimous support of all peoples. It is a fact that the international consequences of such an attitude directly affect all the socialist countries.

Their desire to provide themselves with the atom bomb at all costs and regardless of everything, cannot fail to give rise to serious doubts regarding the aims of the foreign policy of China's leaders.

It is a fact that they cannot prove that this is necessary in the interests of the defence of China and of the whole socialist camp. It is well known that the U.S.S.R.'s nuclear power is sufficient to wipe from the face of the Earth any state or coalition of states that might encroach on the revolutionary gains of the socialist countries. Even the imperialists have no illusions on that subject.

In these conditions, need there be Chinese atom bombs, too, for the defence of the socialist camp? Of course not. The Chinese leaders themselves not so long ago admitted that inasmuch as the Soviet Union had achieved great successes in the production of nuclear weapons, China clearly "need not organise the production of such weapons, especially considering the fact that they are very costly." That was said by none other than Mao Tse-tung in September, 1958.

What has changed since then? Has the nuclear rocket power of the U.S.S.R. become weaker since that time? On the contrary, the whole world is aware of our country's tremendous successes in this field. If anything has changed, it has been the policy of the government of the People's Republic of China, its attitude towards the Soviet Union,

towards the whole socialist community.

In recent times much has been said about the fact that the spreading of nuclear weapons is not in the interests of peace. An increase in the number of socialist countries possessing nuclear weapons would immediately lead to a chain reaction in the imperialist camp, and the atomic cancer would spread throughout the entire globe, greatly increasing the threat of nuclear war.

The authors of the statement hint that the Soviet Union could, if it wanted to, present nuclear weapons to China with one hand and, with the other, could struggle against the United States giving nuclear weapons to Western Germany. However, such recipes, so to speak, have a nasty smell.

Indeed, what would have happened if the Soviet Union had, on the one hand, started arming its allies with atom bombs and, on the other, had poured forth declarations against similar actions on the part of the United States? What would have been the consequences of that? They would have been most deplorable.

If the United States imperialists have not agreed up to now to the atomic arming of Western Germany, Japan and their other allies, that is explained above all by the fact that they have not dared to act contrary to the position of the socialist countries and to the unanimous demand of the public in their own and other countries.

And what would happen if we were to follow the insistent advice from Peking? The aggressive circles in the United States and in the other imperialist countries would immediately make use of this in order to step up the nuclear arms race and involve more and more countries in it. That could only hinder the resistance of the masses of the people to the nuclear arms race in the capitalist countries. We consider that such a development of events

would be very dangerous to the cause of peace.

The Chinese government believes that the atomic arming of Western Germany, Japan and the other imperialist powers could allegedly be compensated for by the appearance of nuclear weapons in China. Yet if we recognise that imperialism is the source of war, it is also necessary to recognise that the danger of war will increase in proportion to the number of imperialist states that receive nuclear weapons, and especially so when they are countries where aggressive, revenge-seeking elements are so strong.

It is common knowledge that the rulers of Western Germany, for instance, are not only allies of American imperialism, but also have their own aggressive plans with regard to the German Democratic Republic, and with regard to Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union as well, and are striving to secure the revision of frontiers. Revenge-seeking schemes are also being harboured by the Japanese reactionaries.

The reason why the imperialists of Western Germany and other countries are trying to acquire nuclear weapons for themselves can easily be explained: they need them in order to pursue their predatory, aggressive foreign policy. But it is inconceivable that people who call themselves Marxists should, by their policy, help revenge-seekers and other reactionaries to carry out their schemes. Giving revenge-seekers a chance to get hold of nuclear weapons is tantamount to putting a torch into the hands of a madman who is dancing on a keg of gunpowder.

Common sense indicates that in the interests of peace it is necessary to refrain from increasing the number of nuclear powers and to wage a struggle for the banning and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, common sense is far from being the strong point of



the Chinese leaders. Otherwise they would at least have taken into account the interests of the economic development of their own country and would have been grateful to the Soviet Union for shouldering the difficult task of manufacturing nuclear weapons for the defence needs of the whole socialist camp. It is well known that China does not have surplus resources, and it takes enormous resources to produce nuclear weapons.

We have told the Chinese leaders all this honestly and frankly. But the authors of the statement have even tried to reproach us for this. Clearly wanting to play upon the national feelings of the Chinese people, they are presenting things as if the Soviet Union were gloating over China's poverty and backwardness. And they say this about the Soviet people, who themselves experienced tremendous privations in overcoming the age-old backwardness of tsarist Russia. We do not consider ours to be a poor country, but even we have much to do in order to put an end to those material difficulties which still exist for the time being and about which we speak openly.

Our party and the Soviet government have full understanding and full sympathy for the difficulties experienced by other peoples, by the great Chinese people. We know that the basic cause of those difficulties is China's grim past, the aftermath of imperialist domination, the many years of war, the iniquity of the feudal-bureaucratic rulers.

Soviet people sincerely rejoiced when, as a result of the heroic work of the Chinese people, China's face began to change, new factories and mills appeared, irrigation facilities were built and agriculture was being reconstructed in accordance with socialist principles. Comrade Nikita Khrushchov had this to say about that on November 29, 1956:

"Soviet people view with admiration the victories of the Chinese people, the victories of the glorious fraternal Communist Party of

China, under whose leadership the Chinese people are successfully building socialism."

The Soviet people not only rejoiced at the successes of fraternal China, but also helped the Chinese people to overcome more quickly the dire legacy of the past, to develop successfully their national economy, to create new branches of industry, to carry out a technical revolution, to train national cadres and to put an end to poverty and want.

For some reason or other the Chinese leaders do not like it when we recall this. But we speak of our assistance not in order to boast about it, but in order to show other nations that the Soviet people honestly fulfil their international duty to the fraternal Chinese people. It is not our fault that the leaders of the People's Republic of China have curtailed economic co-operation with the Soviet Union and thereby deprived the Chinese people of a chance to benefit from the Soviet Union's unselfish help.

Precisely because the interests of the Chinese people are dear to us, we were upset by the turn which became apparent in the development of the Chinese national economy in 1958, when the leaders of the People's Republic of China proclaimed their line of the "Three Red Banners," announced the "Great Leap" and began setting up People's Communes. Our party saw that this was a road of dangerous experiments, a road of disregard for economic laws and for the experience of other socialist states. For instance, we could not help feeling doubts about the plan to increase steel output in the People's Republic of China from five million to 80-100 million tons in five years, and to increase total industrial output six and a half times over and agricultural production two and a half times over. These plan targets were not corroborated by any sound economic calculations. We could not fail to feel alarmed when, with every step they took, the leaders of the People's Republic of China began to pour abuse on the Leninist principle of

material incentive, abandoned the principle of remunerating labour, and went over to equalitarian distribution in People's Communes.

Our party did not find it possible to come out with open criticism of this line of the Chinese leadership. At the same time we could not conduct propaganda for those unjustified experiments either, because we would thereby have been doing a poor service to the Chinese communists and would have been misleading other fraternal parties. We regarded it as our duty to tell the Chinese leaders in a comradely way as early as 1958 about our doubts concerning such "innovations."

This was said by Nikita Khrushchov personally to Mao Tse-tung in the summer of 1958. The head of the Soviet government pointed out in those conversations that many things which the Chinese comrades regarded as the very latest in Marxism, as a method of speeding up the building of communism, had already been tried out in practice by our own people during the first years of the revolution. In our day we learned that such a form of organising peasant production as the commune did not justify itself for many reasons. Our party accomplished the task of the socialist transformation of agriculture on the basis of Lenin's co-operative plan.

The Chinese leaders turned a deaf ear to our considerations and did not take into account the experience of our party and state. Moreover, people in China began calling us conservatives, believing that the "Great Leap" and the People's Communes would permit the People's Republic to skip a whole stage in the building of a new society and go over to communism straight away.

Everyone now knows what really came of all this. The industry and agriculture of China have been seriously upset and the leaders of the People's Republic have been compelled already for some years to work on so-called "adjustments" of the

national economy, which actually means recognition of the utter failure of the line of the "Three Red Banners."

Today the leaders of China are trying to explain their country's serious economic difficulties by various objective reasons. What is more, they are striving to put the blame for these difficulties on the Soviet Union, alleging that failures in the Chinese economy occurred because the Soviet Union broke the existing agreements and recalled its specialists.

The Soviet government has already explained on more than one occasion the reasons why it was compelled to recall from China its specialists, who were placed by the Chinese authorities in conditions which ruled out the possibility of doing normal work and which were humiliating to their human dignity. And we do not consider it necessary to dwell at length on this question here.

The attempts of the Chinese leaders to justify difficulties in the development of the Chinese economy by references to the recall of Soviet specialists are absolutely artificial, all the more so since not a single Soviet specialist is known to have worked in Chinese agriculture or in many branches of industry. No matter how the Chinese leaders manoeuvre, they will have to admit, sooner or later, that the real reason for the dire state of the Chinese economy lies in the fact that Leninist principles of managing the socialist economy were flagrantly violated there and grave mistakes were made, for which the Chinese people are now having to pay.

In striving to justify their stand on the question of nuclear weapons, the leaders of the People's Republic of China have gone to such lengths as to say that the Soviet Union became, as from a certain time, an unreliable ally, that it cannot be relied upon now and this is why China, you see, should make her own nuclear weapons. In order to make this version, so to speak, look more trust-

worthy, they misrepresent the universally-known stand of the U.S.S.R. with regard to Taiwan\* and accuse the Soviet Union of having agreed to recognise the existence of "two Chinas."

What "proofs" are brought forward to confirm this? Primarily that the Chiang Kai-shekites have signed the American copy of the nuclear test-ban treaty. In this connection the Chinese government hastened to declare: You accuse us of linking up with the American "wild men," the French extremists and the West German revenge-seekers, while you yourselves, by signing the treaty, have landed in the same company with Chiang Kai-shek.

What a proof! As if the Chinese leaders did not know that the Chiang Kai-shekites have signed the treaty precisely for the purpose of speculating on the political miscalculations of the government of the People's Republic of China, on its irresponsible attitude with regard to the treaty, and thereby creating the impression that, as distinct from the People's Republic of China, they are allegedly in favour of the easing of international tension. American propaganda is using this in order to further its own ends in every possible way.

It is not the Soviet Union that is to be blamed for the fact that the Chiang Kai-shek dregs and American propaganda have received material for such speculation, but the Chinese government, which is alone responsible for this. There can be no doubt that the imperialists will strive to avail themselves further of every such opportunity in their own interests. Nothing else can be expected of them.

As for our attitude to the Chiang Kai-shek clique, it is well known. We have not recognised and do not recognise the signature of a Chiang Kai-shek representative under any international documents. The Soviet government did not invite the Chiang Kai-shekite to sign the treaty and did not give its consent to this. More-

over, the Soviet government warned the United States government already during the talks on the conclusion of the treaty, that it would not recognise the signature of a representative of the Chiang Kai-shek clique and that the only legitimate signature of China under the treaty could be that of a representative of the People's Republic of China.

It can only be regretted that precisely this signature is lacking under the test-ban treaty.

The statement of the Chinese government also contains another nonsensical invention to the effect that the Soviet Union "wants China to agree to the shady schemes of the United States, aimed at setting up 'two Chinas.'" What is more, it refers to a statement of Comrade Nikita Khrushchov, made in October, 1959, during a conversation with leaders of the People's Republic of China. During this talk Nikita Khrushchov said, touching on the Taiwan question, that different ways to solve it were possible—not only military ways, but peaceful ways, too. Now the Chinese leaders, distorting the meaning of those pronouncements, strive to present the case as though the Soviet Union, in allowing for the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan issue, thereby recognised a "two Chinas" situation.

But this, of course, is utter nonsense. It was none other than the government of the People's Republic of China that in its day put forward the idea of the peaceful reunification of Taiwan with the rest of the territory of China and was even ready, according to reports, to give Chiang Kai-shek a responsible post in the Chinese government. Did it thereby also want to legalise a "two Chinas" situation?

The whole world knows that the Soviet government has always shared and supported the stand of the People's Republic of China on the question of Taiwan.

The Soviet Union has never agreed, and never will agree to the wresting

of Taiwan from China and it resolutely rejects the conception of "two Chinas." In the course of the talks with the United States President in 1959, the head of the Soviet government, Nikita Khrushchov, resolutely stressed that Taiwan was an inalienable part of China and that the Chinese people had every right to liberate Taiwan.

The message from the head of the Soviet government to the President of the United States of October 12, 1959, said:

"The so-called question of Taiwan is a question of relations between Chinese and Chinese, a purely internal matter for China. The extension to Taiwan of the system of government now existing on the rest of China's territory will, in actual fact, be the final stage of the revolutionary liberation process which has been going on in China for many years.

"No international complications would have arisen over Taiwan in general, had it not been for foreign interference in the civil war in China, had it not been for the situation artificially created in Taiwan as a result of the United States' military support and protection for Chiang Kai-shek."

Addressing the session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1960, the head of the Soviet government, Nikita Khrushchov, declared:

"It is no secret from anyone that the idea of 'two Chinas' is actually a poorly-disguised diversion aimed at partitioning the territory of great China and at annexing one of the parts of that country—the province of Taiwan. It has long been clear that the provocative plans for creating 'two Chinas' are doomed to failure and the sooner certain politicians in the United States realise this, the better it will be for the cause of world peace."

The Soviet Union has more than once proved by deeds its loyalty to its duty as an ally in relation to frater-

nal countries, including China. Who does not remember, for instance, that when a dangerous situation arose in the area of the Taiwan Strait in 1958, the Soviet government warned the President of the United States that it would regard an attack on the People's Republic of China as an attack on the Soviet Union and that if the aggressor used nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would use its own nuclear rocket weapons to defend China.

During those anxious days the Chinese leadership was grateful for the effective Soviet support and duly appreciated the role of the Soviet Union in ensuring the security of the People's Republic of China. A letter from the central committee of the Communist Party of China of October 15, 1958, signed by Mao Tse-tung, said:

"We are deeply touched by your boundless devotion to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and internationalism.

"On behalf of all the comrades who are members of the Communist Party of China, I convey heartfelt gratitude . . ."

After that, the letter continued as follows:

"We are fully confident that should the events on Taiwan resolve themselves into a war between China and the United States, the Soviet Union will unflinchingly render assistance to us with all its strength. Actually, in our struggle with the Americans, we have already now received powerful support from the Soviet Union."

The newspaper *People's Daily* wrote in the same vein (September 11, 1958):

"The statement of the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers to the effect that an attack on the People's Republic of China would be tantamount to an attack on the Soviet Union and that the U.S.S.R., together with China, would do everything to uphold the security of both states and the interests of

\* Formosa.

peace in the Far East and throughout the world, constitutes effective and powerful support for the people of China in their struggle against American armed provocations. This is a serious warning to the American rulers."

Now that the critical days of the Taiwan crisis are behind us, the Chinese government is claiming the direct opposite.

"A still greater absurdity," it says, in its statement of September 1, "is the fact that the Soviet statement also credits Soviet nuclear weapons with the victory of the Chinese people in smashing the armed provocation of American imperialism in the Taiwan Strait in 1958. . . . Although the situation in the area of Taiwan Strait was tense, nevertheless the possibility of nuclear war did not arise and there was no need to render support to China with Soviet nuclear weapons. When all that became clear to the Soviet leaders, they came out in support of China."

The Chinese leaders, it seems, have short memories. They think that facts can be assessed in one way today and in another tomorrow, and in yet another way the day after tomorrow. Unfortunately, such treatment of facts has become a usual method of struggle of the leaders of the People's Republic of China against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Marxist-Leninist parties. But slander and deceit only undermine their own authority and give rise to still greater doubts about the political aims of the Chinese leadership.

Matters, however, are not confined to this. Now that the United States imperialists are well aware of the strength of the Soviet nuclear rocket shield, which is reliably guarding the security of all socialist countries, the Chinese leaders are less afraid of the possibility of American aggression against China. In this situation they believe they can permit themselves to jeer at those very measures of the

Soviet Union during the Taiwan crisis for which, at that time, they themselves warmly thanked us. The Chinese leaders now say cynically in their statement of September 1: "Well, Soviet leaders, protect us with your nuclear weapons, but we shall still criticise you."

In this connection one cannot but recall the old Russian proverb: "Don't foul the well; you may need its water!"

The statement of the Chinese government also contains the following amazing conclusion which deserves to be quoted:

"It is true that if Soviet leaders really adhered to the principles of proletarian internationalism, then China would not have had to ponder over the need to produce nuclear weapons. However, it is also true that if Soviet leaders really adhered to the principles of proletarian internationalism, they would have had no grounds whatsoever for preventing China from producing nuclear weapons."

There is also another proverb: "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." The Chinese leaders, who are occupying a more than doubtful position, would do better to be careful in raising the question of proletarian internationalism and of who is violating its principles. The stones thrown by them are bouncing back, breaking to pieces their flimsy logical contrivances. Indeed, if the leaders of China follow the principles of proletarian internationalism, why are they trying so hard to get hold of their own atom bomb? After all, persons who are stopping at nothing in their desire to acquire new types of devastating weapons should, after all, have some motives? What is behind this desire?

From our point of view, the very idea of a need to acquire their own nuclear weapons can be conceived by the leaders of a country whose

security is guaranteed by the whole might of the socialist camp, only when they have developed special aims and interests of some kind which cannot be supported by the military strength of the socialist camp. But only people who are renouncing proletarian internationalism, departing from socialist positions on questions of foreign policy and discarding the Leninist principles of peaceful co-existence, can develop aims and interests of such a kind.

Plans for developing nuclear weapons in order to increase, for instance, one's influence in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, or to create for oneself a "position of strength" on disputed international issues, or to increase international tension—such plans cannot possibly be made to accord with the peace-loving course in foreign policy pursued

by the countries of the socialist system. We will be frank: we would not like to think that the government of the People's Republic of China is guided by such motives.

We are convinced that the prestige of any socialist country is measured by the example it sets the peoples in the struggle for the fulfilment of their aspirations, in the creation of a better life, in the development and strengthening of the economy and culture, improving the wellbeing of the working people and developing socialist democracy, in the struggle for peace on earth. That is what really increases the international authority of socialist countries in the eyes of the peoples throughout the world. And it is such a policy that was bequeathed to the communists by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

### 3

THE Chinese leaders have had to justify themselves very often recently with regard to the just accusations, advanced by the world public, that, by their policy, they are leading matters to an aggravation of world tension and are pushing the world towards a thermonuclear war.

In the statement of September 1 the Chinese leaders try to prove that they have never come out against the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence, but, on the contrary, are the most fervent supporters of the prevention of war.

This statement by the Chinese leadership could be welcomed if it indeed signified a turning point in the views of the Chinese leaders on the question of war and peace and in their policy on the world scene.

In reality, however, we see that they are not even considering such a turning point, but, as before, are upholding their erroneous conception on the question of war and peace which is fraught with serious con-

sequences for the security of nations. The difference between their present statements and the previous ones consists only in the fact that they are now trying still harder to screen their real position and to hide it behind words about peaceful wishes and their desire to preserve peace.

By resorting to denial and self-justification, however, the authors of the statement become still more confused and create new doubts with regard to the true attitude of the Chinese leadership to the problem of war and peace.

Indeed, what are they trying to prove? They allege that quotations from statements by Mao Tse-tung that not all, but half, of mankind would perish in a future war and from his well-known article *Long Live Leninism!* published in the magazine *Red Flag* on the "wonderful prospects" which allegedly would open up before mankind after a thermonuclear war, have been torn from the text and misinterpreted in Soviet documents.

Well, we are ready to examine the question of who is distorting and who is misinterpreting both quotations. We shall dwell on this below.

But don't the authors of the statement see that in this way they are giving themselves away lock, stock and barrel, that they are not refuting, but only once more confirming the grave fears of the world communist movement and the progressive public with regard to the position of the Chinese leaders on the questions of war and peace? What are they arguing about? In effect, they are arguing about what part of mankind will perish in the event of a new world war—all or only half.

The statement says: "The words of Mao Tse-tung, used by him in 1957 and quoted above, were addressed to those people who allege that in the case of a nuclear war being unleashed by imperialism, mankind will perish."

"We," the statement goes on to say, "do not agree with this view of theirs, so pessimistic and full of despair. We say that if imperialism unleashes a nuclear war, it will bring on the death of at least half of the world's population." And in conclusion it says: "We are confident of the bright future of mankind."

This is, indeed, monstrous talk! What "wonderful future" can one speak of in view of the prospect of the annihilation of half of mankind! No less dangerous is another fact, that the Chinese leaders are making their forecasts regarding the possible consequences of war not simply because they want to penetrate into the future with the eye of the mind, but in order to justify a definite policy.

The authors of the statement themselves do not deny this. Summing up the argument on how many people would perish in the flames of thermonuclear war, they write: "Essentially the question is what policy, after all, should be followed in the face of the nuclear blackmail and nuclear threat

of the American imperialism—to offer resistance or to surrender?"

It goes without saying that no Soviet leader ever posed, or could pose, the question of surrender. It is not for surrender that the Soviet Union has created and is perfecting its enormous nuclear might. There is no doubt—nor can there be any—that if the imperialist aggressors attack the socialist camp, they will receive a crushing rebuff.

The question has to be posed differently: must we, seriously and with all our strength, fight for peace, must we adhere to the principles of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems as the general line of foreign policy, or take our cue from the "wild men" and compete with the imperialists in building up international tension? It is in solving this question that the Chinese leaders deliberate whether a half or all of mankind would be destroyed in the flames of a new war. If it would be "only" half, then a war may be risked because a "wonderful future" is in store for the other half!

That this is exactly how the question is being posed is evident also from the pronouncement by Mao Tse-tung even in the altered form in which it is given in the statement of the Chinese government of September 1 "... if the worst came to the worst and half of mankind died, the other half would remain, while imperialism would be razed to the ground and the whole world would become socialist."

No less eloquent in this sense is the quotation from the magazine *Red Flag* which they are trying to deny, to the effect that in case of war the victorious peoples "will very quickly create a civilisation a thousand times higher on the ruins of destroyed imperialism."

We consider that it is absolutely impermissible for communists to argue from such positions and to determine a policy on the basis of how many people would perish in a

thermonuclear holocaust: half of mankind or the whole of mankind.

We Marxist-Leninists hold the destinies of all the peoples close to our hearts. We realise full well what modern nuclear weapons are, and we therefore consider forecasting the scale of casualties in a future war to be absurd and irresponsible, and this is what the Chinese leaders are doing instead of concentrating their efforts on the struggle to prevent a new world war.

If communists, if the peace fighters, if all the peaceloving forces allow atomic bombs to start falling, then the question of how many people will perish and how many will survive will no longer be controlled by governments and political parties.

It will be decided by military technology, by the logic of the development of war and by the number of countries and peoples which will find themselves in the sphere of direct or indirect effects of nuclear weapons.

Trying to distort the clear-cut position of the C.P.S.U. on the question of atomic war and its consequences, the Chinese leaders ascribe to the C.P.S.U. leadership, to Comrade Nikita Khrushchov, a statement allegedly made by him at the Bucharest meeting of fraternal parties, to the effect that now that nuclear weapons exist, "an organised militia is not an army but cannon fodder." Having invented this absurdity, the authors of the statement immediately draw a staggering conclusion from it: "in the eyes of the Soviet leaders the entire 3,000 million people of the world are nothing but worthless rubbish."

Can there be anyone who knows the noble humanitarianism of Soviet foreign policy, and who is aware of our struggle for the future of the peoples, who would believe this invention? This is what Nikita Khrushchov actually said:

"Let the Chinese comrades take no offence. Of course you have a great experience of war, but chiefly of guerrilla war, while we

fought a more serious, so to say classic, war against Hitler Germany. The imperialist strategists now regard divisions as cannon fodder. What counts with them now is who has hydrogen bombs and combat planes and how many. Whereas formerly the enemy had to be put out of action with the bayonet, now they will be dropping bombs."

This is what was said in Bucharest. What evil intent do the Chinese leaders read into this?

The Chinese theoreticians have tackled the task of substantiating their recipes for a "wonderful future" in earnest; they are even trying to substantiate some law according to which the more people perish, the better for the cause of the revolution.

"Reactionaries of all colours have sought to destroy the revolution by means of terror," says a Chinese publication entitled *Imperialism and All Reactionaries are Paper Tigers*.

"They thought that the more people were killed, the smaller would be the forces of the revolution. Contrary to such reactionary subjective wishes, the facts show that the more people that are killed by the reactionaries, the greater are the forces of the revolution, the nearer reaction is to its doom. This is an inexorable law."

The Chinese leaders are urging the socialist countries and communists to become fatalists and to accept the inevitability of sacrificing a half—if only a half!—of the population on the altar of a new war. It is clear that the losses of the countries with great density of population which would find themselves in the centre of hostilities would be even greater, and their peoples might cease to exist altogether.

As a matter of fact, they have spoken about this with the utmost frankness and on more than one occasion. For instance, when a Czechoslovak journalist pointed out in a

conversation with Tao Chu, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party of China, that in Czechoslovakia with her population of 13 million, the entire nation might perish in a thermonuclear war, he was told :

"In the case of a war of annihilation, the small countries belonging to the socialist camp would have to subordinate their interests to the common interests of the entire camp as a whole."

Another high Chinese official in a conversation with Soviet representatives contended that Comrade Togliatti, secretary-general of the Italian Communist Party, was mistaken when, expressing concern for the destiny of his people, he said that in the case of a thermonuclear war the whole of Italy would be destroyed.

"But other peoples would remain," said that official, "and imperialism will be destroyed . . ."

Such, in essence, is the point of view of the Chinese leaders on the question of thermonuclear world war. They refuse to take into consideration the tremendous casualties that war would bring. They refuse to take scientific data into consideration and, with a stubbornness which is worthy of a better cause, keep repeating that one should not exaggerate the dangerous consequences of a world war, even if half of the population of our planet would die.

But even if part of humanity, whether more than half or less than half, survives, who can seriously believe that the survivors would be able rapidly to build a new high civilisation in conditions when cities and economic and cultural centres would have been reduced to radioactive rubble, when whole countries would have been consumed by nuclear fire and when the earth's atmosphere would have been poisoned with lethal radioactive matter.

In politics one must proceed not from Utopias but from the fact that thermonuclear war would entail disastrous consequences for all peoples

and for the whole world. All countries, even those which survived the war, would be set back in their development by decades, perhaps even by centuries.

Neither will the picture of the birthrate in a world after a thermonuclear war look the way the Chinese leaders are trying to present it: half the people will perish but—who cares?—mothers will give birth to new ones and the human race will be none the worse for that.

The Chinese leaders refuse to take all these facts into consideration; in essence they preach that thermonuclear war is permissible. What is this, after all, a special brand of heroism or some new-fangled humanitarianism? Is such a position compatible with the noble duty of leaders of the working class, of working people?

Did they stop to ponder the question in Peking as to who, in point of fact, is destined to perish in the flames of a thermonuclear war if it does break out? The imperialists and monopolists? Not they alone, unfortunately. They will touch off the war, but it is the tremendous masses of working people—workers, peasants and intellectuals—that would perish in it.

Not a single Marxist party which has a responsibility to the people will ever accept the Chinese propositions as the basis of its policy.

This is how matters stand with regard to the substance of the argument. Let us now return to the question of quotations.

The authors of the statement quote a corrected version of Mao Tse-tung's pronouncement at the 1957 Moscow meeting which differs substantially from the genuine text. For the sake of truth we shall quote from the records of the meeting the words actually uttered by Mao Tse-tung in the presence of those taking part in the meeting. This pronouncement reveals most nakedly the erroneous views of the Chinese leadership.

"Can one guess," he said, "how

great the toll of human casualties in a future war will be? Possibly it would be a third of the 2,700 million inhabitants of the entire world, i.e., only 900 million people. I consider this to be even low, if atomic bombs should actually fall. Of course it is most terrible. But even half would not be so bad. Why? Because it was not we that wanted it but they. It is they who are imposing war on us. If we fight, atomic and hydrogen weapons will be used. Personally I think that in the whole world there will be such suffering that half of humanity and perhaps more than a half will perish.

"I had an argument about this with Nehru. In this respect he is more pessimistic than I am. I told him that if half of humanity is destroyed, the other half will still remain but imperialism will be destroyed entirely and there will be only socialism in all the world, and within half a century, or a whole century, the population will again increase by even more than half."

The substance of this pronouncement is fully confirmed in the statement of September 1, but the version of the text cited in that document contains words and phrases which clearly betray a desire to veil its genuine meaning. For instance, the statement lays special emphasis on the words :

"Here in China we are engaged in construction, we want peace. However, if the imperialists, notwithstanding anything, impose a war we shall have to clench our teeth, postpone construction, to resume it after the war."

The point is, however, that these were not at all the words that were uttered at the 1957 meeting. This is what Mao Tse-tung actually said :

"In China construction has not got under way in earnest. If the imperialists impose a war on us, we shall be prepared to terminate the construction; let us first have a trial of strength, and then return to construction."

It will be clear to everyone that this pronouncement has an absolutely different meaning. What does the call "let us first have a trial of strength and then return to construction" mean? Is this a call for peace, for the struggle for peaceful co-existence? In essence, this means exactly an orientation towards an armed conflict, towards a military solution of the contradictions between socialism and capitalism. And no one could succeed in presenting this orientation as a slip of the tongue.

The Chinese leaders are displeased when they are reminded of this statement by Mao Tse-tung, and they claim that what was involved was the case of the imperialists thrusting war on the peoples. In this connection, we would like to ask: where and when did they speak of any other prospect of victory over capitalism? Where and when did they specifically declare that the socialist countries could defeat capitalism by the course of peaceful competition with it?

The Chinese press and the documents of the Chinese Communist Party systematically and stubbornly preach the idea that "peaceful economic competition is not a real means of struggle against imperialism," and that "peaceful co-existence cannot be recognised as the general policy of the socialist countries."

The facts show that instead of the policy of peaceful co-existence, the Chinese leaders are lavishly praising the "cold war" and a situation of world tension.

As far back as 1958, when the view concerning the supposed benefits which the cold war situation offered to the interests of the revolution was apparently only taking shape in Peking, the head of the People's Republic of China advanced the following ideas: The West thinks that it will profit from the cold war. However, the cold war "is more profitable to our countries." Later the Chinese leaders developed this kind of belief into a whole "theory."

"In the talks on the questions of

international policy," runs the resolution of the 3rd plenary meeting of the central committee of the Costa Rica People's Vanguard Party, "the Chinese leaders told our comrades that the 'cold war is a good thing' and that the 'situation of tension is a good situation' for the development of the revolutionary struggle."

These ideas are being extensively put forward in the Chinese press. Here are some examples. In one of its issues in December, 1962, the newspaper *People's Daily* said:

"As to the assertion that it is possible to create 'a world without war,' this is certainly absolute nonsense."

Liao Cheng-Chih, member of the central committee of the Communist Party of China, at the session of the World Peace Council in Stockholm in December, 1961, tried to prove that those who think that it is possible to reach agreement with the imperialists and ensure peaceful co-existence are deceiving themselves.

Let us analyse the real meaning of these propositions.

On the one hand, the Chinese leaders assert that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists, and put forward the view that international tension and the cold war are a boon. On the other hand, they say that if world war does break out, nothing terrible will happen, because half mankind will remain alive anyway, and will build an even more wonderful future.

If you couple these views together, you will see clearly that they do not deal at all with what will happen if the imperialists unleash war, in spite of all the efforts of the forces of peace. Nothing of the kind, such talks are only a means of camouflage. In reality the stand of the Chinese leadership looks quite different. The war variant of the development of events is regarded by it as inevitable and even more desirable than the peaceful variant.

With all this in the background, it

is hard for the Chinese leaders to present themselves as the champions of peace and of peaceful co-existence.

The core of the matter, however, is not only in quotations and statements, but in the fact that in recent years the Chinese leaders have been carrying out in practice a policy which leaves no doubts of their desire to undermine peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems.

Having no faith in the possibility of preventing a thermonuclear world war, the Chinese leaders are putting obstacles in the path of carrying out the measures proposed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to lessen international tension. Every time that, thanks to the efforts of the socialist countries and peace-loving peoples, a relaxation of tension has taken place in recent years, the Chinese leadership has left no stone unturned in order to undermine such a relaxation.

No doubt remains now that one of the reasons for the attack by the Chinese leaders on the policy of the world communist movement was the lessening of international tension, which took place in 1959, when there was a definite relaxation in the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States, especially after Comrade Khrushchov's trip to the U.S.A.

It cannot be considered as accidental that at that actual period the Chinese leaders got themselves involved in an armed clash on the Indian-Chinese border, and this, besides creating an acute situation in that part of the world, was ultimately aimed at torpedoing the relaxation of international tension which had taken place.

Already at the time when the Chinese-Indian conflict began in 1959, the Soviet leaders told the Chinese government frankly that the aggravation of the dispute in connection with frontier territories in the Himalayas, territories inherited by China and India from the old days, and the development of this dispute into a

large armed conflict was undesirable and fraught with negative consequences, not only for Chinese-Indian relations but for the whole international situation.

We consider that in frontier disputes, especially in a dispute of the type of the Chinese-Indian clash, one should adhere to the Leninist views according to which it is possible to settle any frontier problems without resorting to armed force, granted that both sides desire to do so.

Everyone can now see that the Chinese-Indian conflict in the Himalayas had the most negative consequences for the cause of peace, inflicted great harm on the unity of the anti-imperialist front in Asia and placed the progressive forces in India in an extremely difficult position.

As it could be expected, China herself did not benefit in any way. And her prestige in the eyes of the peoples of the world, and especially of the Afro-Asian peoples, has certainly not grown.

It was with a feeling of bewilderment and bitterness that the peoples saw one of the socialist countries, which had recently become independent and served as a model to them, get itself involved in a military conflict with a young neutralist state and, using its military superiority, endeavour to gain for itself in that way a favourable solution of the problem of a certain part of territory.

The Chinese leaders ignored the comradely advice of other socialist and fraternal countries. Moreover, they saw in this an unwillingness to support them in the international arena and considered this comradely advice a great injury to themselves.

In the article *What is the Cause of the Dispute?*, the Chinese comrades directly link the beginning of their differences with the fraternal parties with the fact that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries failed to give unconditional support to China's stand in the conflict on the Indian-Chinese border.

The actions of the Chinese leaders,

which undermine the policy of neutralism, in effect help the imperialist powers to increase their influence in the emancipated countries and especially in India.

All this can, of course, hold up the development of the struggle for national independence and have a negative effect on the balance of forces in the world arena: This attitude to a neutral country is all the more obscure in view of the fact that the government of the People's Republic of China has in every way been making overtures to the blatantly reactionary regimes in Asia and Africa, including countries which belong to the imperialist military blocs.

The Chinese leaders often use the question of the Soviet Union's aid to India for anti-Soviet purposes. However, they do not tell their people the truth of the fact that Soviet aid to the peoples of the emancipated countries is imbued with the desire to strengthen their economic and political positions in their struggle for independence and against imperialism.

That policy is also to be seen clearly in our relations with India. The Soviet Union helped the Indian people, who had shaken off the yoke of British imperialism, to gain a footing in neutral positions and to oppose the attempts of the imperialists to impose an economic yoke on India. We have always considered this policy to be correct, for it conforms to the interests of peace and socialism.

It would not be amiss to recall the fact that before 1959 the People's Republic of China pursued the same kind of policy with regard to India. We were glad to see the development of good-neighbourly relations between Asia's two largest states, their support of one another in the struggle for peace and against the aggressive designs of imperialism. We met with approval the friendly contacts between Chinese and Indian leaders, their joint statement in favour of

peace, and especially, the Pancha Shila principles proclaimed by Premiers Chou En-lai and Nehru. In the light of all this, the Chinese-Indian armed conflict came as a complete surprise both to the Soviet people and to the whole world public.

The Chinese leaders are now making accusations, stating that India is waging war on China and using Soviet armaments. First of all, this is essentially not true to the facts; secondly, if one were to follow this kind of logic, the Indian government has a great deal more reason to declare that the Chinese troops are waging war on India and are using Soviet armaments—because everyone knows of the tremendous military aid which the Soviet Union gives to China.

In helping socialist China and peaceloving India, we have been prompted by the best of sentiments. We were proceeding from these friendly feelings and in the interests of strengthening the peace and unity of the anti-imperialist forces when we declared that the Chinese-Indian conflict evoked our deep regret. We still consider that the solution of that conflict in a peaceful way, through negotiations, would be in the interest of both the Chinese and Indian peoples and in the interests of world peace.

In recent years, on her borders with neighbouring states, the Chinese side has been stooping to acts of a nature which gives us reason to think that the government of the People's Republic of China is departing, on this question, more and more from Leninist positions. The leaders of the People's Republic of China are deliberately concentrating the people's attention on frontier problems, artificially fanning nationalist passions and dislike for other peoples.

Since 1960, Chinese servicemen and civilians have been systematically violating the Soviet frontier. In the one year of 1962, more than 5,000 violations of the Soviet frontier from the Chinese side have been recorded. Attempts are also being made to

“develop” some parts of Soviet territory without permission.

One Chinese citizen who crossed the border had written instructions from the People's Committee of the Heilun Ch'iang province, which said:

“When fish are being caught on the disputed islands of the Amur and the Ussuri, the Soviet border guards often demand that our fishermen leave these islands. We propose that the catching of fish on the disputed islands be continued and that the Soviet border guards be told that these islands belong to China, and that the border is being violated by them, not by us.” And further:

“... our fishermen are not to be removed from these islands in any circumstances. We imagine that, in view of the friendly relations between our states, the Soviet side will not resort to force to remove our fishermen from the islands.”

The Soviet government has already proposed many times to the government of the People's Republic of China that consultations be held on the question of the demarcation of specific sections of the frontier line, so as to exclude any possibility of misunderstanding. However, the Chinese side evades such consultations, while at the same time continuing to violate the border.

This cannot but make us wary, especially in view of the fact that Chinese propaganda is giving clear hints alleging that there has been unjust demarcation of some sections of the Soviet-Chinese border in the past.

However, the artificial creation, in our times, of any territorial problems—especially between socialist countries—would amount to entering on a very dangerous path. If, today, countries begin making territorial claims on one another, using as arguments certain ancient data and the graves of their forefathers, if they start fighting to revise the

historically developed frontiers, this will lead to no good, but will merely create feuds among all peoples, to the joy of the enemies of peace.

It should not be forgotten that questions of territorial disputes and claims have often in the past been the source of acute friction and conflict between states, a source inflaming nationalist passions. It is common knowledge that territorial disputes and frontier conflicts have been used as pretexts for wars of conquest. That is why communists consistently work for the solution of frontier problems through negotiation. The socialist countries, guided in their relations by the principle of proletarian internationalism, should show other peoples an example in the friendly solution of territorial problems.

The Soviet Union has no frontier conflicts with any of her neighbouring states. And we are proud of this, because this situation is in line not only with the interests of the Soviet Union, but also with the interests of all the socialist countries and the interests of world peace.

The petty methods the Chinese leaders use in fighting against the Leninist course in foreign policy taken by the socialist countries can be particularly clearly seen in their pontifications on last year's crisis in the Caribbean. Quite a lot of space is devoted to this question in the September 1 statement.

You can find there assertions that the cause of the crisis was the “reckless” behaviour of the Soviet leaders and that it was “adventurism” to install Soviet rockets on Cuba. There are also wordy allegations that the evacuation of those rockets from Cuba meant “capitulation.” There is only one feature lacking from all these things discussed in the statement of the government of the People's Republic of China—and that is the truth.

Listening to the Chinese leaders, you would think that it was not the

aggressiveness of American imperialism that placed the world on the brink of thermonuclear catastrophe in October 1962; it appears that American imperialism was not to blame, for it had not even thought of threatening Cuba!

This, however, is a flagrant lie, which Peking needs now in order to vilify the Soviet government's actions in retrospect—actions taken at a critical moment for the defence of the Cuban revolution from the threat of America's military intervention.

Neither the Cuban leaders nor the Soviet government had any doubts that this threat existed, and that the clouds were closing down over Cuba virtually day by day. The fact that the U.S. government and the Cuban counter-revolutionaries had reached an understanding for the invasion of Cuba, and that it was only left to select the moment for that invasion was confirmed, six months later, by a statement by Miro Cordona, leader of the Cuban counter-revolutionaries. In April 1963, he made public the fact that the Cuban counter-revolutionaries had signed an agreement with the U.S. government on the organisation of an invasion of Cuba.

In these conditions the Soviet Union, acting in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, supplied without hesitation its nuclear missile weapons for the defence of Cuba's revolutionary gains. The determination of the Cuban people and the Soviet rockets did their job. The American imperialists did not venture to attack Cuba, and the invasion plan was foiled. Moreover, assurance was received from the U.S. President that the U.S.A. would not undertake an attack on Cuba and would keep her allies from doing so in the future.

All this is well known to the entire world. And here is how Comrade Fidel Castro has assessed the role played by the Soviet Union in those grim days, its might, its policy in safeguarding the integrity of revolutionary Cuba. He said:

"Shining in eternal glory will be the country which, to protect a small people thousands of miles away from it, put in the balance of thermonuclear warfare its well-being, forged by 45 years of creative labour and at the price of tremendous sacrifices!"

"The Soviet Union, which lost more lives in the great patriotic war against the fascists than the entire population of Cuba in order to uphold its right to existence and to the development of its tremendous wealth, did not hesitate to assume the risk of a terrible war and the defence of our small country. History does not know such an example of solidarity."

"This is true internationalism!"

"This is communism!"

Need we add anything to those words of comrade Fidel Castro?

That is how the Soviet Union acted, guiding itself by the principles of proletarian internationalism. It acted—brushing aside the inflammatory "advice" which emanated from Peking during the Caribbean crisis—advice which would assuredly have plunged the world into the cauldron of thermonuclear war if we had followed it instead of the Leninist course of our foreign policy.

For, in effect, the Chinese leaders then tried to prod us into an extremely dangerous gamble and convert Cuba into a field where the concept formulated for the small peoples in Peking—to sacrifice them-

selves "for the sake of the wonderful future of mankind"—would have been tried out for the first time.

Now, when a year has passed since the Caribbean crisis, it is becoming even more clear that the Chinese leadership sabotaged the agreed actions of the socialist countries for ensuring the security of the island of freedom, and thereby played into the hands of the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The imperialist circles of the West do not conceal their satisfaction at the present line of the People's Republic of China, frankly declaring that the policy of the government of the People's Republic of China facilitates their actions in maintaining tension in the Caribbean. Can this line of Chinese leaders be described otherwise than as a betrayal of the interests of the Cuban people, betrayal of the interests of the peoples of the socialist countries?

The policy of the Soviet government, directed towards a peaceful resolution of the Caribbean crisis, towards protecting the peaceful labours of the Cuban people, has been warmly and unanimously approved by the whole Soviet people, by all peaceloving people in the world. Only the extreme rancour of the Chinese leadership can explain the fact that they are still trying to speculate on the difficulties which existed during the solution of the Caribbean crisis, time and again advancing a provocative version of the policy of the U.S.S.R. during that period.

4

**T**HIS is not the first time that we have had to deal with statements by Chinese leaders alleging that the struggle to ease international tension, for the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, conflicts with the tasks of the world revolution and of the national liberation movement.

In their latest document, that of

September 1, the Chinese leaders are again using a government statement to raise this question once again. They contend that the struggle of the Soviet Union for peace and peaceful co-existence is nothing else but a "ban on revolution," and forgetting the interests of the liberation struggle of the peoples.

Because a correct understanding

of the problems of war, peace, and revolution in our time has assumed the utmost importance for working out the correct political line of the socialist countries and of the whole communist movement, we must demonstrate once more the falseness of the views and actions of the Chinese leadership on these questions, and set out our own position.

Does the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence favour the development of revolutionary class struggle in the capitalist countries? Does it favour an upsurge of the national liberation movement? Is it in the interests of the working class, of the working masses—i.e. of the overwhelming majority of the population of the earth—to strengthen peace, to impose upon imperialism a policy of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems? It is on the answer to these questions that the strategy and tactics of the working class and the communist movement in a large measure depend.

The entire experience of the working class and the national liberation movement in the postwar years shows convincingly that the struggle for socialism is closely interwoven with the struggle for peace, that not a single problem of any magnitude of the people's revolutionary and liberation struggles can now be regarded out of the context of the struggle for peace and peaceful co-existence.

Summing up this experience, the 1960 meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties pointed out in its statement that it is exactly "in conditions of peaceful co-existence that favourable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national liberation struggle promote peaceful co-existence."

Peace is the prime condition for

strengthening and expanding the positions of socialism in the world arena. Socialism does not need war. In conditions of peace, the socialist system has the best chance of displaying its superiority over capitalism, of achieving successes in economic development, of developing democracy, raising the welfare and culture of the people. And this, as Lenin taught, is the principal medium through which the socialist countries have a revolutionary influence on other peoples.

In conditions of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems, an upsurge is taking place, an upsurge of the economic and political struggle of the working class, of the broad masses of the workers of the highly-developed capitalist countries against imperialism, for their vital interests, for socialism. In the 15 postwar years in the capitalist world, two-and-a-half times as many factory and office workers have taken part in strikes as in the 20 prewar years. The tide of the strike movement is rising higher and higher. Whereas 13,800,000 people took part in strikes in 1956, the figure rose to more than 60,000,000 in 1961. The international communist movement has grown into the biggest political force of our time.

Life shows that, far from impeding an upsurge of the national liberation movement, the policy of peace and of strengthening peaceful co-existence stimulates it. It is in the conditions of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems that the peoples of more than 50 countries have achieved national independence.

Conditions of peace presented them with favourable opportunities for consolidating their political independence, for achieving economic independence, for overcoming age-old backwardness. The national democratic forces have a chance to press for the realisation of social reforms in the interests of the broad masses of the peoples. The countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression are



now becoming an increasingly important political factor in the international arena.

Not a single world problem can be decided any longer without their participation.

Peace is the true ally of socialism, of the international working class movement, of the peoples fighting for national liberation, and time is working for socialism and progress, against imperialism.

And what would have happened if the socialist countries, the international communist movement, had accepted the line of the Chinese leaders on the issues of war and peace?

For the socialist countries, this would mean that they would have to curtail peaceful construction, to slow down the rate of development of the productive forces and of raising the living standards of the masses of the people, because it would be necessary for them to divert very substantial quantities of additional resources to military requirements.

Reactionary circles in the capitalist countries usually take advantage of an atmosphere of international tension to resort to violent repressions against the working class and democratic organisations, to decimate the communist parties and drive them underground, to attack the vital interests, the democratic rights and freedoms of the working people.

To countries that have freed themselves from colonialism, the stepping up of tension would complicate the solution of the task of creating a national industry, the task of ousting the imperialist monopolies from their economies, the task of the carrying out of social reforms by their progressive forces; it would have diverted their resources, scanty as they are, towards military preparations. That would have delayed the liberation of peoples still held in colonial bondage.

If the viewpoint of the Chinese leaders had come out on top, if

instead of fighting for peace, the communists had themselves adopted the road of aggravating international tension, if they had conceded that world war was fatally inevitable, then mankind would have been plunged into the thermonuclear holocaust. In vain do the Chinese leaders delude themselves and others into thinking that this would bring nearer the triumph of world revolution.

When the C.P.S.U. and the fraternal parties of other countries say that imperialism would be destroyed in the flames of a new world war, they proceed from the assumption that the working people themselves would overthrow the ruling, exploiting class of their countries on whom would lie the grave responsibility for the monstrous annihilation of millions upon millions of people. But if the communists, following the line of the Chinese leaders, lowered the banner of peace and—more than that—themselves helped to unleash war, would the masses of the people entrust their destinies to such inglorious communists?

No, the peoples would never forgive those who, in one way or another, pushed mankind into thermonuclear war, no matter with what revolutionary phrases this fact was camouflaged.

It will be easily seen that the policy of the Chinese leaders is directed against the fundamental interests of the masses of the people of all countries. In reality it is tantamount to a betrayal of world socialism, of the working class and the national liberation movement, to treason to the cause of world revolution.

Revising the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, revising the general line of the communist movement, the Chinese leaders are trying to impose on the international working class and the national liberation movement the theory of speeding revolution by means of "revolutionary wars."

They believe that only in this

way can the socialist countries advance the cause of the revolution in the capitalist countries.

Here we are dealing with a violation of the Leninist thesis that revolution is the domestic affair of the working people of each country and that revolution cannot be imported from abroad. Having adopted the policy of speeding up revolution, the leaders of the People's Republic of China irresponsibly proceed from the assumption that revolutions are possible always, everywhere and under all conditions. They ignore the real balance of class forces, ignore the question of the existence of a revolutionary situation in any particular country and disregard the international situation.

The Chinese theoreticians deliberately make a hotch-potch of a multitude of different questions: world war, local wars, national liberation and civil wars, popular uprisings, peaceful and non-peaceful ways of revolution. They need to do this so as to distort the position of the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties, to present matters as if the communist movement, by adopting a policy of defending peace, is by this very fact opposing revolution.

But the position of the C.P.S.U. and of the fraternal parties is clear. We are most resolutely opposed to world war, just as we are opposed in general to wars between states. Only the imperialists need a world war—so as to seize foreign territories, to enslave and plunder the peoples, to wage struggle against the socialist countries.

We maintain, firmly and consistently, that there is no justification—nor can there be any—for touching off a new world war which, in view of the destructive nature of modern weapons, would be a real disaster for the peoples. There need, of course, be no doubt that if the imperialists were to unleash war, the peoples would sweep capitalism away and bury it. But the communists, who represent the peoples, are called upon to

do everything in their power to prevent a new world war.

At the same time, the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties consider it necessary to display the maximum vigilance with regard to all the local wars and conflicts engendered by the imperialists' "policy of strength." The facts show that, faced with an abrupt change in the balance of strength in favour of world socialism and fearing that a world war would end in complete collapse for the imperialists, some imperialist circles place their hopes on touching off local wars, striving in this way to achieve their aggressive designs.

It is the task of all democratic and peace-loving forces to give the most determined rebuff to the imperialist fomenters of local wars. This is all the more important since local wars might be the spark igniting the flames of world war. The Chinese leaders make a serious error by contending that local conflicts would under no conditions lead to universal thermonuclear war. The logic of this reasoning leads to the recognition of local wars as an acceptable and desirable political method for the socialist countries, too—in particular for the "export" of revolution.

But the entire experience of the postwar years—the experience of such crises as, for instance, the Suez crisis, caused by the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt—shows how great is the threat in our days of local wars growing over into a universal war.

The danger of thermonuclear weapons being used in local wars also becomes very real, if they involve countries possessing such weapons, or the countries bound by relevant alliances to the nuclear power.

There is a difference of principle in our attitude towards national liberation civil wars—popular uprisings. Peoples fighting, arms in hand, for their freedom and independence, for socialism, are waging a just war and we support them, as we have always done.

Like civil war, a war of liberation is usually fought within one country. The question of the use of nuclear weapons does not arise with regard to it. So far they have not been used in such a war. This is quite comprehensible, because in such cases there is very often no clearly defined front line dividing the adversaries. So it has been in Viet Nam, Cuba, Algeria and other countries.

Soviet communists welcome the struggle of the peoples who are waging wars for national and social liberation and render them every possible assistance.

As to the question of peaceful and non-peaceful forms of national liberation struggle and the struggle for socialism, here, too, the position of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the fraternal parties is absolutely clear and fully accords with the interests of the peoples.

We proceed from the premise that various forms of struggle exist, that revolutionary forces must master all these forms—both peaceful and non-peaceful—and be able to apply them skilfully in conformity with concrete situations. Such a position is the genuinely Leninist and only correct one. It has been recorded in the most important documents of the international communist movement.

It is not the C.P.S.U. or the communist movement, but the Chinese leaders who are departing from these theses. They are directly linking the victory of the revolution with war.

Mao Tse-tung says outright that "the world can be reorganised only with the help of a rifle" and that "war can be destroyed only through war." War, to quote Mao Tse-tung, is precisely the bridge over which "mankind will pass to the new historic epoch."

The theory of "revolutionary war" for the purpose of accelerating the revolutionary process is by no means a new one. It has been extracted from the dusty Trotskyite archive. This pseudo-revolutionary theory was smashed to smithereens in his time

by Lenin. And now, many years later, there are people who wish to make this scheme universal and foist it on the revolutionary forces.

What did Lenin say about the so-called theory of accelerating revolution, preached by Trotsky and the "Leftists"? He called it an "itch for revolutionary phraseology." Lenin said that any moujik would have told the author of such a theory:

"You know, my lord, it's best you leave off governing a state and enlist as a verbal clown or go and have a hot bath to wash off the itch." (*Works, Russian edition, vol. 27, p. 18.*)

Lenin used to tell such people:

"Perhaps the authors believe that the interests of international revolution require its *prodding* on, which would result only in war, and by no means in peace which could give the masses the impression that imperialism is sort of 'legalised'? Such a 'theory' would utterly contradict Marxism, which has always rejected the idea of 'prodding on' revolutions, which develop as the class contradictions which engender revolutions grow increasingly acute. Such a theory would be tantamount to the view that an armed uprising is a form of struggle which is compulsory always, and in all conditions." (*Works, vol. 27, p. 49.*)

Lenin fought implacably against revolutionary phrasemongers. He made the behest to communists:

"We must fight against the revolutionary phrase, we have to fight, fight without fail, so that no one at any time can utter the bitter truth about us: 'the revolutionary phrase about the revolutionary war killed the revolution.'" (*Works, Russian edition, vol. 27, p. 10.*)

The Chinese theoreticians, who repeat the sorry anti-Soviet slander about a "ban on revolution," cannot, of course, be ignorant of the fact that revolution does not take place on orders from Moscow or Peking, and that once it is ripe, no "ban" can stop it. And if they seriously believe

in the possibility of starting a revolution by the incantation of a left revolutionary phrase, then they are very far from Marxism-Leninism.

Marxist-Leninist teaching on revolution is now known to all educated people. Marxism-Leninism teaches that definite objective and subjective prerequisites are necessary for the victory of the revolution. The struggle for revolution in the capitalist countries is the internal matter of the working class of each country. Only the working class of this or that country and its communist vanguard can determine revolutionary tactics, the forms and methods of their struggle, and determine the time and form of the revolution.

The victory of the cause of socialism and the national liberation movement is inevitable. This is an objective process proceeding from the development of human society. Just as in its time capitalism replaced feudalism, socialism in the same way will inevitably defeat capitalism. Neither Washington, nor London, nor Paris, nor Bonn can avert the process of the collapse of capitalism.

The question is not whether "to carry on or not to carry on the revolution" as it is posed by the Peking theoreticians. Only naive people can think that should some leaders suffering from "the itch of the revolutionary phrase" wish it, then a revolution will immediately flare up in any part of the world. The authors of this theory would do better to ponder over the fact that, despite all their incantations, life is passing them by.

Indeed can the experience of revolution in the post-war epoch be confined to any pattern? The Chinese leaders, for instance, believe that all the post-war years were years of "revolutionary wars," that all the peoples have achieved liberation or can achieve it exclusively by way of war.

But this is an attempt to distort reality, to squeeze it into the narrow limits of dead patterns. In reality the

national liberation of the peoples was achieved in a struggle which included a complex interweaving of the most diverse methods and means, both peaceful and not.

The Chinese leaders accuse the Soviet people of pacifism, and of striving to disarm the liberated countries. Perhaps the Chinese leaders have facts in their possession to prove this? No, they do not have a single fact, no matter how long their statements may be. They have never given concrete examples.

That is why they have to resort to groundless declarations. There is quite a number of them in the latest Chinese government statement, too. It is alleged there that our policy in respect to the national liberation movement boils down to the following:

"One should not resist the imperialists who possess nuclear weapons; if the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations resist and if the socialist countries support their resistance, that means pushing mankind into world thermonuclear war."

Every word here is a lie, intended to delude and deceive uninformed people. The idea of this political subversion is clear: to smear the Soviet Union, to sow among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America mistrust in the policy of the Soviet Union.

The struggling peoples, however, well know that the Soviet Union has always come out and will come out against colonialism, that it has supported and will support the sacred struggle of the oppressed nations.

"The Soviet Union's position is precise and clear-cut," Comrade Nikita Khrushchev declared, "in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, in no area of the world should there be a single people living in the chains of colonialism. All peoples should be free."

The Soviet Union is doing everything necessary to prevent a nuclear hurricane from sweeping our planet,

from searing continents and leaving behind millions and millions of corpses, not excluding countries that have become free from colonialism.

Is there anything bad in this? Every sensible person will reply: "This is good. I am grateful to the Soviet Union." But the Chinese government for some reason is not satisfied with this struggle by the Soviet Union. Since they do not dare state this openly, however, they have decided to resort to falsifications, attempting to pass off black for white.

In its desire to smear the policy of the Soviet Union, the Chinese government allows itself to produce rude concoctions which sometimes reach the point of absurdity. They allege, for example, that the Soviet leaders have called the national liberation movement a "movement for piling up corpses."

The Chinese leaders apparently think that all means are good, provided they lead to the aim that they have set. But one may ask: What do such methods have in common with the morality of communists? The Soviet Union believed and believes that to uphold their independence in modern conditions the newly independent countries must not disarm but strengthen their defences, and is helping them in this righteous cause.

The Soviet Union is supporting the young newly independent countries, and is helping them not only in words but also in deeds to defend their national interests. In rendering this aid, our people sees its internationalist duty. Why do the Chinese leaders keep absolutely silent about this aspect of the question? Why are they so irritated by every mention of the concrete practical aid rendered by our country to the peoples who are in difficulty because of the aggressive intrigues of the imperialists or are experiencing serious economic difficulties in the strengthening of the independence of their countries?

The answer to these questions is not in doubt. The Chinese leaders have

set themselves the aim of making a breach in the relations of friendship and co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and other countries of socialism with the national liberation movement. They are pressing for this for the sake of their special vanguardist aims which dominate their entire present-day political course.

In promoting this course, the Chinese leaders are trying to shout as loudly as possible about their revolutionaryness. No one, however, has ever heard of a single case when shouts have brought down even a flimsy structure. This is all the more true for the capitalist system. A wise Eastern saying is: "If one hears a shout of *Candies, Candies*, it will not make a sweet taste in his mouth."

The victory of the revolution does not need hysterical appeals, but the firm advance of the working masses and their good organisation; it needs the greatest possible number of practical deeds in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

\* \* \*

When you take a closer look at the theories of the Chinese leaders, and especially their practical activities in the world arena in recent times, you cannot help wondering: Are they really such zealous revolutionaries as they pretend to be? Are they really so concerned for the fate of the world revolution, the struggle of the peoples of other countries for socialism? Their acts show that, far from putting the interests of the peoples fighting for socialism and national liberation first, the Chinese leaders are pursuing their own great power aims.

Were the Chinese leaders concerned for the fate of the Cuban revolution in the period of the Caribbean crisis? No, they occupied a provocative position, adding fuel to the glowing embers of the conflict, and strove for only one thing, regardless of the consequences this might have for the Cuban people—to exploit the crisis for their factional ends.

And did they reckon, in the Sino-

Indian border dispute, with the consequences their policy might have for the revolutionary forces of India, for the Communist Party, the working class of that country, for the entire national liberation movement? No, in this case, too, they pursued their own special aims.

Do they care now about the consequences it would have for the world, when they urge them, in their statement, to ignore the realities of the existing situation, to leave out of consideration the possibility of thermonuclear war?

Everything shows that the true objectives of the Chinese leaders are becoming increasingly removed from the interests of the struggle for the victory of socialism in all the countries of the world.

\* \* \*

The recent events—a special place among which belongs to the Chinese leaders' active struggle against the test-ban treaty and their vehement attacks upon the Soviet Union, most evident in the latest statement of the government of the People's Republic of China—cannot but arouse deep concern.

The statements and concrete practical actions of the Chinese leaders on questions of war, peace and peaceful co-existence, on the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement, on the unity of the socialist camp, and on Chinese-Soviet relations show that the government of the People's Republic of China is departing further and further from the common co-ordinated line of the countries of the socialist community, from the programme, provisions and principles of the world communist movement.

The C.P.S.U. central committee and the Soviet government have stated repeatedly that they are ready to do everything in their power to strengthen unity between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, between the Soviet and the Chinese peoples. On our part, these state-

ments have been backed by the necessary practical actions. Unfortunately, however, all our appeals to our Chinese comrades, urging them to take the road to settling differences, so as to develop our relations on the basis of what unites us, have remained unheeded. None of our practical steps in that direction have met with support.

While the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet government have striven and still strive earnestly to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the world communist movement, the leaders of the Communist Party of China are going farther along the road of division. The disagreements which have arisen between the leaders of the C.P.C. on the one hand, and the C.P.S.U. and the world communist movement on the other, are increasingly being transferred by them to inter-state relations. The Chinese government has resorted to openly hostile acts against the Soviet Union.

Its foreign policy steps more and more contradict the peaceloving policy of the U.S.S.R. and the other countries of the socialist community.

The latest statements of the Chinese leaders aimed against the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties give rise to apprehensions in yet other respects. They have not only outdone all previous statements of the Chinese leaders in the quantity of abuse and irate expressions, but they have revealed to the imperialists the internal affairs of the communist movement—confidential correspondence between the governments and parties of the socialist countries, international talks and meetings of the fraternal parties.

Not being scrupulous about their choice of words and expressions, the leaders of the Communist Party of China acrimoniously slander the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leadership and the government agencies and officials of other communist and workers' parties—and especially

Comrade Nikita Khrushchov. Judging by everything, they have set themselves the special task of discrediting the outstanding leaders of the world communist movement who are waging a principled and consistent struggle against the splitting line of the Chinese leaders.

All this shows that the leaders of the C.P.C. have transcended the boundaries of comradely party discussion and are now waging an open political struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, a struggle for their special goals. The impression is more and more strongly created that the Chinese leadership regard those Marxist-Leninist parties which disagree with them, and their leaders, as political opponents.

The Soviet people reject with angry indignation this unworthy campaign against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, against the world communist movement.

The whole Soviet people and the entire Communist Party of the Soviet Union are rallied more closely than ever around the C.P.S.U. central committee, headed by Comrade Nikita Khrushchov. The feelings and thoughts of our party and of the whole Soviet people were expressed by the June plenary meeting of the C.P.S.U. central committee.

It declared in its resolution:

"The plenary meeting of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union entirely and unanimously approves the political activity of the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee and the first secretary of the C.P.S.U. central committee. Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, Comrade Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchov, in further rallying the forces of the world communist movement, and also all the concrete actions and measures undertaken by the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee in the mutual relations with the cen-

tral committee of the Communist Party of China."

Our country and our party are linked to the great Chinese people and the Communist Party of China by a long standing unselfish friendship. "The Soviet people," Comrade Nikita Khrushchov has declared, "treats the Chinese people as their brother, friend and ally." Our fraternal attitude to the Chinese people remains unchanged. The Soviet government declares that it will go on doing everything in its power to eliminate the present difficulties, that it will stint neither energy nor time to strengthening unity with China on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet government would like to stress the impermissibility of transferring differences on ideological questions, disagreements arising among parties, to relations between socialist states, of using them as the pretext for fanning nationalism and chauvinism, mistrust and dissension between the peoples of these states.

There is no justification, nor can there be any, for the fact that the leaders of the People's Republic of China, instead of considering the existing differences in the course of friendly discussion as befits like-minded communists, have started along the road of hostile, anti-Soviet attacks and slanderous *démarches* against our party.

We are deeply convinced that, in the existing situation, the question of ending open polemics between the governments of the People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R., between the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, remains just as urgent as before. It is common knowledge that, even before the meeting of the delegations of the two parties in Moscow and during the meeting itself, the C.P.S.U. central committee put forward a proposal that open polemics should be ended so that the existing disputes could be discussed calmly

and in a businesslike way and that ways of overcoming the existing differences could be found.

Now, too, we believe that those who really strive to strengthen the camp of socialism, those who desire to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement, must come out for the ending of open polemics, because they only stir up and deepen disagreements. Only persons who pay lip service to unity while actually pursuing a splitting policy can refuse to end polemics.

The meeting of representatives of the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C., held in Moscow from July 5-20, 1963, has not been ended—it was suspended on the motion of the Chinese delegation and agreement was reached to continue it later. It should be pointed out that the latest actions of the government of the People's Republic of China and the C.P.C. leadership and the campaign of open hostility against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union does not provide evidence of their intention to resume the meeting.

Our readiness to avail ourselves of every opportunity in an effort to overcome existing disagreements is dictated by sincere concern for the interests of the countries of the socialist community and the world

communist movement, for the consolidation of the peace and security of all nations. We have taken and are taking all steps that depend on us to achieve unity with China, to strengthen the unity of the communist ranks.

However, it would be a grave mistake for the Chinese leaders to interpret our good will wrongly. If they intend to continue with their hostile actions against the Soviet Union, to continue slandering our party and the other fraternal parties, to step up their factional activities in the world communist movement, they must clearly realise that along that road the most vigorous rebuff awaits them from the C.P.S.U. and from the Soviet people.

We shall not retreat an inch from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We shall not be moved by any adventurist attacks on our policy—after all, the vital interests of the Soviet people and of all peoples, new successes of the world revolutionary process and the fate of peace and socialism, depend on the Leninist line of our party and of the whole communist movement. Our party has fought and will continue to fight against all attempts to divert us from this correct Leninist road.

*Regular news of Soviet achievements is  
published in*

# **SOVIET WEEKLY**

**Illustrated**

**Thursday 3d.**



Authentic, well-written articles on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, international relations, and other aspects of Soviet life and work, can be found within its well-illustrated pages.



*Subscription rates:*

**4s., 3 months; 8s., 6 months; 15s., 12 months**

**Overseas 21s. (3 dollars) a year**

*From newsagents, or post free from*

**“ SOVIET WEEKLY ”**

**3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7**