

*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:*

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

**Overseas 21s. (U.S.A. and Canada 3 dollars)**

*From newsagents, or post free from*

**"SOVIET WEEKLY"**

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

---

# FOR THE TRIUMPH OF CREATIVE MARXISM - LENINISM

against the revision of  
the course of the World  
Communist movement

---

A reprint of the editorial from  
the Soviet magazine COMMUNIST  
No. 11, 1963

Soviet Booklet

No. 121

October,  
1963

6<sup>d</sup>

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>



# **FOR THE TRIUMPH OF CREATIVE MARXISM - LENINISM**

against the revision of the course of  
the World Communist movement

*A reprint of the editorial from the Soviet  
magazine COMMUNIST No. 11, 1963*

The world liberation movement is now at a crucial stage of its development. The growth of the might of the socialist system and the radical changes in the correlation of forces in the international arena in favour of socialism, create favourable conditions for the further development of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, and indeed all the imperialism-oppressed working people of the capitalist countries, for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

The role of Communist and Workers' Parties has increased as never before. It is with the activity of the communists that the peoples associate their hopes for a better life and it is to them that they entrust their destinies.

How can the most rapid and least painful road of transition to socialism be ensured, how can present generations be offered the possibility of enjoying all the benefits of socialism and of communism? How can the threat of devastating thermonuclear war be averted and the destruction of hundreds of millions of lives by imperialism as it collapses, be prevented?

History has entrusted the communists with the solution of these problems so vital for mankind.

To fulfil their historic mission the communists must be unwaveringly loyal to Marxism-Leninism and be able to apply its principles creatively in a concrete historical situation.

It is easy to understand, therefore, the serious concern of the world communist movement on account of the departure of the leadership of the Communist Party of China from the general line

of Marxist-Leninist parties. The CPC leaders set their own special platform against this line and try to impose their erroneous views on the world communist movement.

What are these views? Why are they erroneous and harmful to the cause of the working class, the national liberation movement and the cause of peace and socialism? The replies to these questions are presented in the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU and the statements of other fraternal parties which have subjected to Marxist analysis the essence and causes of the differences between the CPC and the world communist movement.

## THE DANGER OF "LEFT-WING" OPPORTUNISM

Before proceeding to the essence of the differences which have placed the CPC in opposition to the line of the entire communist movement, it should be recalled how the polemics of the CPC against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties have developed, stage by stage. This is all the more necessary since the history of the differences affords a deeper insight into the motives that guided the Chinese comrades as they launched the struggle against the general course of the communist movement as expressed in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The first round of polemics was started by the CPC in the spring of 1960 with the publication of the collection "*Long Live Leninism!*" which set forth the erroneous views of the CPC leadership on a number of vital issues of today against the inferences and estimates of the 1957 Declaration.

What had prompted the publication of the collection? Perhaps the Chinese comrades had in mind some facts which made them doubt the revolutionary policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties?

No, there had been no such facts.

The article "What Has Caused the Differences?" published in the newspaper, *People's Daily* in February 1963 sheds light on this problem. In this article the Chinese comrades bluntly connect the beginning of their open sallies against other Marxist-Leninist parties with the fact that the socialist countries and the Communist parties had not supported the position of China in the Sino-Indian border dispute.

In other words, annoyed that the Soviet Union and other countries of socialism had not supported unconditionally the position of China in this border dispute with India, the CPC leaders took up a "big ideological club" by publishing the above-

mentioned collection of articles and triggered off a campaign against the Marxist-Leninist parties. **It is precisely the Chinese comrades who were the initiators of the differences, and they are responsible for the difficulties that have arisen in the communist movement.**

At the Moscow meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960 the Chinese comrades attempted to defend their erroneous views which had deviated from the 1957 Declaration. The meeting did not agree with them, endorsed the 1957 Declaration, and evolved in the Statement its main ideas, taking into account the changes in the international situation. The Statement adopted at the meeting was signed by 81 Parties, including the CPC. Thus there were grounds to hope that the main differences had been overcome and the communist movement would be able to concentrate, unhindered, on the carrying through of its current tasks.

However, soon after the adoption of the Statement, the Chinese comrades opened a second round of even sharper polemics in which direct attacks were launched against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. These attacks have grown in intensity since December 1962 when the Chinese party press carried a series of articles which levelled sharp criticisms against the inferences and decisions which had been agreed upon among the Communist parties. These articles include "The Proletarians of All Countries Unite and Fight Against Our Common Enemy", "The Difference between Comrade Togliatti and Us", "Lenin and Modern Revisionism", "What Has Caused the Differences. A Reply to M. Thorez and Other Comrades", "Once Again About the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and Us. Concerning Some Major Principles of Leninism in Our Epoch", "On the Statement of the Communist Party of the USA", "A Mirror for Revisionists", etc.

These articles are aimed against the CPSU, and the Communist and Workers' Parties of Italy, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, the GDR, France, the USA, India and some others. Their content shows that the Chinese comrades did not merely challenge the general line of the Marxist-Leninist parties on separate issues, but in fact revised the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties worked out at the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960.

The CPC leadership began to transfer ideological differences into the sphere of politics and aggravate its relations with the Marxist parties and socialist states. In China the CPC leadership launched a propaganda campaign, obviously anti-Soviet in tone and content and calculated to evoke animosity and even hostility among the Chinese people for the other socialist countries and for the Communist parties of capitalist countries.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union showed the maximum of reserve to overcome the differences detrimental to the communist movement and to the interests of the socialist camp. A major step testifying to the goodwill of the CPSU was the proposal, made by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov at the 6th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and supported by many fraternal parties, to stop public polemics. On the initiative of the central committee of the CPSU an agreement was reached with the central committee of the CPC on holding a meeting of representatives of the two Parties in Moscow.

On March 30, 1963, the central committee of the CPSU forwarded to the central committee of the CPC a letter which set forth considerations as to which problems it would be desirable to discuss at the forthcoming meeting and emphasised the need for applying efforts to overcome the differences and consolidate the communist movement on the basis of the documents approved by the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. In this letter the central committee of the CPSU presented in fact the main content of the Declaration and the Statement, loyalty to which our party deemed it necessary to confirm since in its propaganda the leadership of the CPC had attempted to distort the position of the CPSU.

It could be expected that the central committee of the CPC would also, in turn, show concern for overcoming the differences. Far from showing any goodwill, the Chinese comrades in the letter of June 14th of the CPC central committee came out with a comprehensive platform opposed to the line of the communist movement and launched violent, slanderous attacks against creative Marxism-Leninism, against the policy of the CPSU and other fraternal parties.

The June 14th letter of the CPC central committee culminated, as it were, a whole series of overall onslaughts by the CPC leadership on the joint positions of the international communist movement. In its letter the Chinese leadership declared that it was fully responsible for each word in the previous campaigns of the Chinese press. It was now clear to all that the CPC leadership had launched a preconceived, intentionally sharpened attack against the general line of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

But this time also the central committee of the CPSU showed reserve: it was decided to forgo a public answer since the exacerbation of the polemics on the eve of the meeting of representatives of the two parties would reduce the chances of successful negotiations. Nevertheless the Chinese side continued to aggravate the situation. Every day the Chinese radio broadcast the letter in Russian. The Embassy of the Peoples' Republic of China mobilised Chinese citizens in the USSR to distribute the letter of the CPC central committee among the Soviet population, showing

thereby that no means were too low, and acting contrary to the elementary standards of relations between states. All this was accompanied by a slanderous distortion of the actual motives which made the central committee of the CPSU consider it undesirable at that time to publish the letter of the central committee of the CPC in the Soviet press. It was suggested to Soviet citizens that the CPSU "was afraid" of bringing the content of the letter to the attention of the Soviet people, whereas the real cause of forgoing publication of the document was, as is commonly known, unwillingness to aggravate the polemics on the eve of the meeting of representatives of the two parties in Moscow.

Under such conditions the central committee of the CPSU deemed it necessary to publish an Open Letter to all party organisations and communists of the Soviet Union. Simultaneously the letter of June 14th, 1963, of the central committee of the CPC was published.

In its letter of June 14th the CPC leadership came out with an unprecedented claim—to dictate its "general line" to the entire communist movement. In its letter the CPC leadership intimated to other Communist parties that most of them allegedly misconceive the Declaration and the Statement and therefore must listen to lecturing on that score from the CPC leadership. Declaring in words their loyalty to the documents of the Moscow meetings in which the general line of the international communist movement was enunciated clearly and distinctly, the Chinese leadership openly decided to impose its so-called general line on other parties. But surely it is impossible, without being unfaithful to these documents, to claim to formulate anew the general line as is done by the Chinese comrades.

Without bothering with a scientific analysis of the contemporary situation and spellbound by generalities and quotations, the Chinese comrades subject to a complete revision, from left-wing-opportunist and nationalist positions, the programmatic documents of the world communist movement on all the basic issues: the character of the contemporary epoch and its main contradiction; the role of the world socialist system; war and peace; the development of the revolutionary processes and the forms of transition to socialism; the national liberation movement; the international experience of the building of socialism; the principles of the relations between the Communist parties, the struggle against the cult of the individual and other problems.

Here we have an example of the distortion of Marxism-Leninism in the spirit of "left-wing" opportunism and its pseudo-revolutionary slogans, dogmatic juggling with quotations and a splitting sectarian platform.

It is obvious that the present line of the Chinese comrades is connected with all the difficulties which have resulted in recent years in China as a consequence of several erroneous propositions on the part of the CPC. The CPC leaders are trying to distract the attention of the masses from the actual causes which have led to failures inside China.

Hence the central committee of the CPC has begun to assure the people that the way out lies through the acceleration and pushing-ahead of the world revolution. By such manoeuvres, using "left-wing", ultra-revolutionary phrases, the Chinese comrades try to conceal their disbelief in the intrinsic forces of the socialist system. For the same purposes nationalism and the preaching of national and then racial exclusiveness has been fostered in China. There have appeared bombastic phrases about the "rotten" and "impotent" West (or North) and the "young" and "powerful" East. By this ostensible revolutionism the CPC leadership also hopes to attract unstable elements prone to succumb to revolutionary phrases.

The erroneous views and splitting actions of the leadership of one of the largest Communist parties were bound to create certain difficulties in the world communist movement. This is why the struggle against "left-wing" opportunism, sectarianism and dogmatism is especially important and urgent.

In the Declaration and the Statement it is emphasised that revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement. Simultaneously the need for a struggle on two fronts is pointed out: against "right-wing" as well as against "left-wing" opportunism. In the second half of the '50s the Marxist-Leninist parties conducted extensive work to expose right-wing opportunism, revisionism. There is no need to elaborate on the fact that the CPSU has made its contribution to the exposure and defeat of modern revisionism. It is well known that our party showed an initiative in the criticism of the erroneous propositions of the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and took an active part in the ideological rout of the revisionists in those Communist and Workers' Parties where they were dangerous.

However, by the end of the '50s the danger of dogmatism and sectarianism had grown as a result of the activity of the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour and the Communist Party of China, and it was in this connection that the Statement presented a more comprehensive characterisation of them than the Declaration had done. Under present conditions dogmatism, sectarianism, adventurism and revolutionary phrase-mongering are becoming an ever more salient threat to the communist movement.

Of course, as long as capitalism exists and the bourgeoisie seeks

to exercise its influence on the working class movement it would be wrong to underrate the danger of right-wing opportunistic errors in some parties or others. But the work done by the Marxist-Leninist parties in past years to expose and eradicate revisionism has no doubt been fruitful.

At the same time the latest events, especially following the 1960 meeting, have shown that "left-wing" opportunism, dogmatism and sectarianism have come to the foreground of the ideological struggle and may become the chief danger in the international communist movement at a certain stage. The supporters of this trend, to which the Chinese leaders have given leadership, attempt to revise the general joint documents of the communist movement—the Declaration and the Statement—from the positions of dogmatism and sectarianism. They want to impose an adventurist course on the communist movement and the socialist countries, they tend towards the aggravation of the international situation and are engaged in splitting activities in the communist movement, in the socialist camp and in the entire world liberation movement. When a fraternal party in power slips into "left-wing" opportunism and seeks to impose its erroneous policy on other parties, dogmatism and sectarianism become a no less acute danger than revisionism—not just for one party, but for the entire communist movement as well.

**This is why it is necessary, without weakening the criticism and exposure of "right-wing" opportunism, to intensify the struggle against "left-wing" opportunism, dogmatism, sectarianism and adventurism in politics.**

## **THE DECLARATION AND THE STATEMENT ARE THE PROGRAMMATIC DOCUMENTS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT**

The differences between the CPC leadership, on the one hand, and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, on the other, involve, as is emphasised in the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU, the vital problems of world development, the vital interests of the peoples. These are the problems of

- war and peace;
- the development and role of the world socialist system;
- the struggle against the cult of the individual, its ideology and practices;
- the strategy and tactics of the world working-class movement and the national liberation struggle.

"These questions have been put forward by life itself, by the

profound changes that have occurred in the socialist countries and all over the world, the alterations in the correlation of forces in recent years between socialism and imperialism, and new possibilities for our movement," the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU states. "The communist movement had to give an answer to them and it has given it by working out the general line in relation to the conditions and requirements of the present stage of world development."

In contrast to the main line of the international communist movement enunciated in the documents agreed upon and signed, the Chinese leadership proposes its own "general line". This line actually amounts to the enumeration of the most general tasks of the working class, without taking into account the actual correlation of class forces, without taking into account the features of the present historical stage.

The successes of the communist movement can be traced to the fact that its main line reflects fully and in due time the changes in the conditions of social life and class struggle. Referring to the well-known words of the founders of Marxism that their teaching is no dogma, but a guide to action, Lenin wrote: "In this classical proposition, that aspect of Marxism which is quite often left out of consideration is emphasised with remarkable vigour and expression. Leaving it out of consideration we make Marxism one-sided, misshapen, dead; we take out of it its living soul, we undermine its radical theoretical foundations: dialectics, the teaching of the comprehensive and deeply contradictory historical development; we undermine its connection with certain practical tasks of the epoch which may change at each turn of history" (Works, Vol. 17, p. 20).

The general line of the communist movement determines the basic trends on which it concentrates its power in the struggle for the attainment of the ultimate goal of the working class. A necessary requirement when the general line is worked out is the most comprehensive consideration of the peculiarities of the situation, of the real correlation of class forces in the world arena, which is precisely what is done in the Declaration and the Statement.

By its articles and by the June 14th letter the CPC leadership has shown that it ignores the connection of the struggle for the solution of such problems, vital for the widest masses of all countries, as, for example, the prevention of a thermonuclear war, with the struggle for the realisation of the class aims of the proletariat. By showing a scornful attitude towards the struggle for peaceful coexistence of countries with different social and political systems, the CPC leaders deliberately refuse to take into

account the vast historical significance of this struggle from the viewpoint of the main strategic principles of the international working class, from the viewpoint of the struggle for socialism. While swearing their allegiance to the world revolution, by their policy they obstruct its development along the only correct path today: the path of close combination of the anti-monopolist struggle for the interests of the working class with the struggle for peace among the peoples.

The Marxists-Leninists cannot ignore the real situation which shows that today the struggle for saving mankind from a thermonuclear war is of primary significance. The communists were the first to make the defence of peace their major political task.

The Chinese comrades claim that the propositions they set forth in their June 14th letter are based on the principles of the Declaration and the Statement. Actually they glaringly contradict these programmatic documents. Characteristically, for example, the Chinese theorists pass over in silence, as they discuss the general line, the following thesis of the Statement: "**The main content, main direction and main features of the historical development of human society in the contemporary epoch are determined by the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism and for the socialist transformation of society.**"

The fact is that the Chinese comrades do not notice or do not want to notice how the tasks of the communist movement are modified in the concrete situation of today. Reducing the general line to over-all problems, they deprive it of concreteness, purposefulness and real effectiveness.

In working out the general line, the world communist movement proceeded from a concrete analysis of the alignment of class forces in individual countries as well as internationally, taking into account the peculiarities and results of development of the two opposing systems and evaluating the fact that imperialism had lost power over the majority of mankind for good.

The precise evaluation of the results and trends of world development enabled the Moscow meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960 to work out a deeply scientific, genuinely revolutionary characterisation of the epoch: "Our epoch, the main content of which is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is the epoch of the struggle between the two opposing social systems, the epoch of socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions, the epoch of the collapse of imperialism and the abolition of the colonial system, the epoch of the transition to the path of socialism of ever more peoples, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale."

The main propositions of the strategic line worked out by the communist movement are presented in the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU as follows:

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

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

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

—the goals of the working class and the Communist Parties in the national liberation movement lie **in carrying through to the end the tasks of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution**, in the development and consolidation of the national front based on an alliance with the peasantry and the patriotically-minded national bourgeoisie, in the preparation of conditions for the setting up of a national democratic state and transition to the non-capitalist road of development;

—relations of co-operation and mutual assistance between the

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

**“The struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism is, in brief, the essence of this general line,”** is how the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU sums up these cardinal propositions of the international communist movement presented in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings.

The general line of the international communist movement is in fact rejected by the CPC leadership. Thus, this is a matter, not of differences on secondary questions, but of differences on cardinal problems of vital importance to the destinies of the world system of socialism, to the international revolutionary working-class movement and to the national liberation struggle.

## THE MAIN CONTRADICTION OF THE PRESENT EPOCH

**The socialist system is the decisive force of the world revolutionary movement.** The CPC leadership does not agree with this. That is why it has been harping on the question of the epicentre of the world revolutionary process. The areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America where the national liberation movement is in progress constitute such an epicentre or “main zone of storms”, in the opinion of the Chinese comrades. At the same time they relegate the struggle of the two opposing systems, socialism and capitalism, to a secondary, auxiliary position, whereas it is between these systems that the giant world-historical battle is being enacted and it is on its outcome that the future of all mankind depends.

Marxists-Leninists have all grounds for believing that despite the importance of the contradictions between the proletariat and bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, between oppressed nations and imperialism, between imperialist countries and between monopolies—it is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism that is decisive.

“... The mutual relations of the peoples, the entire world system of states,” wrote Lenin in the first days of Soviet power, “are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia” (Works, Vol 31, p. 216). Lenin, who demonstrated



the great revolutionary possibilities of the working class and the vast role of the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary stream, deemed it necessary at the same time to lay special emphasis on the decisive importance of the main contradiction—that between socialism and imperialism. “If we leave it out of consideration,” noted Lenin, as though anticipating possible objections in the future, “we shall not be able to raise a single national or colonial problem even if this is a question of the remotest corner in the world. Only proceeding from this point of view can political questions be correctly raised and solved by the communist parties in civilised as well as backward countries” (Works, Vol. 31, p. 216).

With the setting up and consolidation of the world socialist system, the contradiction between socialism and imperialism has become even more prominent as the main contradiction of our epoch. Without taking into account this contradiction, other present-day contradictions cannot be defined either. As the 1960 Statement puts it: “The development of international relations today is determined by the struggle of the two social systems—the struggle of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy against the forces of imperialism, reaction and aggression—a struggle in which the superiority of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy becomes increasingly obvious.” A major conclusion was drawn in the Statement: “The principal characteristic of our time is that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society.”

Running counter to the documents of the international communist movement, the CPC leadership slurs over the main contradiction of the contemporary epoch, putting into circulation the concept of a so-called “intermediate zone” lying “between the USA and the socialist camp”. According to the CPC leadership, the “invariable strategic aim of American imperialism” is aggression in this “intermediate zone”. In the article “Once Again About the Differences between Comrade Togliatti and us” it was explained that these areas are the weakest link in the chain of imperialism, the main centre of revolutionary storms in the contemporary world. Included in the “intermediate zone” are all imperialist countries (except the USA), young independent states and the remnants of the colonial empires.

It is perfectly obvious that the category of the “intermediate zone” replaces the social by the geographic approach. There is hardly any need to show that the underdeveloped countries have the sharpest contradictions not only with the USA, but with other imperialist countries as well. The theory of the “intermediate zone” actually lumps together all the imperialist countries (except

the USA) and in general all developed capitalist countries as well as the countries and peoples which have recently liberated themselves from colonial dependence. Obviously any unity of interests of the underdeveloped countries and imperialist states is out of the question. Conversely, there is a unity (along with the contradictions) of all the imperialist states in the struggle against the national liberation movement.

The development of the world revolutionary process is greatly influenced by the struggle of the socialist countries against imperialism in politics, economics and ideology; their ability to defend peace; direct and indirect support by world socialism for all other revolutionary liberation forces; experience in the building of a new life and the force of example of the socialist countries.

Of special importance at the present time is the struggle between the two world systems in the decisive sphere of human endeavour: material production and economy. The founders of Marxism-Leninism repeatedly emphasised that in the final analysis the victory of the new system depends on whether it is able to attain a higher productivity of labour, to surpass the old system economically. With the advent of the proletariat to power it is precisely on to this plane that the sharpest class struggle on the world scale is transferred. “. . . It is by our economic policy that we exert our main influence on the international revolution,” Lenin emphasised. “It is in this arena that the struggle is transferred on a world-wide scale. If we solve this problem we shall win on an international scale for certain and forever” (Works, Vol. 32, p. 413).

In their letter the Chinese comrades intentionally shun the problem of the international significance of the economic successes of the countries of socialism.

This cannot be interpreted otherwise than as disagreement with the major propositions of Lenin and the conclusions of the 1960 Statement. Disbelief as to the economic victory of socialism over capitalism is obvious in this disagreement.

The successes of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have shown the cardinal advantages of socialism over capitalism. Using their vast achievements in science and engineering, the socialist states are successfully creating such a material and technical basis which makes it possible to raise steadily the living standards of the population and is preparing proper conditions for the total social equality of all members of society, for the realisation of the principle of communism: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.”

The growth of the power of world socialism has led to the deepest revolutionary shifts in the entire system of international relations, has made it possible to restate—in the interests of all

peoples—the problems of peace and war, and create the most favourable international conditions for the revolutionary movement of the working class in capitalist countries, for the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples, for general democratic movements and hence for the successful development of the entire world revolutionary process. This is manifest in such cardinal factors as:

—a steady change in the correlation of forces in favour of socialism and to the detriment of imperialism; contraposition of international relations of a new type to the imperialist policy of plunder and oppression; development of the socialist system of the international division of labour which undermines the groundwork of the relations of economic inequality, exploitation and plunder which imperialism had generated;

—increasing possibilities for the curbing of the imperialist aggressors by the camp of socialism and for preventing the export of counter-revolution; ever wider recognition, under the influence of the policy of the socialist countries, of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems;

—changes in the conditions of the class struggle in capitalist countries due to the successes of world socialism; moral and material support of the working class and all working people of these countries by the USSR and other socialist states; growth of the influence of socialist ideas and development of the class consciousness of the proletariat of these countries;

—support of the world socialist system for the national liberation struggle of the peoples; frustration of the plans for direct armed intervention by the imperialists in the young sovereign states of Asia, Africa and Latin America; extension and development of the political ties of the socialist states with these countries; consolidation of economic, scientific and cultural co-operation with them and assistance to them in the struggle against colonialism, for national liberation and revival.

It is the successes of world socialism and the general correlation of the forces of socialism and imperialism in the world arena that determine to a vast extent the destinies of the world, the successes of the national liberation movement and the outcome of the class struggle of the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries.

In contrast to this, the Chinese comrades believe that the struggle of the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia is “of decisive importance for the international proletariat as a whole”. They even claim that the “revolutionary cause of the international proletariat depends in the final analysis on the outcome of the struggle of the peoples of these areas who are the absolute majority of the world’s

population; depends on whether it receives support from the revolutionary struggle in these areas.”

It is fundamentally wrong to deny the revolutionary possibilities of the working class movement in the developed capitalist countries and claim that the destinies of the world revolution depend decisively and indeed exclusively on the outcome of the national liberation movement.

Obviously, in considering the problem of what constitutes the leading force of the world revolutionary process, the Chinese comrades have deviated from a proletarian, class approach and replaced it with a petty-bourgeois approach. Marxism-Leninism has put forward and substantiated the idea of the leadership (hegemony) of the working class as a prerequisite for the victory of the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world. It is only with the hegemony of the working class—and the strength of the international working class today is expressed above all in the world system of socialism—that the anti-imperialist movement of the popular masses becomes in the final analysis genuinely socialist and is bound to culminate in the transition to a socialist revolution.

The Leninist idea of the hegemony of the working class has been confirmed by historical experience and was expressed in all its aspects in the Declaration and the Statement. In glaring contradiction with Lenin’s statements and the documents of the international communist movement, the CPC leadership is propagating its own view, according to which it is not the working class but the petty-bourgeoisie or national-bourgeoisie that must take the lead in the world struggle against imperialism. This is not accidental, of course. Flirting with the national liberation movement, the CPC leadership wants to impose its hegemony on it and isolate it from the international working class and the world socialist system. There is no need to argue that should the ties of the national liberation movement with the community of socialist states and the international working class be seriously weakened, this would seriously jeopardise the cause of the struggle of the peoples for freedom and independent development along the path of progress.

The CPSU has always attached immense importance to the role which the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is playing in the entire world-historical process. Just like other Marxist-Leninist parties, our party has put forward and substantiated the proposition that collapse of the world colonial system ranks second in historic importance.

But there are no grounds for believing that under present conditions there are real prospects for the revolutionary move-

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

Under all circumstances it is obvious that the communist movement would perpetrate a grave error if it proceeded from the proposition of the possibility of the revolution only in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and ignored the interests of the struggle for socialism in the countries of Europe and North America.

The revolutionary struggle of the working class and the consolidation of the world system of socialism have been and will be of primary importance for the destinies of the entire liberation movement. This Marxist-Leninist conclusion has nothing to do with the theory of "passive waiting" or "rejection of revolution" as is claimed by the Chinese comrades.

The conversion of world socialism into a decisive factor for the revolutionary transformation of society imposes special responsibilities on each socialist country. The continuous growth of economic power and raising of living standards, ever more extensive development of socialist democracy, consolidation of international ties and cohesion of the socialist community are not only factors of the internal development of the countries of the world socialist community, but also their most effective contribution to the revolutionary overthrow of imperialism and the liberation of all mankind.

## PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND WAR

With regard to the problems of peace and war the CPC leadership has cardinal principled differences with the CPSU and the world communist movement. The essence of these differences is the approach of the Chinese comrades, contradicting the line of the world communist movement, to such major problems as the possibility of preventing a thermonuclear world war, peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the interaction between the struggle for peace and the world revolutionary movement.

The CPSU and the entire world communist movement decisively reject as non-Marxist the thesis that the path to revolution lies through war. Marxists-Leninists deny the theory of the "prodding" of a revolution by military interference from outside.

Ours is the Marxist-Leninist position. The CPSU has adhered to it even when the Soviet country was much weaker economically and militarily than it is now and was forced to struggle on her own against imperialism, amid capitalist encirclement. We do not abandon this position today when the correlation of forces in the

world arena has drastically changed to the detriment of imperialism, when the USSR and all socialist countries are militarily superior to imperialism.

In considering the problems of peace, war and revolution it is necessary to take full account of the features of the concrete situation today and above all the profound qualitative changes of military-technical means of warfare. As the Appeal to the Peoples of the Entire World adopted at the Moscow meeting of 1960 puts it: "In the face of the threat of a military catastrophe which would entail heavy losses and hundreds of millions of deaths and would convert the main centres of world civilisation into ruins, the problem of the preservation of peace is of more vital concern to mankind than at any time before." According to scientific data, by the '60s the stocks of nuclear weapons were equivalent to 250,000 million tons of TNT and 3 per cent of these stocks are sufficient for destroying completely such a country as, for example, the United States of America or another country of equivalent size.

Hence it is clear that the prevention of a thermonuclear world catastrophe is a necessary prerequisite for any progress, a major condition for the successful solution of basic social, political and national problems. Therefore, even today the building of socialism and communism in the countries which have discarded the yoke of capitalism, the struggle of the revolutionary forces of the working class in capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement, can only be viewed in connection with the struggle for the prevention of thermonuclear world war. The greatest ideological victory of the countries of socialism is the fact that socialism and peace have become inseparably linked in the consciousness of the overwhelming majority of people throughout the world.

The Chinese comrades have an entirely different point of view: "the atomic bomb is a paper tiger", it is "by no means terrible". The problem of the sacrifices which mankind will sustain in a world war for the elimination of imperialism is of secondary importance to them. Characteristically, in the articles and in the letter of the central committee of the CPC, so much is said about "inevitable sacrifices". Characteristically, some responsible Chinese leaders have declared the possibility of sacrificing half of the Chinese people and even half of mankind in a war for the elimination of imperialism.

The CPC leadership actually puts forward the thesis of a "revolutionary" war of the socialist states against imperialism. The Soviet communists are familiar with the arguments proposed in defence of this thesis: suffice it to recall the position of Trotsky and the "left-wing" communists against which Lenin fought.

The international communist movement cannot but reject the views expressed in the letter of the central committee of the CPC. These views fundamentally contradict the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the most humane of all ideologies, they are completely isolated from real life and they can do irreparable harm to the peoples.

Says the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU:

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

The task of the communists is to prevent a thermonuclear world catastrophe. We want the popular masses to deal with this task consciously, to explore the ways and means of accomplishing it and to fight actively for a lasting peace.

The communist movement holds that a **"world war can be prevented"** that **"even before the complete victory of socialism, while capitalism still remains in a part of the world, there will arise a real possibility of excluding world war from the life of society"**.

The Chinese comrades question this conclusion formulated in the documents of the communist movement. They try to replace the question of possibilities of preventing thermonuclear world war by discourses about just and unjust wars. They teach the world communist movement that to "mix up just and unjust wars without drawing a distinction between them and come out sweepingly against them, means to maintain the bourgeois-pacifist and not the Marxist-Leninist point of view". But the question remains—who is sharing this viewpoint? There are no Communist parties which would maintain this position.

As for the CPSU, it is well known that while fighting for the realisation of the possibilities of preventing world war, it has at the same time regarded as sacred the right of each people to a war of liberation, to popular uprisings against the oppressors. "Wars of liberation will exist while imperialism exists, while colonialism exists," said N. S. Khrushchov. "These are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only allowable, but are inevitable since the colonialists do not grant independence to the peoples voluntarily. Therefore it is only by struggle and, in particular, armed struggle that the peoples can win their freedom and independence." The Soviet Union has been helping, not in words, but in deeds the peoples of Vietnam, Egypt, Algeria, Yemen—all the peoples fighting for freedom and independence.

Again and again do the Chinese comrades reiterate the thesis on the invariability of the aggressive nature of imperialism, in

order to prove the impossibility of the prevention of a new world war.

There is no arguing that the essence of imperialism has not changed, but the correlation of forces in the international arena has changed radically in favour of peace and socialism and to the detriment of imperialism and aggression. The forces of socialism are gaining more and more possibilities for curbing arbitrary actions by the imperialists in world politics.

To justify their view of the problems of war and peace, the Chinese theorists cite the Clausewitz maxim to which Lenin repeatedly referred, viz., that "war is the continuation of politics by other means". This reference is interpreted by them in the sense that there is no policy without war. But surely the conclusion of the inevitability of wars does not derive at all from the fact that war is the continuation of politics.

It does not follow at all from the proposition that "war is the continuation of politics" that any policy under any circumstances leads to war. Lenin never used this formula to prove the inevitability of war; he used it only to define the character and trace the causes of the origin of war. Lenin's proposition about war as the continuation of policy is correct today as well. The wars which were waged in the past decade and a half in Korea, Indochina, Suez and Algeria continued the colonialist policy of the imperialist states.

Should a new world war break out, it would also be the continuation of the policy of the imperialist camp. The decision of the June, 1963 Plenary Meeting of the central committee of the CPSU states: "It is necessary to reckon with the fact that the policy of imperialism may result in a thermonuclear world war unleashed by its most aggressive and adventurist forces. . . ." The danger of war will exist while imperialism exists. However, today the policy of imperialism no longer dominates international relations. The world socialist system becomes an ever more decisive force in international social development, and the policy of the countries of socialism in co-operation with the joint actions of all peace-loving forces has every reason for triumphing over the policy of the imperialist camp and for preventing a new war.

Lenin is known to have expressed the view that the methods of warfare would become so destructive in time that world war would cease to be a weapon of policy and become impossible. Lenin was right: that is where things are tending to move. In our time the sharpest contradiction has arisen between the military machine of imperialism, gigantic in its destructive power, and the possibilities for its practical use in gaining world domination. The military power of the socialist states is such that unleashing a new world war will inevitably be suicidal for imperialism.

One cannot help noting the departure of the Chinese comrades from the platform of the Moscow meetings on such an important issue as peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems and its significance. According to the 1960 Statement: "Under the conditions of the division of the world into two systems the only correct and sensible principle of international relations is the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems put forward by Lenin and developed further in the Moscow Declaration and Peace Manifesto of 1957, the decisions of the 20th and 21st Congresses of the CPSU and the documents of other Communist and Workers' Parties." Our party has been supporting this proposition fully and firmly and pursuing it unswervingly.

In words the Chinese comrades seem to support the principle of peaceful coexistence. In deeds they act against it. Suffice it to say that the Chinese leaders were not ashamed to declare in their June letter that "it is erroneous to regard peaceful coexistence as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries". These words are quite important in characterising the present position of the CPC leadership. They show that the CPC does not regard the struggle for peace as a primary target, as set down in the Declaration and the Statement, and that the CPC leadership isolates this question completely from the revolutionary struggle of the peoples for socialism and national liberation.

If the Chinese comrades had consulted the working class of those countries in which imperialism rules before putting forward their dangerous course for the aggravation of the international situation, they would, doubtless, have received no support. "The working class, the working people will ask such 'revolutionaries': What right have you to decide for us the questions of our existence and our class struggle—we too are for socialism, but we want to win it through class struggle, and not by unleashing a thermo-nuclear world war," states the Open Letter of the central committee of the CPSU.

It is notable that the Chinese comrades launched the campaign for the new "general line" of foreign policy of the socialist countries and began to belittle in every way possible the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, precisely at the moment when they had seriously undermined their prestige among the communists of all countries. They were in a war with India; they had risked a collision with a country pursuing a neutralist policy. In the world communist movement there rose doubts as to the allegiance of the Chinese comrades to the principles of peaceful coexistence.

What was the line of the CPC leadership during the Caribbean

crisis? At that critical moment the Chinese comrades set forth their own position, designed to aggravate the conflict, against the Soviet government's realistic and firm policy of the peaceful settlement of the conflict around revolutionary Cuba. Astonishingly enough, the Chinese comrades concentrated the fire of criticism not so much on aggressive U.S. imperialism, as against the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The CPC leadership assumed the attitude of a critic of the Soviet Union and not its fighting ally and comrade. The Chinese comrades did practically nothing to defend the Cuban revolution. Instead they obviously tried to aggravate the already tense situation in the Caribbean and threw fuel on to the embers of the conflict.

The real position of the Chinese comrades on the issues of war and peace is clearly manifest in a gross underestimation—nay, deliberate neglect—of the struggle for disarmament. They object even to the statement of this question in the communist movement and they argue in every way possible that disarmament is infeasible and unnecessary. Ignoring the rapid conversion of the socialist system into a decisive factor of world development and drawing arguments only from quotations, they try to prove that general disarmament will become possible only after the total victory of socialism on earth.

If the Communists waited with folded hands for the victory of socialism all over the globe, while the world is strangulated in the grip of the arms race and the imperialists accumulate stocks of nuclear weapons and threaten to plunge mankind into the abyss of world war, this would be a criminal neglect of their duty towards all mankind in the face of the imperative need of our time.

This is why the Soviet government and the governments of other socialist countries, solidly supported by the fraternal communist parties of both capitalist and newly liberated states, do their utmost at each particular moment to attain general disarmament and eliminate the threat of war. Guided by such considerations, the government of the Soviet Union concluded the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water which was initialed by representatives of the governments of the USSR, USA, and Great Britain in Moscow on July 25, 1963.

Is the Treaty advantageous to the peoples? Is it a step towards general disarmament and relaxation of international tension? No doubt it is. In accordance with this Treaty the three powers are to ban, prevent and not carry out test explosions of nuclear weapons or any other nuclear explosions in the spheres most dangerous to health. The Treaty is open for signing by other states and hence it contributes to the restriction of the proliferation of nuclear

the main areas of the concentration of productive forces of the capitalist world and the military and political forces of world imperialism. The working class of these countries constitutes a great revolutionary force, is much experienced in class struggle and is headed by well-trying Communist parties. It is quite clear that the class struggle of the proletariat in these countries is a major factor in the world revolutionary process.

In their articles and documents the Chinese comrades ignore the new factors in the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries as set down in the Declaration and the Statement. Thus, the letter of the central committee of the CPC even makes no mention of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism, of such processes of modern capitalist society as the development of state monopoly capitalism, the mounting role of the mass general-democratic movements in the struggle against the monopolies, or the importance of nationalisation and other political demands in the present day anti-monopolist class struggle. This is no accidental omission, but a manifestation of the dogmatic, scholastic approach of the CPC leaders to the questions of the revolutionary movement today.

The Communist parties in the capitalist countries proceed from the fact that new and more favourable opportunities for the class struggle of the proletariat and of the anti-monopoly struggle of the masses open out in the present situation. Under the conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-political systems the possibilities for imperialist export of counter-revolution are restricted considerably, the monopolistic bourgeoisie finds it increasingly difficult under such conditions to foment jingoism and chauvinistic sentiments among the masses. Raising up the struggle for peace, the working people become aware of the need to block the path of reaction, fascism and militarism and grow aware of the need for putting an end to the source of war itself, the domination of monopoly capital.

Under conditions of increased international tension and war hysteria, the influence of militarist, reactionary forces grows, but the successes of the policy of peaceful coexistence furnish more favourable conditions for winning over the masses to the side of socialism and for the development of the world revolutionary movement. By neglecting this point, the Chinese theorists reveal their ignorance of modern imperialism and the specific conditions and problems facing the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries.

The CPC leadership has launched subversive activity against the Marxist-Leninist parties of capitalist countries. The aim of this campaign can be understood from the following words of the article

in the *People's Daily*: "We are sure that in the ranks of the Communist Party of America as well as outside it, there are to be found genuine Marxists-Leninists who will lead this Party on to the correct path." In the letter of June 14th this idea is evolved even more extensively with respect to the Communist parties of capitalist countries. "If the leadership of a party, adhering to the line of rejection of revolution, converts its party into a reformist one, their place in the revolution are taken by Marxists-Leninists, members of this party or otherwise, who lead the people to the accomplishment of the revolution." This is the crux of the matter. The aim is to split the Communist parties under the camouflage of struggle against the reformists, and set up inside them or around them, factions which would follow obediently the lode-star in Peking.

Not since the struggle of the Trotskyites against the Comintern and against the communist parties has there been such an example of unbridled factional activity in the ranks of the revolutionary working-class movement.

The Chinese leaders want to cancel the right of the communists of Italy, France, USA and other countries to regard themselves as Marxist-Leninist parties on the sole ground that these parties attempt to use creatively the experience of the international communist movement and find the truest ways of winning the working masses for the socialist revolution under the concrete conditions of their respective countries.

The CPC leadership deviates from the joint position of the world communist movement also on the issue of the variety of **ways of transition to socialism**. The 1960 Statement is known to emphasise the possibilities of peaceful as well as non-peaceful ways of socialist revolution. The CPC leadership maintains another point of view. While paying lip service to "mastering all forms of struggle", the CPC leadership actually orientates the communists for only one path—that of armed struggle.

Arguing that the thesis of the peaceful advent to power of the working class is an illusion, the central committee of the CPC claims in its letter of June 14th: "Facts show that so far in world history there has been no precedent of a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism." But this is not true. Surely the working class of Hungary came to power in 1919 peacefully? Surely the revolution in Czechoslovakia developed comparatively peacefully? The revolutionary practice of the masses is so rich and varied that the Marxists-Leninists do not intend to proceed solely from historical precedents. Only doctrinaires and pedants fail to understand that the conclusion of the Communist parties on various forms of transition to socialism, including peaceful forms of

transition, rallies the working people for the active struggle against the monopolies and helps to augment the ranks of the allies of the proletariat and consolidates the anti-monopolistic coalition in the struggle against the financial oligarchy.

The Communists' recognition of the variety of forms of development of the socialist revolution, including peaceful forms, is a practical conclusion from irrefutable historical facts—aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and radical change in the correlation of forces in favour of socialism and the working class.

To proclaim in words certain revolutionary goals and at the same time to reject the effective methods and means of attaining these goals means to commit an error which Lenin called "revolutionary phrase-mongering". As Lenin pointed out "... it would be an obvious mistake to give rein to bawlers and phrase-mongers who allow themselves to be carried away by 'bright revolutionism', but are not capable of sustained, thought-out, deliberate revolutionary work taking into account the most difficult transitions as well."

The letter of the CPC central committee laying claim to define the line of the entire communist movement, says in fact nothing about the ways of winning the masses for the revolution and their approach to it. Yet this problem is one of the most important in the theory and tactics of the socialist revolution. In his "Left-wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder" Lenin called upon the communist parties to concentrate all efforts, all attention, on the search for the "forms of **transition** or **approach** to the proletarian revolution" (Lenin, Coll. Works, vol. 31, p. 73).

Ignoring the importance of democratic, anti-monopolist transformations in bringing the masses up to the revolution, the Chinese leaders accuse the communist parties of the capitalist countries of "parliamentary cretinism and legalism", "social democratism" and such like sins. These accusations are aimed in fact against the struggle of the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard for large-scale democratic transformation, for undermining and eliminating the domination of the monopolies.

The tactical propositions which the Chinese leaders try to impose on the communist parties of the capitalist countries are only capable of creating serious difficulties for these parties, undermining their influence among the masses, and reducing them to the position of wretched sectarian groups.

## PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The interpretation of the problems of the national liberation movement, its place in the present-day world revolutionary process and its prospects as formulated by the CPC leadership cannot but meet with opposition. The Chinese comrades think that they alone are orthodox theoreticians of the problems of the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. Actually, however, they do not see deeply rooted phenomena and ignore new features that are born of life.

In the letter of the CPC central committee some correct theses, taken from the Statement, are given out as alleged discoveries made by the Chinese comrades. On the whole, however, the letter wrongly outlines the development of the national liberation movement. It ignores specifically the following important conclusions contained in the 1960 Statement:

"The October Socialist Revolution awakened the East, drew the colonial peoples into the common stream of the world revolutionary movement.

"This process was tremendously accelerated by the victory of the USSR in the Second World War, the establishment of the system of people's democracy in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, the triumph of the socialist revolution in China and the formation of the world socialist system.

"The forces of world socialism have contributed in a decisive way to the struggle of the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries for liberation from the yoke of imperialism.

"The national liberation movement receives powerful support from the international working class movement."

It follows from these theses of the Statement that it was precisely the successes of socialism which ushered in the era of the liberation of the subjugated peoples, that the chief and decisive force in the world revolutionary process, which assures also the impetuous development of the national liberation movement, is the international working class and its creation—the world socialist system.

Leninism gave a clear-cut answer to the question of what was the decisive force of the world revolutionary process. Lenin wrote in 1920 that all the events of world politics invariably converge on one central point, namely—the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the Soviet Russian Republic which inevitably groups around itself, on the one hand, the Soviet movements of the foremost workers in all countries and, on the other, all the national liberation movements of the colonies and oppressed nationalities.

In our time, when the world socialist system exists, these theses

have a special ring. The national liberation movement is an important component of the world liberation process, a powerful force destroying the front of imperialism. Its successes also arise out of the existence of the powerful world system of socialism. Hence to promote the advance of the national liberation revolutions and effectively to help the struggling peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, it is essential to strengthen in every way the world socialist system. Only then will the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America be able to show fully all its immense revolutionary potential.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have displayed mighty revolutionary energy, self sacrifice and heroism in the fight for liberation. It is an important force in the world historic process, which together with the world system of socialism, with the international working class, is having a most telling effect on the entire course of history.

A correct, Marxist viewpoint is not to counterpose these great forces but to see their common interests, their close co-operation and mutual assistance in the common fight against imperialism.

Our party has considered and now considers it to be its international duty to help the peoples which are winning and strengthening national independence, to help all peoples fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system. The Soviet Union has supported and continues to support the sacred wars of the peoples for liberation; it has given and continues to give all possible moral, economic, military and political support to the national liberation movement. The indisputable facts show the profoundly international character of the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The allegation in the letter and articles of the CPC central committee that apart from imperialism and internal reaction, the national liberation movement has opponents also in the ranks of the communist movement, that the Marxist-Leninist parties regard the struggle for liberation of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America with "contempt", that they "restrain" it, "justify" imperialist domination and their policy of new and old colonialism, can only be qualified as sheer slander. These absurd accusations are aimed at undermining the growing prestige of the communist movement and the socialist countries in the eyes of the peoples fighting for national independence, at weakening the friendship between the peoples of the socialist countries and the young national states. Here we come up against an attempt to substitute the Leninist thesis about the indivisible connection between the socialist countries, the socialist revolutions and the national liberation movement, with the determining role of socialist revolutions, with an anti-Marxist, thoroughly demagogic "theory" about a

special geopolitical and racial unity of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The letter of the CPC central committee quotes a correct slogan, which Lenin approved of: "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" This slogan rightly advanced to the fore the proletariat, called upon to be the leading force, the head of all the movements for liberation. Does not isolation of the national liberation movement from the socialist countries and the international proletariat, which the Chinese leaders are advocating, run counter to the substance of this slogan? Yes, it does.

It is interesting to note a statement made by a prominent leader of the Liberal-Democratic Party of Japan, Kendzo Matzumara, who, referring to his talks with the leaders of the CPC summed up their opinion as follows: ". . . The East is none the less the East . . . Asians must alter world history. We must unite and strengthen the ties between our peoples which have the same colour skin and the same written language." The newspaper *People's Daily* published the statement without comment, nor was it disavowed by the Chinese leadership.

Nationalism and internationalism are opposites. Internationalism is the ideology of the working class and nationalism the ideology of the bourgeoisie. The nationalism of the oppressed nations has a general democratic content, directed against oppression, and communists support it, considering it historically justified at a given stage. But communists must always maintain internationalist positions. Lenin insisted that the dregs of nationalism should be crushed with an iron hand. He warned: "Anyone who has said A must also say B—he who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism, naturally goes as far as to want to surround his nationality, his national workers' movement with a Chinese wall, he is not even embarrassed by the fact that separate walls will have to be put up in every city, township and village, he is not even embarrassed by the fact that by his dividing and splintering tactics he is **reducing to nought** the great behest of bringing together and uniting the proletariat of all nations, races and languages." (*Collected Works*, vol. 6, pp. 474-5.)

He who counterposes the struggling peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to the socialist countries and the international labour movement, damages the cause of the national liberation revolution as well as the cause of international socialism. And the colonialists want nothing more than to divide the peoples fighting against imperialism, to isolate the national liberation movement from the Soviet Union, from the socialist community and to wrest it from the labour movement of the developed capitalist countries.

Refusing to analyse the concrete situation, the Chinese leaders



do not see the new phase in the development of the national liberation movement.

The mighty sweep of the national liberation revolution has destroyed the colonial prison-house. The peoples of over 50 countries have won political independence and have become active makers of world history. In these countries new tasks have come to the fore: consolidation of political independence; economic self-sufficiency; abolition of poverty and ignorance and involving the masses in shaping the policy of the state.

Marxism-Leninism has given the answer to the question of how to solve these problems. It is to abolish foreign monopoly rule, carry out agrarian reforms, develop national industry and introduce other far-reaching economic and social reforms, and democratise social life.

All these cardinal issues of the contemporary national liberation movement are overlooked in the letter of the CPC central committee. The Chinese comrades seek to reduce everything to the need for developing armed struggle, whereas many of the countries that have won state independence are faced with new complex tasks.

The peoples still groaning under the colonial yoke are waging a sacred fight for national independence and using all methods which they think fit. Support for this struggle is the international duty of all socialist countries, of the entire communist movement. There must not be a single nation on earth left in the chains of colonialism; all peoples must be free. It is just as indisputable that the freed peoples must be vigilant and resolutely rebuff all imperialist attempts to strangle the cause of national freedom.

Marxist-Leninists consider that the winning of political independence is but the beginning of the national liberation revolution. The Moscow meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in 1960, established that the further development of the young sovereign states is possible in a non-capitalist way. In an epoch when there exists the world socialist system, national liberation revolutions far exceed the tasks which were tackled by bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the past, and set themselves tasks not only of national, but also of social liberation. Lenin foresaw this when he wrote that "in the impending decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, which at first is directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a much more revolutionary part than we expect". (Collected Works, V. 32, p. 458.)

Imperialism strives to keep the ex-colonies and semi-colonies within the system of capitalist economy and to perpetuate social inequality. The struggle for eradicating imperialist monopoly

domination is the main task in the present stage of the national liberation revolution. At this stage, too, the support of the socialist countries is of the utmost importance. The young national states have to be protected against the export of counter-revolution. Along with this, economic and cultural assistance, the sharing of experience in economic management and the carrying through of a cultural revolution become ever more important.

It is the international duty of communists to satisfy the great desire of the many millions in the young national states to master the ideas of scientific socialism, to help them understand and see which is real, genuine socialism and which is sham socialism, to help them to define accurately the prospects for further development.

In the letter of CPC central committee the prospects for the development of the national liberation revolution are treated one-sidedly and therefore mistakenly. The letter simplifies the problems of the national liberation movement to the utmost, daubing all countries with one paint. Actually, however, the national liberation movement embraces countries which are at varying stages of historical development. There are countries where capitalism is developed and a big army of the working class, headed by strong Communist parties exists; there are also countries with practically no industrial proletariat and no Communist parties. Finally, there is quite a big group of countries which have no working class at all and no Communist parties.

The Chinese comrades point out in their letter that the liberated countries have only one way—the establishment of people's democracy. The authors of the letter do not specify what they mean by this. If it is to establish a people's democracy as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it means skipping incomplete stages and that would tend to undermine the united front of the national liberation movement and weaken the struggle against imperialism. Who, for instance, will head the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat in countries where there is no proletariat and its party? And what kind of a dictatorship of the proletariat is it without any proletariat? That probably the authors of the letter alone know.

The process of development of the freed countries proceeds in a complex way. Because of the different historical and socio-economic conditions in these countries, the revolutionary creative activity of the masses will introduce a good many new features in the forms and stages of their development on the way to social progress.

The international communist movement has made an important contribution to revolutionary theory by establishing that in the contemporary historical situation, favourable premises prevail in

many countries for the formation of national democratic states as a form of non-capitalist development. A number of Communist parties of the young national states have made the creation of such a state a point in their programmes. Are the authors of the letter aware of this? Of course they are. But they arrogantly ignore the experience of the international communist movement, the experience of the Communist parties of the young national states which understand better the concrete situation in their own countries and which draw on this experience in determining their strategy and tactics. The Chinese leaders are trying to deprive the Communist parties of this right and to foist upon them a stereotyped, erroneous and therefore dangerous pattern.

Thus, having taken upon themselves the role of "sole" theoreticians and strategists of the national liberation movement, the Chinese comrades have not shown either a clear understanding of the problems of the present stage of the movement or a clear insight into the prospects of its development, which are linked, above all, with the successes and victories of the world socialist system.

## INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN SOCIALIST AND COMMUNIST CONSTRUCTION

Expanding the polemics against the line of the international communist movement, the Chinese comrades are subjecting to sweeping criticism the vital theses of the CPSU Programme on the laws of transition from socialism to communism, which are based on the experience of our country, tested in practice and which, as universally acknowledged by the fraternal parties, have become part and parcel of the treasure-trove of Marxism-Leninism. The things that strike the eye are that when talking about the state of affairs in the Soviet Union and about socialist construction in other countries, the Chinese comrades fear the facts like fire. They appeal not to living reality, but to quotations, not to life but to a scheme. Scholasticism and dogmatism, disregard for the facts, for the revolutionary practice of the masses—that is the general "background" of their criticism levelled against the CPSU Programme.

The Chinese leaders talk a lot about the class struggle in the USSR. But what classes, hostile to the people, have they discovered in our country? In their opinion they are the bourgeois hangers-on, parasites, blackmarketeers, thieves, idlers, hooligans and embezzlers of public property. However, anyone with even a

superficial knowledge or the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory on classes well understands that to consider criminal elements a special class would mean outright disregard for the criterion of class division. Criminals never have constituted a definite class in any society. This even a schoolboy knows. Naturally, these elements constitute no class either in a socialist society. It is a manifestation of the survivals of capitalism.

Here is Lenin's famous definition of classes: "Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions and mode of acquiring the share of social wealth of which they dispose. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy." (Collected Works, v. 29, p. 388.)

What place in the system of social production do the hangers-on occupy, what part is played by the idlers and hooligans in the social organisation of labour, and finally how are all these elements distinguished in the pattern of social economy? We have but to pose these questions to see how far-fetched and insipid is the talk about "hostile" classes in the USSR, about the "class struggle" under the conditions of the complete and final victory of socialism.

**Speaking about class struggle in Soviet society, the Chinese comrades mechanically shift the laws of development of society in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism to the period of the transition from socialism to communism.**

But such an approach is radically wrong. During the transition to socialism there do exist antagonistic classes and class struggle. But things are different when socialism triumphs, when public ownership of the means of production is established, when the exploiter classes and the underlying reasons which generate them have been abolished. None can refute the fact that Soviet society is made up of two friendly classes of socialist working people—the workers and peasants, and also the intelligentsia. The Chinese comrades do not wish to see the fact that Soviet society has been developing for almost half a century and has achieved socio-political and ideological unity, built socialism and is successfully working on the full-scale construction of communism.

The Chinese comrades needed this argument about the so-called "new" hostile classes under socialism, in order to call in question the conclusion, concerning the transformation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people in our country, which had been advanced in the CPSU Programme.

Wrongly interpreting certain statements by the classics of Marxism-Leninism, they are trying to prove that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary right up to the complete victory of communism.

For instance, they quote Marx who wrote: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition in which the state can be nothing but the **revolutionary** dictatorship of the proletariat."

Referring to this statement the Chinese comrades write: "If we were to declare half-way that the dictatorship of the proletariat was no longer necessary, then what would happen? Does not this radically contradict the teaching of Marx and Lenin on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat?"

We must say outright that the thesis of the CPSU Programme on the socialist state for the whole people under the conditions of the full-scale construction of communism does not contradict but on the contrary fully accords with the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state in general, with the teaching on the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular, and with the creative spirit of Marxism-Leninism. As for the quoted statement by Marx it has to be properly understood and not used for speculation. It is well known that Marx and Lenin had often applied the concept "communism" to characterise the entire socio-economic structure which was to take the place of capitalism, and also to characterise socialism. This was emphasised by Lenin in his work *The State and Revolution*. "What is usually called socialism," he wrote, "was termed by Marx the 'first' or lower phase of communist society. In so far as the means of production become **common** property, the word 'communism' is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that this is **not** complete communism."

It goes without saying that the foregoing pronouncement by Marx, which speaks about the necessity of a dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of the transition from capitalism to communism has in mind the first, socialist phase of communist society. Lenin did indeed explain this thesis of Marx in this way. He wrote that Marx speaks about the entire period of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a period of the transition from capitalism to socialism, that the aim of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to set up socialism.

It would be quite possible to cite literally dozens of pronouncements by Lenin which state that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary only in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. But that, it appears, does not suit the Chinese comrades who have undertaken the unseemly task of discrediting the CPSU

Programme, our party and communist construction in the USSR. They ignore Lenin's statements explaining the historical framework of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship and are piling up heaps of slanderous inventions about "substituting the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state by bourgeois teaching", about "substituting the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by a state of a different character" and even about a "big step back in the course of historic development".

This is not the first time the Leninist party has had to encounter such slanderous accusations. The Trotskyites also talked about the "degeneration" of the party and the state. The Right Social Democrats who have long ago betrayed Marxism and the cause of the working class are also fulminating on this score. The same is being done by the ideologists of imperialism, the advocates of anti-communism. Now the CPC leadership has added its voice to this chorus.

Quoting the correct Marxian thesis that there can be no state of the entire people when antagonistic classes exist, the Chinese comrades draw the incorrect conclusion that there can neither be a state of the whole people also under socialism where there are no antagonistic classes, but statehood is still necessary. Marxism-Leninism does indeed link the existence of a state with the class society and approaches the state from class positions. When our party drew the conclusion that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union has been transformed into a state of the whole people it proceeded precisely from an analysis of the existing class changes that had taken place in the country. The establishment of a state of the whole people in the USSR is the result of the cardinal changes in the class structure of society, the outcome of the complete and final victory of socialism and the entry of the USSR into a period of full-scale construction of communism. The Soviet state of the whole people is now not only an idea, but a real fact.

The dogmatic nature of the positions of the Chinese leaders is graphically evident in their conceptions on the forms of the withering away of the state. They assert that "in this transitional period the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the workers' state, passes through the dialectical process of the establishment, consolidation, intensification and gradual withering away". It follows that in the opinion of the Chinese comrades the gradual withering away of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and consequently, also of the state in general will take place through its intensification. This reminds us of what Trotsky said about the withering away of the state, which he identified with the fading of a lamp. He said that just as the light in a lamp flashes up before going out, so also

the dictatorship of the proletariat must reach its maximum strength before withering away.

This viewpoint has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. Lenin stressed that the state will reach a condition of withering away through the all-round development of socialist democracy. As socialist democracy advances more and more, interference of the authorities of state in public relations becomes superfluous, the state bodies gradually assume the features of public organisations or pass on their functions to society.

It is not fortuitous that not a word is said about the development of socialist democracy either in the articles of the Chinese comrades or in the letter of the CPC central committee of June 14. **Denial of the need to develop democracy during the transition from socialism to communism—such is the real political position which stems from the scholastic reasoning of the CPC leadership.**

Unwilling to understand the stages of development of socialist society in the USSR, the Chinese comrades are dead set against the thesis in the CPSU Programme concerning the conversion of the party of the working class into the party of the whole people in the period of full-scale communist construction. What sort of loud phrases and “devastating” questions, designed to mislead some people, sow doubt in the minds of others and intimidate still others, have not the Chinese leaders piled up? They include the allegation that “that conflicts radically with the teaching of Marx and Lenin on the party of the proletariat” and the frightening conclusion that that allegedly “is organisational and moral disarming of the proletariat and all the working people” and finally a direct accusation presented in the form of a rhetorical question: “Is not this tantamount to serving the cause of restoring capitalism?” There can be no question that these are terrible words and loud phrases. Only they are utterly groundless.

Let us cite a thesis from the CPSU Programme, which in this particular instance is being attacked by the Chinese leadership: “As a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the consolidation of the unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, the party of the entire people, and extended its guiding influence to all spheres of social life.”

As is evident from this thesis of the CPSU Programme the party becomes the party of the whole people, not at anyone’s behest or subjective wish, but by virtue of the objective conditions, as a result of the victory of socialism and the achieved socio-political and ideological unity of Soviet society.

The absurdity of the assertions of the CPC leadership, presented in the form of questions, that a party which becomes the party of

the entire people is allegedly no longer a Communist Party, can only astonish every Marxist-Leninist. If a socialist society has achieved such a stage in its development that it consists of two friendly classes of socialist toilers—the workers and peasants—and also the intelligentsia, the distinctions between which are being more and more obliterated, if all the social groups of society, with the working class playing the leading role, are endeavouring to build communism, it is only natural and legitimate that a Communist Party in such a society expresses the will of and represents the entire people, it becomes its vanguard, its collective leader and guide. This objective thesis found its reflection in the deduction of the Programme—the CPSU is the party of the entire people.

Only people who close their eyes to the real processes taking place in the life of Soviet society, who look not forward but back, who abide by positions of dogmatism and look upon Marxism-Leninism as a statute book of unchangeable formulas, can doubt this conclusion or see in it something that contradicts Marxist-Leninist teaching on the party.

As for the militancy of the party itself and its role in Soviet society after it is transformed into a party of the entire people, this is graphically and clearly reflected in the Open Letter of the CPSU central committee:

“Life shows that the CPSU, having become a political organisation of the entire people, has consolidated its ties with the masses, has acquired still greater strength and has an even higher level of discipline. With the victory of socialism, the ideology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism—has become the ideology of the entire people, of its progressive part. The aim of the working class—the building of communism—has become the aim of the whole people. Marxist-Leninists can only rejoice, of course, in this growth of the influence of communist ideology. We can say that never since the death of Lenin has our party been so strong, so capable of accomplishing the most daring tasks connected with the building of a new world.”

## ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The tremendous importance of the struggle, launched on the initiative of the CPSU, against the cult of the individual and its effects, for the restoration of Lenin's standards of party life and principles of leadership, is generally recognised in the world communist movement. It is stressed in the 1960 Statement that the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU were of historic importance for the entire world communist movement.

In its time, the Chinese leadership, too, recognised the historic significance of the 20th Congress and the necessity of the struggle against the cult of the individual. In the well-known article "Once More About the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" the Chinese comrades wrote: "The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union displayed tremendous determination and courage in eliminating the cult of Stalin, in exposing the seriousness of Stalin's mistakes and in liquidating the consequences of his mistakes. Throughout the world, Marxists-Leninists and those who sympathise with the cause of communism, support the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to correct these mistakes, and wish that the efforts of the Soviet comrades be crowned with complete success."

Today, contrary to its former pronouncements, the CPC leadership openly defends the cult of the individual and denounces the struggle against it.

The Chinese comrades cannot fail to know that the question of the cult of the individual is one of the vital questions for the world revolutionary movement of the working class. The matter concerns not merely evaluation of Stalin's activities. The matter concerns eradication of the pernicious methods and forms of leadership that became widespread under the cult of the individual.

The cult of the individual signifies disparagement of the role of the party and of the masses, violation of Lenin's standards of party life and principles of leadership, curtailment of party democracy and abuse of power. The overcoming of the cult signifies the restoration and strictest observance of Lenin's standards of party and state life, strengthening of the leading role of the party and of the constructive initiative of the masses and the broadest possible development of socialist democracy.

Our party understood all this very well when, at its 20th Congress, it boldly and openly condemned the ideology and practices of the cult of the individual realising that this condemnation conformed to the interests of socialism although it could cause some

temporary difficulties, on which the Chinese leaders are trying to speculate now.

The course of the 20th Congress, the party's criticism of the cult of the individual and the overcoming of its consequences have fully justified themselves. It is ten years now since the CPSU effected a sharp turn towards the restoration of Lenin's principles in the life of the party and the state. In these years Soviet society has achieved outstanding successes in economic, scientific and cultural development, in raising the well-being of the people and in the pursuit of the policy of peace. Our country is stronger than ever before. Its strength lies in the unity of the party and the people. It possesses a mighty economic and defence potential which serves as a reliable bulwark for the entire socialist community, for all the peoples of the world in their struggle for peace and progress.

The criticism of the cult of the individual and the restoration of Lenin's standards and principles have been of tremendous positive importance for the entire international communist movement. The communist movement has risen to a new and higher stage and is successfully solving theoretical and practical problems. Many fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties of the capitalist countries have further grown, gained in strength and won new positions in the working class and among the working people in general. It is not accidental that the enemies of communism are launching one crusade after another against communist ideas and the Marxist-Leninist parties; it is not accidental that they are compelled to admit the growth of the influence of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the force of their policy.

It can be said confidently that without the exposure of the cult of the individual, socialism and the revolutionary movement could not develop successfully. Only by brushing aside the ideology and methods of the personality cult have the Marxist-Leninist parties been able to broaden their links with the masses, enhance their fighting ability and exert ever greater influence on social development.

For what purposes are the Chinese leaders again raising the question of the cult of the individual? Is it that they are out to return the world communist movement to a state of things where one man towered, god-like, above the peoples and arbitrarily decided the most important questions of the activities of all Communist parties? **No party, no consistent Marxist-Leninist will ever agree with the restoration of the ways and methods of the cult of the individual.**

The position of the Chinese comrades is a manifestation of dogmatism and sectarianism, of departure from life, an attempt at

decreeing in theory. The latter is shown especially graphically in the arrogant tone characteristic of the Chinese leaders, in their slighting attitude towards the experience of other Communist parties, in the refusal to see things as they are.

It hardly needs to be proved that with the emergence of the world socialist system the experience of socialist construction is created collectively by all the Marxist-Leninist parties. Comrade Khrushchov's report to the 22nd Congress on the Programme of the CPSU pointed to the substantial contribution made by the Marxist-Leninist parties of the fraternal countries to the collective experience of the building of socialism.

Far from noting the positive contribution of other Marxist-Leninist parties to the treasure-store of collective experience, the Chinese comrades devote their efforts to searching for shortcomings, to the "exposure of shady aspects" in the activities of other parties. There is, of course, nothing blameworthy in the fact itself that one Communist party states its opinion on some or other aspects of the activities of another Communist party. Discussions, constructive exchange of opinions in the communist movement are useful. But it is absolutely inadmissible for one party to seek to assume the role of attorney with respect to other Communist parties and claim a monopoly of the interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. But that is precisely what the CPC leaders are doing.

In recent years nothing has been said in the Chinese press about the defence and development of Marxist-Leninist theory by the other Communist and workers' parties, with the exception of the Albanian Party of Labour, the activities of which are lauded in every way. Claiming the role of the sole interpreter of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the CPC leaders excommunicate from Marxism all those who disagree with their views. The entire propaganda apparatus of the CPC endeavours to present things in such a way as if the Chinese leaders are the sole creative theoreticians of Marxism-Leninism in our epoch.

The CPC theoreticians and propagandists have proclaimed a "new stage" in the development of Marxism. One of the leaders of the Communist Party of China said: "The experience of China and of the international communist movement confirms that the revolution and the cause of construction are victorious only when they guide themselves by the ideas of Mao Tse-tung. . . ." After this and many similar utterances it is no longer surprising that even generally-known propositions of Marxism are presented as having been first discovered in China. There is, it turns out, not a single category of Marxist philosophy, economic law or proposition of the theory of scientific communism which has been

formulated outside China, without the participation of the Chinese leaders!

The CPSU has always recognised and recognises now, the important part the Chinese Marxists have played in applying Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions of their country. But it is one thing to develop creatively and apply Marxism in the concrete conditions of a given situation, and quite another to try, as the Chinese leaders are doing, to create "one's own" Marxism opposed to genuine Marxism, and even try to impose this Marxism of "one's own" upon all as the last word in truth.

It becomes clear from articles printed in Chinese newspapers and magazines that the CPC leadership makes a fetish of its experience, proclaims it as a new, higher stage in the revolutionary theory of the working class, claims a monopoly of the development of Marxism-Leninism. Chinese text-books abound in discourses on the ideas of the CPC leadership as having, you see, "universal importance for the world communist movement and the national liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies".

An interesting picture results: the CPC resolutely objects to the application of the experience of other countries to the conditions of China and to the application of the experience of the CPSU by other Communist parties, and at the same time insists that all parties and peoples accept the statements of the Chinese leaders as indisputable precepts suitable for all countries.

Proclaiming their party to be the sole treasurer of the theoretical heritage of the world revolutionary movement, speaking of themselves as the "minority" which allegedly defends the truth and of the "majority" of Communist parties as parties allegedly caught in the snares of "revisionism", the CPC leaders high-handedly reject the principled criticism of their erroneous theses by Marxist-Leninist parties.

It would be wrong, of course, to deny—and nobody does deny—that the experience of revolutionary struggle, the experience of socialist construction gained by the CPC has a number of aspects, creative application of which may prove useful to fraternal parties. But, as is known, it is by no means the intention of the Chinese comrades simply to have use made of whatever is valuable in their experience. No, they are pushing through their erroneous views on pressing problems of today. At the same time the CPC leaders recommend, as a model to follow, precisely those aspects of their theoretical and practical activities which are not free from serious errors.

It was understood by all—and the Chinese comrades themselves said that more than once—that the "people's commune" and the "big leap forward" were experiments. But the CPC leaders, with-

out waiting for a verification of these experiments in practice, immediately raised them to the level of theoretical discoveries. The Chinese press claimed that "the best organisational form of accelerated construction of socialism and of the subsequent transition to communism—the people's commune" had been found in China. When life had shown that the communes had been advertised with excessive haste, the Chinese leaders did not find the strength to analyse their mistakes openly. Having changed the policy in the village, they continue to maintain and proclaim publicly, slogans which had already become an anachronism.

Seeking to prove their infallibility and retain their prestige, the CPC theoreticians have "discovered" a new law, "the law of the undulating development of the national economy". This pursues a definite aim—to justify errors in economic management, to prove that the drop in the rate of development of industry and agriculture is not a result of miscalculations and mistakes, but an objective necessity. Comrade Hsio Ti-sin, a prominent Chinese economist, writes in *Red Flag* (No. 11, 1962): "From balance to imbalance and again to balance in the development of the national economy—such is the objective process of the continuous emergence of contradictions and their continuous solution."

Cyclic, or "undulating" economic development is known to be a law of capitalism. The operation of this law even in a modified form has not yet been observed in the socialist countries, where economy develops according to plan, steadily, along an ascending line, without any undulating recessions. Consequently, at most there can be a question of a phenomenon taking place in China alone. But is it possible here to speak of a law at all? For it is evident to all that the undulations in the development of the Chinese economy are a result of serious miscalculations and blunders in economic policy. Why deceive oneself and put manifestations of subjectivity and self-will in economics under the cloak of an objective law? This is a very dangerous road.

The defence by the Chinese leaders of the cult of the individual, their attempts to turn their experience into the absolute, and their subjectivity in assessing events taking place in the world—all this runs counter to the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

## SPLITTING POLICY

The Chinese leaders also carry over their differences with the communist movement to the sphere of practical relations, of concrete policy. Sufficient facts justifying this conclusion have been accumulated in the past few years.

This trend is manifested especially clearly in the CPC leadership's ignoring of the principles of socialist internationalism and unity of action, in questions pertaining to relations between socialist countries, to the interests of the development and consolidation of the world socialist system.

Having launched an ideological struggle against the Marxist-Leninist course of the CPSU and other fraternal parties, the CPC leaders began curtailing economic and cultural contacts of the PRC with the USSR and other socialist countries, and cutting down contacts along political lines; in the international arena, they more and more often counterposed their positions to the positions of the socialist states. The pursuit of this policy compelled the Chinese comrades to search for corresponding theoretical substantiation.

This is the object of the so-called theory of "reliance on one's own forces" expounded in the June 14th letter of the CPC central committee.

We stand unreservedly for the maximum utilisation of the resources of every country. But on what conditions can these resources be utilised to the maximum? Only on the conditions that every socialist country utilises the advantages of socialism as a world system. This applies to all the socialist countries, no matter whether they are highly developed or have inherited a backward economy. The countries that embarked upon the road of socialism after the second world war have carried out industrialisation with the help of other fraternal countries. This mutual assistance helps to even up the levels of economic development. Nor can the problems of the economic competition with the capitalist countries be ignored: we shall be able to win this competition only if we establish extensive and profound co-operation in production, making it possible rapidly to introduce new techniques and keep up with world scientific and technical progress. It should also be kept in mind that the foundation of the future world socialist economic system is beginning to be laid at this precise moment, relying on a thoroughly thought-out, scientifically grounded division of labour among countries and regions of the world.

The Chinese comrades, however, deny the need for the development of a socialist international division of labour on the basis of consistent implementation of the principle of socialist internationalism; they ignore the fact of the existence of the world socialist system and deliberately reject the advantages of developed

and smooth co-operation among all socialist countries. Moreover, the slogan of building socialism by one's own forces, as interpreted by the Chinese comrades, gives rise to mistrust of one people in another, to disbelief in the opportunities of the socialist community. Not only is it devoid of "concrete embodiment of proletarian internationalism", as is asserted in the letter of the CPC central committee, it clearly smacks of nationalism.

The experience of recent years has confirmed the need for a close alliance of the peoples who have taken the road of socialism; it has shown that mutual assistance and economic co-operation among socialist countries accelerate their economic growth and make for the most rational and effective solution of problems of developing the national economy. Conversely, repudiation of economic co-operation among fraternal countries leads to the squandering of resources, excessive expenditures, and unnecessary sacrifices.

Such a policy harms first and foremost the national economy of the country whose leaders set the course towards isolated development. In the letter of the CPC central committee, the international socialist division of labour, the basic principles of which were defined by the members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, is depicted as "imposition of the will of one country upon others, infringement of independence and sovereignty". It is common knowledge, however, that every socialist country is absolutely free in deciding on its participation in specialisation and co-operation in production, that the nature of this participation is determined by its own benefits and interests as much as by the interests of the socialist community as a whole.

Whether the Chinese comrades want it or not, their policy leads to impairing the unity of the countries of the socialist system. This is shown especially graphically in connection with the so-called Albanian and Yugoslav questions. Instead of contributing in every way to the settlement of these questions in the interest of rallying all states of the socialist system, the Chinese leaders exacerbate the existing differences, advance them to the foreground in the ideological struggle and distort the real state of affairs so as to utilise this for attacks on the CPSU and on the line of the world communist movement.

It is a matter of record that beginning with 1960, not without influence from the outside, the Albanian leaders launched large-scale splitting activities, attacking the common line of the world communist movement, viciously vilifying the CPSU and the Soviet government. As far as the views of the Albanian leaders are concerned, they fully coincided with the views expounded in the Chinese press, except that they were expressed in a more rude, unrestrained form.

All attempts of the CPSU to normalise relations with the Albanian Party of Labour met with stubborn, resentful resistance on the part of the Albanian leaders, and comradely proposals to meet and discuss the disputed issues were rejected by them out of hand.

To say the least, a highly negative part was played by the unqualified support of the Chinese comrades for all the splitting activities of the APL leadership. Every anti-Soviet attack of the Albanian leaders was received in Peking with approval. The Chinese comrades never missed an opportunity to stress the "loyalty of the APL leaders to Marxism-Leninism", and the more the Albanian leaders got worked up, the more praises were lavished upon them. It can be confidently said that only due to this encouragement do the Albanian splitters continue their noisy campaign against the CPSU and other Communist parties.

With regard to the so-called Yugoslav question, despite the opinion of the Chinese leaders and in accordance with the Statement of 1960, we consider Yugoslavia to be a socialist country. Its economy is dominated by the public sector, the share of which, far from diminishing, has increased in recent years. Yugoslavia adheres to the same positions as the other socialist countries on many most important problems of international relations, and strives for *rapprochement* and co-operation with them. Several years ago the Chinese comrades themselves did not deny the socialist character of the social system of Yugoslavia. Now they "assign" Yugoslavia to the system of capitalism and call its leaders "a special task force of US imperialism". This cannot be appraised otherwise than deliberate use of the "Yugoslav question" for whipping up polemics against the CPSU and other fraternal parties.

Loyal to the decisions of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960, the CPSU criticised the erroneous views of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. But our criticism has always pursued but one aim: to help the Yugoslav comrades overcome erroneous concepts and stand upon the common platform of the world communist movement.

In the statements of Chinese authors, however, just as in the letter of the CPC central committee, everything that comes from the Yugoslav leaders is run down, even when they express views fully coinciding with the propositions of the Statement of the Moscow meeting. The CPC leaders show that the aim of their unsubstantiated criticism is to prevent by any means Yugoslavia's *rapprochement* with the other socialist countries. No sober-minded Marxist-Leninist, no communist cherishing the interests of world socialism can agree with this.



The Chinese communists do not confine their splitting activities within the boundaries of the socialist camp. Trampling underfoot the interests of the world communist movement, acting contrary to the principles laid down in the Declaration and the Statement, the CPC leaders are trying to subordinate many fraternal parties to their ideological and political control; they are knocking together opposition groups inside them. In doing so they do not scruple to use all kinds of Trotskyites, renegades and other scum. The Chinese press has gone as far as to urge the establishment of factions in the Communist and Workers' parties.

The Chinese leaders also carry over their disagreements with the fraternal parties to mass international democratic organisations. The World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Peace Movement, the Afro - Asian Solidarity Movement, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and many other organisations have been confronted with serious difficulties as a result of the splitting activities of the Chinese representatives. PRC representatives in the international democratic organisations are trying to counterpose the Asian, African and Latin American countries to the European countries, the national liberation struggle to the struggle for peace and disarmament, thus seriously harming both the national liberation movement and the international democratic organisations in their struggle for peace.

The internationalist nature of the communist movement, the Marxist-Leninist principles of relations between fraternal parties, presuppose their joint participation in the elaboration of the common line and determine the forms and methods of discussing pressing problems. It is quite natural that in the process of this discussion various points of view come to light and arguments and disputes arise, without which Marxism-Leninism, essentially a revolutionary-critical teaching itself, cannot develop in general. But polemics in the communist movement should be conducted on the basis of a common ideological platform, for it is conducted by like-minded people who strive objectively to look into the complicated problems posed by life, to find, in common, correct solutions to these problems so as to pursue consistently an agreed line. A discussion carried on from such positions can touch upon both international and domestic problems of the activities of individual detachments of the communist movement. It can be carried out in the form of bilateral and multilateral meetings, conferences of Communist parties, statements in the press, exchange of letters and documents.

But the methods used by the Chinese comrades run directly counter to the Marxist-Leninist principles of relations between fraternal parties.

Stating, at first, its disagreements with the CPSU, with the world communist movement on a comparatively narrow range of questions, the CPC leadership has been consistently broadening the range of the polemics. The June 14th letter of the CPC central committee calls in question the very fact of the full and complete victory of socialism and of the Soviet Union's entering into the period of full-scale construction of communism. An impression is formed that the Chinese comrades are tossing ever new subjects into the polemics, like firewood into a stove, with the deliberate intention of preventing the differences from being ironed out, and further hotting up the atmosphere of the discussion.

Nor can one fail to pay attention to the impermissible tone used by the Chinese comrades in the polemics with the international communist movement. In it, hypocrisy is combined with arrogance and rudeness that oversteps all limits, with the desire to defame all those who disagree with them. For instance, the leaders of the Communist parties of the capitalist countries are monstrously accused of being "concerned for the destinies of imperialism and all reactionaries".

Now it has become apparent how seriously the Chinese leaders have departed from the agreed line of the international communist movement and what harm can be done by the activities of the CPC leadership, which, in pursuance of its special aims, attacks the line of the communist movement from left-opportunist positions. The dogmatic, left-sectarian views of the Chinese leaders, their splitting activities in the world communist movement are therefore meeting with a stern and legitimate rebuff on the part of the majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

\*                      \*                      \*

In order to be able to fulfil its great historic mission, the communist movement must be strong and united.

Communists, treasuring the great principles of the Declaration and the Statement, are exerting all efforts to overcome the difficulties and differences that have arisen in the ranks of the communist movement and consolidate its unity on a principled basis, the basis of creative Marxism-Leninism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union holds aloft the victorious banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the banner of proletarian internationalism. It fights indefatigably for the consolidation of the unity of the international communist movement, for the rallying of the working class and all working people against imperialism, for the triumph of the great cause of peace and socialism. The CPSU central committee declared in its Open

**Letter: "We have done and will do everything in our power to strengthen unity with the Communist Party of China, to rally the world communist movement under the banner of Lenin, to rally the countries of the world system of socialism to provide effective aid to all peoples fighting against colonialism, to strengthen the cause of peace and ensure the victory of the great ideas of communism throughout the world."**

The Communists of the Soviet Union, all the working people of our country unanimously approve and warmly support the Open Letter of the CPSU central committee and the Leninist policy of their own Communist Party.