

*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**

*From newsagents, or post free from*

**"SOVIET WEEKLY"**

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

518

## The Open Letter of The Central Committee of The Communist Party of the Soviet Union to Party Organisations and all communists of the Soviet Union

---

Full text of the Open Letter from the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to party organisations and all communists of the Soviet Union, as published by PRAVDA on July 14th, 1963.

Soviet Booklet  
No. 114

London,  
July 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>



Open Letter of the Central  
Committee of the Communist  
Party of the Soviet Union  
to Party Organisations and  
all communists of the  
Soviet Union

★

This is the Open Letter from the central committee of the C.P.S.U. to all party organisations and communists of the Soviet Union. It was published by *PRAVDA* on July 14th, 1963, on which day *PRAVDA* also published the letter of June 14th from the central committee of the Communist Party of China to the central committee of the C.P.S.U.

## Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to Party Organisations and all communists of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The central committee of the C.P.S.U. considers it necessary to address this open letter to you in order to set out its position on the fundamental questions of the international communist movement in connection with the letter of the central committee of the Communist Party of China of June 14th, 1963.

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

For many years relations between our parties were good. But some time ago, serious differences came to light between the C.P.C. on the one hand, and the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties, on the other. At the present time the central committee of the C.P.S.U. feels increasingly concerned over statements and actions of the leadership of the Communist Party of China which are undermining the cohesion of our parties and the friendship of our peoples.

The C.P.S.U. central committee, for its part, has done everything possible to overcome the differences which came to light and in January this year, proposed that open polemics in the Communist movement be stopped in order that the disputed issues might be discussed calmly and in a businesslike manner, and so that they might be resolved on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis. This proposal from the C.P.S.U. met with warm support among all the fraternal parties. Subsequently, agreement was reached to hold a meeting between representatives of the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C., and this is taking place in Moscow at the present time.

The C.P.S.U. central committee hoped that the Chinese comrades, like ourselves, would display good will and would contribute to the success of the meeting in the interests of our peoples and in the interests of strengthening the unity of the communist movement. To our regret, when agreement had already been reached on a meeting of representatives of the C.P.S.U. and C.P.C. in Moscow, when the delegations had been appointed and the date of the meeting agreed upon, the Chinese comrades, instead of submitting the existing differences for discussion at the meeting, unexpectedly found it pos-

sible not only to set out the old differences openly, before the whole world, but also to make new charges against the C.P.S.U. and the other Communist Parties.

This found expression in the publication of the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th this year, which gave an arbitrary interpretation of the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings of representatives of the Communist and Workers Parties and distorted the basic principles of these historic documents. The letter of the C.P.C. central committee contained groundless, slanderous attacks on our party and on the other Communist Parties, on the decisions of the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Congresses and on the Programme of the C.P.S.U.

As you know from the statement by the C.P.S.U. central committee published in *Pravda* on June 19th, this year, the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee, having studied the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th, arrived at the conclusion that its publication in the Soviet press at that time would have been inadvisable. Publication of the letter would naturally have required a public reply on our part, which would have led to a further sharpening of the polemics and would have inflamed passions, and thereby worsened relations between our parties. Publication of the letter of the C.P.C. central committee would have been all the more untimely since a meeting was to be held between representatives of the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. with the purpose, in our opinion, of contributing through consideration of the existing differences in a comradely spirit, to better mutual understanding between our two parties on the vital questions of world development today and to the establishment of a favourable atmosphere for the preparation and holding of a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

At the same time the presidium of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. deemed it necessary to acquaint the members of the C.P.S.U. central committee and all those taking part in the plenary meeting with the letter of the C.P.C. central committee, and informed them of the substance of differences between the C.P.C. leadership and the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

In its unanimously adopted decision, the plenary meeting of the central committee fully approved the political work of the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee and of Comrade Nikita Khrushchov, the first secretary of the C.P.S.U. central committee and Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers in further rallying the forces of the world communist movement, and also all the specific actions and measures taken by the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee in its relations with the central committee of the Communist Party of China.

The plenary meeting of the C.P.S.U. central committee instructed the presidium of the central committee, at the meeting with representatives of the C.P.C., to follow unswervingly the line of the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Congresses of our party, the line which was approved at the meetings of the representatives of the Communist Parties and set out in the Declaration and Statement, a line which was fully confirmed by life and by the course of international developments.

Emphatically rejecting as groundless and slanderous the attacks of the central committee of the Communist Party of China on our party and other Communist Parties, on the decisions of the Twentieth, Twenty-First and

Twenty-Second Congresses, on the Programme of the C.P.S.U., the plenary meeting of the central committee, expressing the will of the whole party, declared its readiness and determination consistently to pursue the course of rallying the fraternal parties and of overcoming the existing differences.

The plenary meeting declared that our party would continue to strive to strengthen unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and of fraternal friendship between the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. in the interests of the struggle for our common cause.

Unfortunately, recent events have shown that the Chinese comrades interpret our restraint in their own way. They depict our sincere striving to avoid a sharpening of the polemics in the communist movement as almost an intention to hide the views of the Chinese leaders from the communists and from the Soviet people.

Mistaking our restraint for weakness, the Chinese comrades, contrary to the standards of friendly relations between fraternal socialist countries, have begun with increasing importunity and persistence to spread illegally in Moscow and other Soviet cities the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th, which was published in Russian in a large edition. Not content with this, the Chinese comrades began sedulously to popularise and spread throughout the world, this letter and other documents directed against our party, not scrupling to use imperialist publishing houses and agencies for their distribution.

Matters were further aggravated by the fact that when the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Foreign Affairs drew the attention of the Chinese Ambassador in the Soviet Union to the impermissibility of such actions, which crudely violate the sovereignty of our state, the Chinese representatives, far from stopping them, declared in a demonstrative way that they regarded it as their right to continue to circulate the letter in the U.S.S.R.

On July 7th, when the meeting in Moscow had already begun, a mass meeting was held in Peking at which officials welcomed as heroes the Chinese expelled from the Soviet Union for the unlawful distribution of materials containing attacks on our party and on the Soviet government. Whipping up sentiments and feelings unfriendly to the U.S.S.R. among the fraternal Chinese people, Chinese officials sought once again at the meeting to prove their right to violate the sovereignty of our state and the standards of international relations. On July 10th, the C.P.C. central committee issued another statement in which it sought to justify these actions and, in effect, tried to arrogate to itself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union which the Soviet government, naturally, will never allow. Such actions inevitably only worsen relations and can do nothing but harm.

In its leading article on July 13th, the newspaper *People's Daily* again attacked our party and distorted the fact that the Soviet press had not published the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th.

The openly unfriendly actions of the C.P.C. leaders, their persistent striving to sharpen the polemics in the international communist movement, the deliberate distortion of the position of our party and the incorrect interpretation of the motives for which we refrained temporarily from publishing the letter, impel us to publish the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th, 1963, and to give our appraisal of this document.

All who read the letter of the C.P.C. central committee will see behind the fine phrases about unity and cohesion, unfriendly and slanderous attacks on

our party and the Soviet Union and a striving to play down the historic significance of our people's struggle for the victory of communism in the U.S.S.R., and for the triumph of peace and socialism throughout the world.

The document is full of charges—overt and covert—against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union. The authors of the letter permit themselves unworthy fabrications, insulting to Communists, about “betrayal of the interests of the whole international proletariat and all the peoples of the world,” about a “departure from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism,” hint at “cowardice in face of the imperialists,” at “a step back in the course of historic development” and even at “organisational and moral disarming of the proletariat and all the working people” which is tantamount to “doing a service to the restoration of capitalism” in our country.

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

## I

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

World history knows no other example of a single country rendering such extensive aid to other countries in the development of their economy, science and technology.

The working people of China and the Chinese communists felt in full measure the fraternal solidarity of the Soviet people and of our party, both in the period of their revolutionary struggle for the liberation of their homeland and in the years of the construction of socialism. Immediately after the forming of the People's Republic of China the Soviet government signed with the government of People's China a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which is a mighty means of rebuffing the encroachments of imperialism, and is a factor consolidating peace in the Far East and in the whole world.

The Soviet people generously shared with their Chinese brothers all their experience of many years of socialist construction and achievements in the field of science and technology. Our country has rendered and is rendering substantial aid to the development of the economy of People's China. With the active assistance of the Soviet Union, People's China built 198 industrial enterprises, shops and other installations equipped with up-to-date machinery.

With the assistance of our country such new branches of industry as the motor, tractor, aircraft and other industries were created in China. The Soviet Union handed over to the People's Republic of China more than

21,000 sets of scientific and technical documentation including more than 1,400 blueprints of large enterprises. We have invariably assisted China in consolidating the defence of the country and the setting up of a modern defence industry. Thousands of Chinese specialists and workers have been trained in Soviet higher schools and at Soviet enterprises. Now, too, the Soviet Union continues to render technical assistance to the People's Republic of China in the construction of eighty-eight industrial enterprises and projects.

We are speaking about all this, not to boast, but only because the leaders of the C.P.C. have recently sought to belittle the significance of Soviet aid, and we do not forget that the Soviet Union in its turn received the goods it needed from the People's Republic of China.

Only a short time ago the Chinese leaders spoke justly and eloquently about the friendship of the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, about the unity of the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C., expressed great appreciation of Soviet aid and urged the people to learn from the experience of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in 1957:

“In the course of struggle for national liberation, the Chinese people enjoyed the fraternal sympathy and support of the Soviet people. After the victory of the Chinese revolution the Soviet Union continues to render all-round assistance to the cause of construction of socialism in China. The Chinese people will never forget all this.”

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

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

“The heroic and hard-working people of China have demonstrated under the leadership of its glorious Communist Party, what a people is capable of when it takes power into its own hands. . . .

“Now everybody admits the successes of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China. The peoples of Asia and Africa see how and under what system the talents and the creative forces of the peoples can be fully developed, when a people can demonstrate both in width and depth its mighty creative force.”

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

In April 1960 the Chinese comrades openly revealed their differences with the world communist movement by publishing a collection of articles called *Long Live Leninism!* This collection, based on distortions, truncated and incorrectly interpreted theses of the well-known works of Lenin, contained propositions in fact directed against the foundations of the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957, which was signed on behalf of the C.P.C. by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, against the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, against the possibility of preventing a world war in the present epoch and against the use both of the peaceful and non-peaceful road of development of socialist revolutions.

The leaders of the C.P.C. began imposing their views on all the fraternal parties. In June 1960, during the session of the general council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, which took place in Peking, without the knowledge of the leadership of fraternal parties the Chinese leaders held a meeting of representatives of several parties, which were then in Peking, and started

criticising openly the positions of the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties and the Declaration adopted by the Moscow Meeting in 1957. Furthermore, the Chinese comrades took their differences with the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal parties to the open tribune of a non-party organisation.

Such steps by the leadership of the C.P.C. caused serious concern among the fraternal parties and in view of this an attempt was made at the Bucharest Meeting of Communist Parties in 1960 to discuss with the leaders of the C.P.C. the differences which had arisen. Representatives of fifty Communist and Workers' Parties subjected the views and actions of the Chinese leaders to comradely criticism and urged them to return to the road of unity and co-operation with the international communist movement in conformity with the principles of the Moscow Declaration. Unfortunately, the C.P.C. leadership disregarded this comradely assistance and continued to pursue its erroneous course and deepen its differences with the fraternal parties.

Striving to prevent such a development of events, the C.P.S.U. central committee came out with a proposal to hold talks with the central committee of the Communist Party of China. These negotiations took place in Moscow in September 1960. But even then it was impossible to overcome the differences that had arisen, due to the stubborn unwillingness of the C.P.C. delegation to heed the opinion of the fraternal party. At the meeting of representatives of eighty-one Communist and Workers' Parties, which took place in November 1960, the absolute majority of the fraternal parties rejected the incorrect views and concepts of the C.P.C. leadership. The Chinese delegation at this meeting stubbornly upheld its own particular views and signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its complete isolation.

Now it has become absolutely obvious that the C.P.C. leaders were only manoeuvring, when they affixed their signatures to the Statement of 1960. Shortly after the meeting they resumed the propaganda for their line, using as a mouthpiece the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. Behind the back of our party they launched a campaign against the C.P.S.U. central committee and the Soviet government.

In October 1961 the C.P.S.U. central committee undertook new attempts to normalise relations with the C.P.C. Comrades Nikita Khrushchov, Frol Kozlov, and Anastas Mikoyan had talks with Comrades Chou En-lai, Peng Cheng and other leading officials, who arrived for the Twenty-Second C.P.S.U. Congress. Comrade Nikita Khrushchov set forth in detail for the Chinese delegation, the position of the C.P.S.U. central committee on the questions of principle which were discussed at the Twenty-Second Congress and stressed our unswerving desire to strengthen friendship and co-operation with the Communist Party of China.

In its letters of February 22nd and May 31st, 1962, the C.P.S.U. central committee drew the attention of the C.P.C. central committee to the dangerous consequences for our common cause, which could be brought about by the weakening of the unity of the communist movement. We then suggested to the Chinese comrades that steps should be taken in order not to give the imperialists an opportunity to use in their interests the difficulties which had arisen in Soviet-Chinese mutual relations. The C.P.S.U. central committee also proposed that more effective measures should be taken on such questions as the exchange of internal political information and the co-ordination of the

positions of fraternal parties in the international democratic organisations and in other spheres.

However, these letters and the other practical steps aimed at improving relations with the C.P.C. and the People's Republic of China in all fields, did not meet with response in Peking.

In the autumn of last year before the departure from Moscow of the former Chinese Ambassador in the Soviet Union, Comrade Liu Hsiao, the presidium of the C.P.S.U. central committee had a long discussion with him. In the course of this conversation the members of the presidium of the central committee once again displayed initiative in the matter of strengthening Chinese-Soviet friendship. Comrade Nikita Khrushchov asked Comrade Liu Hsiao to forward to Comrade Mao Tse-tung our proposal: "To put aside all disputes and differences, not to try and establish who is right and who is wrong, not to stir up the past, but to start our relations with a clear page." But we have not even received an answer to this sincere call.

Extending their ideological differences with the fraternal parties, the leaders of the C.P.C. began carrying them over to relations between states. Chinese bodies began curtailing economic and trade relations of the People's Republic of China with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. On the initiative of the Chinese government the volume of China's trade with the Soviet Union was cut by almost 67 per cent in the past three years and deliveries of industrial plant dropped to a fortieth. This reduction took place on the initiative of the Chinese leaders. We regret that the leadership of the People's Republic of China has embarked on such a road.

We have always believed and believe now that it is necessary to go on developing Soviet-Chinese relations and to develop co-operation. This would have been mutually beneficial for both sides, and above all for People's China, which had received great assistance from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The Soviet Union developed extensive relations with China before, and today, also, it favours their expansion and not curtailment. It would seem that the C.P.C. leadership should have displayed primary concern for the development of economic relations with the socialist countries. However, it began acting in the opposite direction, disregarding the damage caused by such actions to the economy of the People's Republic of China.

The Chinese leaders did not tell their people truthfully whose fault it was that these relations were curtailed. Widespread propaganda aimed at discrediting the foreign and domestic policy of the C.P.S.U. and stirring up anti-Soviet sentiments was started among the Chinese communists and even among the people.

The C.P.S.U. central committee drew the attention of the Chinese comrades to these incorrect actions. We told the Chinese comrades that the people should not be prompted to praise or anathemise this or that party depending on disputes and differences that arose. It is clear to every Communist that disagreements among fraternal parties are nothing more than temporary episodes, whereas relations among the peoples of the socialist countries are now being established for ages to come.

Every time, however, the Chinese leaders ignored the comradely warnings of the C.P.S.U., further straining Chinese-Soviet relations.

From the end of 1961 the Chinese representatives in international democratic organisations began openly imposing their erroneous views. In December 1961, at the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council the Chinese

delegation opposed the convening of the World Congress for Peace and Disarmament. In the course of 1962 the activity of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Peace Movement, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation and many other organisations were endangered as a result of the splitting activities of the Chinese representatives. They came out against the participation of representatives of Afro-Asian Solidarity Committees of the European socialist countries in the Third Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi.

The leader of the Chinese delegation told the Soviet representatives that "the white people have nothing to do here". At the journalists' conference in Jakarta the Chinese representatives took the line of preventing Soviet journalists from participating as full delegates on the plea that the Soviet Union . . . is not an Asian country!

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

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

## II

What is the gist of the differences between the C.P.C., on the one hand, and the C.P.S.U. and the international communist movement on the other? This question will undoubtedly be asked by anyone who studies the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th.

At first glance many theses in the letter may give rise to astonishment: whom are the Chinese comrades actually arguing with? Are there communists who object, for instance, to socialist revolution or who do not regard it as their duty to fight against imperialism and to support the national liberation movement? Why does the C.P.C. leadership set forth such theses so insistently?

The question may also arise—why is it impossible to agree with the positions of the Chinese comrades on many important problems, as set forth in their letter? Take, for instance, such a cardinal problem as war and peace. In its letter the C.P.C. central committee speaks of peace and peaceful coexistence.

The essence of the matter is that having started an offensive against the views of the Marxist-Leninist parties on cardinal problems of today, the Chinese comrades firstly ascribe to the C.P.S.U. and other Marxist-Leninist parties, views which they have never expressed and which are alien to them; secondly, they try to mask their erroneous views and incorrect positions by verbal recognition of the formulas and principles taken from the documents of the communist movement. To come out openly against the people's struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, against disarmament, etc., would mean to lay bare their positions

in the eyes of the Communists of the whole world and all peace-loving peoples and to alienate them. Therefore the further the polemics develop and the clearer the weakness of the positions of the C.P.C. leadership becomes, the more zealously it resorts to such camouflage.

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

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

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

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

The unanimous opinion of the Communist Parties is that a tremendous role in this respect was played by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., which ushered in a new stage in the development of the entire communist movement. This appraisal was recorded in the 1957 Declaration and in the 1960 Statement—the documents of the Communist Parties worked out collectively and formulating the general political line of the communist movement in our epoch.

But the C.P.C. leaders have now put forward a different line in opposition to it and their positions diverge more and more from the common line of the communist movement on basic issues.

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

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

The C.P.S.U. central committee considers it to be its duty to tell the party and the people with all frankness that on questions of war and peace the C.P.C. leadership has major differences, based on principle, with us and with the world communist movement. The essence of these differences lies in a diametrically opposite approach to such vital problems as the possibility of averting a thermonuclear world war, peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the inter-connection between the struggle for peace and the development of the world revolutionary movement.

Our party, in the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses and the world communist movement in the Declaration and Statement, set before communists as a matter of extreme importance, the task of striving for peace and of preventing a thermonuclear world catastrophe. We realistically assess the balance of forces in the world and hence draw the conclusion that, though the nature of imperialism has not changed, and the danger of war breaking out has not been averted, in present conditions the forces of peace,



of which the mighty community of socialist states is the main bulwark, can through their joint efforts avert a new world war.

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

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

The historic task of communists is to organise and lead the struggle of the peoples for averting a thermonuclear world war.

To prevent a new world war is quite a real and feasible task. The Twentieth Congress of our party reached the extremely important conclusion that in our time there is no fatal inevitability of war between states. This conclusion is not the fruit of good intentions, but the result of a realistic, strictly scientific analysis of the balance of class forces in the world arena; it is based on the gigantic might of world socialism. Our views on this question are shared by the whole world communist movement. "World war can be averted"; "a real possibility to exclude world war from the life of society will emerge even before the complete victory of socialism on earth, while capitalism still remains in part of the world", the Statement stresses.

This Statement also bears the signatures of the Chinese comrades.

And what is the position of the C.P.C. leadership? What can the theses they disseminate mean—an end cannot be put to wars as long as imperialism exists; peaceful coexistence is an illusion, it is not the general principle of the foreign policy of the socialist countries; the peace struggle hinders the revolutionary struggle?

These theses mean that the Chinese comrades are acting contrary to the general line of the world communist movement on questions of war and peace. They do not believe in the possibility of preventing a new world war, they underestimate the forces of peace and socialism and overestimate the forces of imperialism, and they actually ignore the mobilisation of the masses in the struggle against the war danger.

It turns out that the Chinese comrades do not believe in the ability of the peoples of the socialist countries, the international working class, and of all the democratic and peaceloving forces to frustrate the plans of the warmongers and to achieve peace for our own and future generations. What lies behind the fine revolutionary phrases of the Chinese comrades? Lack of faith in the forces of the working class and its revolutionary capabilities, lack of faith both in the possibility of peaceful coexistence and in the victory of the proletariat in the class struggle. All the peaceloving forces unite in the struggle for averting war. In their class composition and their class interests they are different but they can be united by the struggle for peace and for preventing war, because the nuclear bomb does not adhere to a class

principle—it destroys everybody within the range of its devastating power.

To adopt the course proposed by the Chinese comrades means to alienate the masses of the people from the Communist Parties which have won the sympathies of the peoples by their insistent and courageous struggle for peace.

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

The Chinese comrades obviously underestimate the whole danger of thermonuclear war. "The atomic bomb is a paper tiger", it "is not terrible at all", they contend.

The main thing, they say, is to put an end to imperialism as quickly as possible, but how and with what losses this will be achieved seems to be a secondary question. For whom, it may be asked, is it a secondary question? For the hundreds of millions of people who are doomed to death in the event a thermonuclear war being unleashed? For the states that will be erased from the face of the earth in the very first hours of such a war?

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 an effort 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 letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th says much about "inevitable sacrifices" allegedly for the sake of the revolution. Some responsible Chinese leaders have also declared that it is possible to sacrifice hundreds of millions of people in war. "On the ruins of destroyed imperialism, the victorious peoples"—it is asserted in the book *Long Live Leninism!* that was approved by the C.P.C. central committee—"will create with tremendous speed a civilisation a thousand times higher than under the capitalism system, and will build their really bright future."

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

The C.P.S.U. central committee—and we are convinced the entire party and the whole of the Soviet people unanimously support us in this—cannot share the views of the Chinese leadership about the creation "of a thousand times higher civilisation" on the corpses of hundreds of millions of people. Such views are in crying contradiction with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

It is permissible to ask the Chinese comrades what means they propose for the destruction of imperialism.

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

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

If we agree with this then, indeed, there is no need for the principle of peaceful coexistence or the struggle for strengthening peace. We cannot agree to such an adventurist course: it is contrary to the essence of Marxism-Leninism.

It is generally known that under present conditions a world war would be a

thermonuclear war. The imperialists will never agree to withdraw from the scene voluntarily, to lie in the coffin of their own free will, without having used the extreme means they have at their disposal.

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

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

But if we are not attacked, we shall not be the first to use this weapon.

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

We would like to ask the Chinese comrades who suggest building a wonderful future on the ruins of the old world destroyed by a thermonuclear war, if they have consulted on this matter the working class of the countries where imperialism rules? The working class of the capitalist countries would be sure to tell them: "Do we ask you to trigger off a war and destroy our countries while annihilating the imperialists?" Is it not a fact that the monopolists, the imperialists are only a comparatively small group while the bulk of the population of the capitalist countries consists of the working class, working peasantry and working intelligentsia?

The atomic bomb does not distinguish between the imperialists and working people, it hits great areas and therefore millions of workers would be destroyed for each monopolist. The working class, the working people will ask such "revolutionaries": "What right have you to settle for us the questions of our existence and our class struggle—we too are in favour of socialism but we want to win it through the class struggle and not by unleashing a thermonuclear world war."

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

In this connection it is impossible not to note the fact that instead of the internationalist class approach expressed in the call "Workers of all countries, unite" the Chinese comrades stubbornly propagate the slogan devoid of any class meaning: "The wind from the East prevails over the wind from the West".

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

There is no doubt, of course, that if the imperialist madmen do unleash a war, the peoples will wipe out capitalism and bury it. But the communists, the true advocates of socialist humanism, representing the peoples, must do everything they can to prevent another world war in which hundreds of millions of people would perish.

No party which truly cherishes the interests of the people can fail to realise

its responsibility in the struggle to avert another world war and to ensure peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

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

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

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has proclaimed the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence as the general line of the Soviet foreign policy and is following this line unswervingly. Since 1953 and particularly after the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. there has been a sharp increase in the activity of our peaceful policy and its influence on the course of international relations has grown in the interests of the masses of the people.

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

The Soviet Union's persistent struggle for peace and international security, for general and complete disarmament, for the elimination of the vestiges of the Second World War, for a negotiated settlement of all controversial international issues has borne fruit. The prestige of our country throughout the world stands higher than ever, our international position is more solid than ever. We owe this to the steadily growing economic and military might of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries and to their peaceful foreign policy.

The C.P.S.U. central committee declares that we have pursued and will continue to pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. In this our party sees its duty both to the Soviet people and to the peoples of all other countries. To ensure peace means to contribute most effectively to the consolidation of the socialist system and, consequently, to the growth of its influence on the entire course of the liberation struggle, on the world revolutionary process.

The profound difference between the views of the C.P.S.U. and other Marxist-Leninist parties on the one hand, and the C.P.C. leaders, on the other hand, on the questions of war, peace and peaceful coexistence was manifested with particular clarity during the 1962 crisis in the Caribbean Sea. It was a sharp international crisis: never before had mankind come so close to the brink of a thermonuclear war as it did in October last year.

The Chinese comrades claim that in the period of the Caribbean crisis

we made an "adventurist" mistake by supplying rockets to Cuba and then "capitulated" to American imperialism when we withdrew the rockets from Cuba. (Such allegations were made in the leading article in the *People's Daily* on March 8th, 1963, "On the statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.")

Such assertions are entirely contrary to the facts.

What was the actual state of affairs? The C.P.S.U. central committee and the Soviet government possessed trustworthy information that armed aggression by United States imperialism against Cuba was about to take place. We realised with sufficient clarity that to rebuff aggression, to defend the Cuban revolution effectively we had to take the most resolute measures. Curses and warnings—even if they are called "serious warnings" and are repeated two and a half hundred times over—have no effect on the imperialists.

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

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

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

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

Agreement on the removal of missile weapons in return for the United States government's commitment not to invade Cuba and to keep its allies from doing this, the heroic struggle of the Cuban people and the support rendered to them by the peaceloving nations, made it possible to frustrate the plans of the extreme adventurist circles of American imperialism, which were ready to go the whole hog. As a result it was possible to defend revolutionary Cuba and save peace.

The Chinese comrades regard as an "embellishment of imperialism", our statement that the Kennedy government also displayed a certain reasonableness and a realistic approach in the course of the crisis around Cuba. Do

they really think that all bourgeois governments lack all reason in all their doings?

Thanks to the courageous and farsighted position of the U.S.S.R. and the staunchness and restraint of the heroic Cuban people and their government, the forces of socialism and peace have proved that they are able to curb the aggressive forces of imperialism and to impose peace on the warmongers. This was a major victory of the policy of reason, and for the forces of peace and socialism; it was a defeat for the forces of imperialism and for the policy of military ventures.

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

When agreement was reached with the President of the United States and a start was thereby made on the liquidation of the crisis in the Caribbean area, the Chinese comrades were particularly zealous in their insults and abuses against the Soviet Union, arguing that the imperialists cannot be trusted in anything.

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

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

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

Why, then, do the Chinese comrades stubbornly ignore the assessment which the leaders of the Cuban revolution themselves give to the policy of the government of the Soviet Union, which they call a policy of fraternal solidarity and genuine internationalism? What are the Chinese leaders dissatisfied with? Is it, perhaps, the fact that it was possible to prevent the invasion of Cuba and the unleashing of a world war?

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

The C.P.C. leadership, which, prior to that argued that imperialism might unleash a world war at any time, assumed the stand of a critic, not of a militant ally and comrade at the most crucial moment. Nobody heard any state-

ments from the Chinese leaders during those days about their practical actions in defence of the Cuban revolution. Instead of this, the Chinese leaders obviously endeavoured to worsen the already critical situation in the Caribbean area and added fuel to the smouldering fire of the conflict.

The true position of the C.P.C. leadership is manifested very clearly on questions of war and peace, in its complete underestimation—and, what is more, deliberate ignoring—of the struggle for disarmament. The Chinese Communists object even to the very raising of this question by communists, going to the length of making references to Marxism-Leninism and trying to prove in every way that disarmament is not feasible, on the one hand, and needless on the other. Juggling quotations, they try to prove that general disarmament is possible only when socialism triumphs all over the world.

Must the Marxists sit idle, waiting for the victory of socialism all over the world, while mankind suffocates in the clutches of the arms race, while the imperialists, stockpiling nuclear weapons, threaten to plunge mankind into the abyss of a world war?

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

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

In fighting for peace and in advancing the slogan of universal disarmament, we proceed from the vital interests of the peoples, take account of the actual situation and do not shut our eyes to difficulties. The imperialists are naturally doing everything to delay and wreck agreement on disarmament—they stand to gain by this. They use the arms race to enrich themselves and to hold the people in capitalist countries in fear. But must we go with the tide, must we follow in the wake of imperialism and refuse to mobilise all forces to struggle for peace and disarmament?

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

To the forces of imperialism and war it is necessary to oppose the organised might of the world working class. It now has the advantage that it relies on the material power and the defensive might of the socialist countries opposed to imperialism. The times have gone for ever when imperialism held undivided sway. The situation has also changed radically compared with the first decades after the October Revolution, when our country was alone and much weaker than today. In our time the balance of forces in the world arena has become entirely different. This is why, to hold now that war is inevitable is to show lack of faith in the forces of socialism, to surrender to the mood of hopelessness and defeatism.

One can repeat forever that war is inevitable, passing this view off as evidence of one's "revolutionary spirit." In fact, this approach merely indicates lack of faith in one's strength and a fear of imperialism.

There are still powerful forces in the imperialist camp opposed to disarmament. But it is precisely to compel these forces to retreat that we must

arouse the peoples' anger against them and force them to comply with the will of the peoples.

The peoples want disarmament and believe that it is the communists who are the vanguard and the organisers of the peoples' struggle to achieve this aim.

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

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

The Chinese comrades have advanced the slogan of "spearpoint against spearpoint", opposing it to the policy of the other socialist countries aimed at relaxing the international situation and ending the cold war. This slogan, in effect, adds grist to the mill of the imperialist policy of brinkmanship, and helps the champions of the arms race. The impression is given that the leaders of the C.P.C. consider it to their advantage to preserve and intensify international tension, especially in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. They apparently believe that the Soviet Union should reply to provocations by provocations, fall into the traps set by the "madmen" from the imperialist camp, and accept the challenge of the imperialists to a competition in adventurism and aggressiveness, that is, a competition not for ensuring peace but for unleashing war.

To take this path would be to jeopardise peace and the security of peoples. The Communists, who hold dear the interests of the peoples, will never follow this path.

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

Our party and all fraternal parties, remember the conclusion in the Statement that the struggle against the danger of a new world war should be developed without waiting for atomic and hydrogen bombs to begin to fall, and they are guided by this conclusion in their work. This struggle should be waged now and intensified from day to day. The main thing is to curb the aggressors in time, to prevent war, to stop it breaking out. To fight for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, tirelessly to expose the policy of imperialism, vigilantly to watch the manoeuvring and machinations of the war incendiaries, to arouse the just anger of the peoples against those striving for war, to improve the organisation of all peace forces, constantly to step up mass action in defence of peace and to strengthen co-operation with all the states which are not interested in new wars.

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

The struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, is bound up with the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. "In conditions of peaceful coexistence," the Eighty-one Communist Parties stated, "favourable opportunities are created for the development of class struggle in the capitalist countries and of the national liberation movement of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries. In turn, the successes of the revolutionary class struggle and the national liberation struggle help to strengthen peaceful coexistence".

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

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

In its letter of June 14th, the C.P.C. central committee accuses the Communist Parties of extending peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems to the relations between the exploiters and the exploited, between the oppressed and the oppressing classes, between the working people and the imperialists. This is a truly monstrous fabrication and slander on the fraternal parties which lead the proletariat in its class battles against capitalism and which always support the revolutionary struggle and the just wars of liberation against imperialism.

The C.P.C. leaders have such weak arguments in the struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties that they have to resort to all sorts of ruses. They begin by ascribing to us absolutely groundless views of their own invention and then they accuse us and fight against us by exposing these views. Such precisely is the case with their absurd allegation that the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties renounce revolution and substitute peaceful coexistence for the class struggle. It is well known in any political study group in our country that when we speak of peaceful coexistence we mean the interstate relations of the socialist countries with the countries of capitalism. The principle of peaceful coexistence, naturally, can in no way be extended to the relations between the antagonistic classes inside the capitalist states; it is impermissible to extend it to the struggle of the working class for its class interests against the bourgeoisie and to the struggle of the oppressed peoples against the colonialists. The C.P.S.U. resolutely opposes peaceful coexistence in ideology. This is a simple truth which all who regard themselves as Marxists-Leninists should have mastered.

## III

There are serious differences between the C.P.C. and the C.P.S.U. and other Marxist-Leninist parties on the question of **the struggle against the consequences of the Stalin personality cult.**

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

The Soviet people and the world communist movement duly appreciated the courage, boldness and the truly Leninist firmness of principle demonstrated by our party and by its central committee headed by Nikita Khrushchov, in the struggle against the consequences of the cult of the individual.

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

The whole communist movement correctly understood and supported the struggle against the cult of the individual, which was alien to Marxism-Leninism, and against its harmful consequences. At one time that struggle was approved by the Chinese leaders too. They spoke about the tremendous international significance of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Opening the Eight Congress of the Communist Party of China in September 1956, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said:

"The Soviet comrades and the Soviet people acted in accordance with Lenin's instructions. They have achieved brilliant successes in a short space of time. The recent Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. also worked out many correct political principles and denounced the shortcomings in the work of the party. It can be said with confidence that in the future their work will result in exceptionally great developments."

In the political report of the C.P.C. central committee made at the congress by Comrade Liu Shao-chi, this appraisal was developed further:

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

Comrade Teng Ksiao-ping in his report on the changes in the party rules at the same Eighth Congress of the C.P.C. said:

"Leninism demands that decisions on all important questions should be

taken in the party by an appropriate collective and not individually. The Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. provided a convincing explanation of the most important significance of the unswerving observance of the principle of collective leadership and the struggle against the cult of the individual. This explanation had a tremendous influence not only on the C.P.S.U., but also on other Communist parties in all countries of the world."

In the well-known editorial in the newspaper *People's Daily*, "Once more about Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," (December 1956) Chinese comrades wrote:

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

And that is really the case.

Any unbiased person who compares these pronouncements of the Chinese leaders with what is said in the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th will become convinced that they have made a 180 degree turn in their evaluation of the Twentieth Congress of our party.

But are any vacillations and waverings permissible on such questions of principle? Of course, they are impermissible. Either the Chinese leaders had no differences with the C.P.S.U. central committee on these questions of principle before, or all these statements were false.

It is well-known that practice is the best standard for judging truth.

It is precisely practice that proves convincingly the wonderful results in the life of our country brought about by the implementation of the line of the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Congresses of the C.P.S.U. In the course of the ten years that have passed since our party made a sharp turn towards the restoration of the Leninist principles and standards in party life, Soviet society has achieved truly majestic results in developing the economy and promoting culture and science, in improving the people's well-being, in consolidating the defence potential and in the successes of foreign policy.

The atmosphere of fear, suspicion and uncertainty which poisoned the life of the people in the period of the cult of the individual has become a thing of the past. It is impossible to deny the fact that the Soviet people now live better and enjoy the benefits of socialism.

Ask the worker who has got a new flat (and there are millions of them!), ask the pensioner who is well provided for in his old age, the collective farmer who is now well-to-do, ask the thousands upon thousands of people who wrongly suffered from reprisals in the period of the cult of the individual and to whom freedom and good repute have been restored and you will realise what the victory of the Leninist course of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. means in practice for the Soviet people.

Ask the people whose fathers and mothers became the victims of reprisals in the period of the cult of the individual, what it means for them to obtain recognition that their fathers, mothers and brothers were honest people and

that they themselves are not outcasts in our society but worthy, fully fledged sons and daughters of the Soviet motherland.

Industry, agriculture, culture, science, art—no matter where we turn our eyes, everywhere we witness rapid progress. Our spaceships are furrowing the expanses of the universe and this too provides a brilliant confirmation of the correctness of the course along which our party is leading the Soviet people.

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

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

The Soviet people find it strange and fantastic that the Chinese comrades are trying to smear the Programme of the C.P.S.U., this magnificent plan for building a communist society.

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

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

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

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

In an attempt to justify the cult of the individual the Chinese leaders have filled their letter with arguments, which are far from Marxism, about a class

struggle in the U.S.S.R., about the allegedly erroneous theses of the C.P.S.U. Programme on the state of the whole people and the party of the whole people.

In this letter we do not intend to analyse all their arguments in detail. Anyone who reads the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th, will undoubtedly pay attention to the utter inadequacy and the lack of knowledge of the life of the Soviet people shown in the arguments contained in the letter.

We are being taught that hostile classes still remain in Soviet society and therefore, you see, the need remains for the dictatorship of the proletariat. What are these classes? One can see from the letter of the C.P.C. central committee that they are "bourgeois hangers-on, parasites, black-marketeers, idlers, hooligans and embezzlers of public property."

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

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

It is impossible to refute the fact that present Soviet society is made up of two main classes—the workers and the peasants, as well as the intelligentsia—and that not a single class of the Soviet society occupies a position permitting it to exploit other classes. Dictatorship is a class concept; over whom do the Chinese comrades propose to effect the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union? Over the collective-farm peasantry or over the people's intelligentsia? One cannot discount the fact that in socialist society the class of workers and the class of peasants have undergone considerable changes and the differences and distinctions between them are disappearing more and more.

After the complete and final victory of socialism, the working class exercises its guiding role but no longer through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working class still remains the leading class in society in the conditions of all-out construction of communism. Its leading role is determined by its economic position, by the fact that it is directly connected with the highest form of socialist ownership, and by the fact that it is more steered by decades of class struggle and revolutionary experience.

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

There are a number of pronouncements of Lenin which stress with absolute clarity that the dictatorship of the proletariat is needed precisely to overcome the resistance of the exploiting classes, to organise socialist construction, to

ensure the victory of socialism—the first phase of communism. It is clear from this that the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat disappears after the victory of socialism, when only working people, friendly classes, the nature of which has absolutely changed, remain in society, and there is no longer anyone to suppress.

If one is to extract the real content of all this mass of pseudo-theoretical talk contained in the letter of the C.P.C. central committee on these questions, it boils down to the following: The Chinese comrades come out against the line of the C.P.S.U. aimed at developing socialist democracy, which was proclaimed with such force in the decisions of the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second Congresses of our party and in the C.P.S.U. Programme. It is not fortuitous that nowhere in their long letter have they found a place for even a mention of the development of democracy in the conditions of socialism, in the conditions of the construction of communism.

It is difficult to judge in full measure the motives by which the Chinese comrades are guided in upholding the cult of the individual. Actually for the first time in the history of the international communist movement we encounter an open exaltation of the cult of the individual. It must be said that even during the period when the cult of the individual flourished in our country, Stalin himself was forced, at least in words, to refuse to have anything to do with this petty-bourgeois theory and said that it stemmed from the Social-Revolutionaries.

The attempts to use Marx and Lenin to defend the ideology of the personality cult, can evoke nothing but surprise. Do the Chinese comrades really know nothing about the fact that Lenin as long ago as the period of the birth of our party, conducted a tremendous struggle against the narodniks' theories about heroes and the mob, that genuine collective methods of leadership in the central committee of our party and the Soviet state were implemented under Lenin, that Lenin was extraordinarily modest and mercilessly lashed the slightest manifestations of toadying and servility towards himself personally.

Of course, the struggle against the cult of the individual was never regarded by our party or the other Marxist-Leninist parties as the negation of the authority of party and government leaders. The C.P.S.U. has stressed time and again—including at the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses—that the party cherishes the authority of its leadership, that while debunking the cult of the individual and fighting against its consequences, the party has a high regard for the leaders who really express the interests of the people and give all their strength to the struggle for the victory of communism and for this reason enjoy well-deserved prestige.

#### IV

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

As depicted by the Chinese comrades, the differences on this question appear as follows: one side—they themselves—stands for a world revolution, while the other side—the C.P.S.U., the Marxist-Leninist parties—has forgotten the revolution, even "fears" it and, instead of revolutionary struggle, displays

concern for things "unworthy" of a genuine revolutionary, such as peace, the economic development of the socialist countries and the improvement of the living standards of their peoples, and the struggle for the democratic rights and vital interests of the working people of the capitalist countries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The solution of all other tasks of the revolutionary movement depends to a tremendous extent on the consolidation of the world socialist system. This

is why the Communist and Workers' Parties have pledged themselves "tirelessly to strengthen the great socialist community of peoples whose international role and influence on the course of world development is growing from year to year." Our Party regards the fulfilment of this overriding task as its supreme international duty.

Lenin taught that "We exert our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy. . . . In this field the struggle is transferred on a world-wide scale. If we accomplish this task, we shall win on an international scale, for certain and forever." (*Collective works, Vol. 32, page 413. Russian edition.*)

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

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

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

Moreover, what situation is more propitious to the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries—the situation of peace and peaceful coexistence, or a situation of constant international tension and the cold war?

There is no doubt as to the answer to this question. Who does not know that the ruling circles of the imperialist states exploit the situation of the cold war in order to whip up chauvinism, war hysteria, unbridled anticommunism, to put into power the most rabid reactionaries and profascists, to abolish democracy and to do away with political parties, trade unions and other mass organisations of the working class?

The struggle of the communists for peace greatly strengthens their ties with the masses, their prestige and influence and, consequently, helps to build up what is called the political army of the revolution.

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

It is hard to believe that the Chinese comrades, who are people of experience, who have themselves accomplished a revolution, do not understand the main thing—that the world revolution today develops through the consolidation of the world system of socialism and through the revolutionary



class struggle of the workers in the capitalist countries, through the struggle for national liberation, the strengthening of the political and economic independence of the recently liberated countries of Asia and Africa, through the struggle for peace, against the wars of aggression and through the anti-monopoly struggle of the masses, and by many other ways, which should not be set against each other, but united and directed towards the same goal—the overthrow of the rule of imperialism.

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

Every well-versed Marxist-Leninist realises that to advance the slogan of an armed uprising, when there is no revolutionary situation in the country, means condemning the working class to defeat. It is common knowledge how very serious was Lenin’s approach to this question, with what political perspicacity and knowledge of the concrete situation he approached the choice of the time for revolutionary action. On the very eve of the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out that it would be too early to start on October 24th, and it would be too late on October 26th—everything might be lost—and, consequently, power must definitely be taken on October 25th. Who determines the intensity of class contradictions, the existence of a revolutionary situation and chooses the moment for the uprising? This can be done only by the working class of each given country, by its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist party.

The history of the international working-class movement shows that a party is bad, if, while calling itself a working class party, it deals only with economic questions, does not educate the working class in a revolutionary spirit and does not prepare it for political struggle, for the seizure of power. In such a case it inevitably slips to the positions of reformism.

But equally bad is a party which sets the tasks of political struggle in isolation from the efforts to improve the economic standards of the working class, the peasantry and all the working people. Such a party inevitably becomes divorced from the masses. Only through the correct use of all forms of class struggle, and their skilful combination, can a party become a really revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist party, the leader of the masses, only in that case can it successfully lead the working class in the storming of capitalism and the achievement of power.

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

Having come out against everything the Communist Parties of the developed

capitalist countries are doing, the Chinese comrades have not displayed either an elementary sense of solidarity with the communists fighting against capitalism in the frontline of the class struggle, or an understanding of the concrete conditions in those countries and the specific paths along which the revolutionary movement of the working class is proceeding there. Actually “for the sake of the revolution”, they reject precisely the ways leading to revolution and try to impose a course which would isolate the Communist Parties from the masses, and lead to the working class losing its allies in the struggle against monopoly domination, against capitalism.

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

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

In its letter of March 30th, 1963, the C.P.S.U. central committee has again outlined its position on this subject:

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

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

We have repeatedly explained our point of view and there is no need to outline it in greater detail here.

And what is the position of the Chinese comrades on this question? It keynotes all their statements and the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th.

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

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

The international revolutionary working-class movement, represented today by the world system of socialism, the Communist Parties of the

capitalist countries, and the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America—these are the great forces of our epoch. The correct relationship between them constitutes one of the main prerequisites for victory over imperialism.

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

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

But this would constitute a tremendous danger to the national liberation movement itself.

Indeed, could the numerous peoples of Asia have been victorious, despite all their heroism and selflessness, if the October Revolution and then the formation of the world system of socialism, had not shaken imperialism to its very foundations, if they had not undermined the forces of the colonialists?

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

Marxists-Leninists always stress the epoch-making significance of the national liberation movement and its great future, but they regard as one of the main prerequisites for its further victories, the solid alliance and co-operation with the countries of the world system of socialism as the main force in the struggle against imperialism, and a firm alliance with the working class movement in the capitalist countries. This position was laid down in the Statement of 1960. It is based on Lenin’s idea of working class leadership (hegemony) as a prerequisite for victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. Only given such hegemony can this movement assume in the last analysis a truly socialist character, culminating in the transition to the road of socialist revolution.

This idea of Lenin’s was tested by the experience of the October Revolution, and by the experience of other countries, and it does not arouse doubts in anybody’s mind. However, the Chinese comrades, as has been noted, wish to “amend” Lenin and prove that it is not the working-class, but the petty bourgeoisie or the national bourgeoisie, or even “certain patriotically minded kings, princes and aristocrats” who must be the leaders of the world struggle against imperialism. And after this the leadership of the Communist Party of China teaches the world communist movement that the proletarian, class approach to the problems in hand must never, in any circumstances be abandoned!

The guarantee of the future victories, both of the international working-class and the national liberation movement lies in their firm alliance and co-

operation, in their joint struggle against imperialism, dictated by their common interests—a struggle in which the working-class earns by its selflessness, by its devoted service in the interests of all peoples, recognition of its leading role and convinces its allies that its leadership is a reliable guarantee both of its own victory and of the victory of its allies.

Our Leninist party regards the national liberation movement as part and parcel of the world revolutionary process, as a mighty force coming out against imperialism. The great call of the founders of scientific communism Marx and Engels “Workers of all countries, unite!” has become the battle standard of the international working class. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who carried forward the cause of Marx and Engels, noted particularly in the new historical conditions, which emerged after the victory of the Great October Revolution, the inseparable bonds between the socialist revolution and the national liberation movement.

The slogan “Workers of all countries, unite!” has been and remains the main slogan in the struggle for the victory of the world revolution. In the new conditions the content of this slogan has expanded. It is common knowledge that Lenin approved the slogan: “Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!” This slogan stresses the leading role of the proletariat and the increased significance of the national liberation movement. In all its activities our party strictly abides by this Marxist-Leninist internationalist principle.

The question arises: What is the explanation for the incorrect propositions of the C.P.C. leadership on the basic problems of our time? It is either the complete divorcement of the Chinese comrades from actual reality, their dogmatic, bookish approach to problems of war, peace and revolution and their lack of understanding of the concrete conditions of the present epoch, or the fact that behind the rumpus about “world revolution,” raised by the Chinese comrades, there are other goals, which have nothing in common with revolution.

All this shows the erroneous character, the disastrous nature of the course which the C.P.C. leadership is trying to impose on the world communist movement. What the Chinese leaders propose under the guise of a “general line” is nothing but an enumeration of the most general tasks of the working class, made without due consideration for time or the concrete correlation of class forces, without due consideration for the special features of the present stage of history.

The Chinese comrades do not notice, or do not wish to notice, how the tasks of our movement are changing in the conditions of the present epoch. By reducing the general line to general tasks, which are valid for all stages of transition from capitalism to socialism, they are depriving it of its concreteness, purposefulness and genuine effectiveness.

In working out their present course, the fraternal parties have thoroughly analysed the distribution of class forces both in individual countries, and on a world scale, and the special features of the development of the two opposing systems and of the development of the national liberation movement at the present stage.

A thorough analysis of the changes taking place in the world situation has made it possible for the fraternal parties of the whole world to draw up a Marxist-Leninist definition of the epoch: “Our epoch, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism, started by the Great October

**Socialist Revolution, is the epoch of struggle between two opposing social systems, the epoch of socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions, the epoch of the collapse of imperialism, the abolition of the colonial system, the epoch when ever more peoples embark upon the road of socialism, the epoch of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale."**

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

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

- The nature and substance of the world revolutionary process in the present epoch is determined by the merging into one stream of the struggle against imperialism, waged by the peoples who are building socialism and communism, the revolutionary movement of the working class in the capitalist countries, the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples 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 creation—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 (the extreme growth of the aggressiveness of imperialism, the emergence of weapons of tremendous destructive power, etc.) the central place among all tasks facing the anti-imperialist forces in the present epoch, is held by the struggle to prevent a thermonuclear war. The primary task of the Communist Parties is to rally all the peace-loving forces to the defence of peace, to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe;

- The socialist revolution takes place as a result of the internal development of class struggle in each country, and its forms and ways are determined by the concrete conditions of each given country. The general law is the revolutionary overthrow of the power of capital and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one or another form. It is the task of the working class and the Communist Parties to make the maximum use of the opportunities now available for a peaceful road of the socialist revolution, not involving civil war, and at the same time to be 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 out to the end the tasks of the anti-imperialist democratic revolution, in the development and consolidation of the national front based on the alliance with the peasantry and the patriotically-minded national bourgeoisie, in the preparation of conditions for setting up a state of national democracy and the transition to the non-capitalist road of development;

- Relations of co-operation and mutual assistance between the socialist movement of class struggle in each country, and its forms and ways are determined countries, the cohesion and unity of the international communist and working class movement, the loyalty to the positions and evaluations which have been worked out jointly, to the Leninist principles on the life of the parties and the relations between them, constitute the necessary conditions for the successful fulfilment of the historic tasks facing the communists.

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

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

## V

The erroneous views of the C.P.C. leaders on the paramount political and theoretical questions of our time are inseparably linked with their practical activities aimed at undermining the unity of the world socialist camp and the international communist movement.

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

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

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

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

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

In an effort to justify its actions in the eyes of the people, the C.P.C. leadership recently advanced a theory of "reliance on one's own forces". Generally speaking, building socialism in each country, relying primarily on the efforts of its own people with the best use of the internal resources of the country, is the correct way of laying the material and technical basis of socialism. The construction of socialism in each country is primarily the concern of the people of that country, of its working class and the Communist Party.

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

reserves for successful economic development. Therefore the statement of the C.P.C. central committee about the construction of socialism mainly by its own forces, in its direct meaning would give rise to no objections.

However, as is shown by the full text of the letter of the C.P.C. central committee and the numerous statements in the Chinese press, this thesis is actually given an interpretation with which it is impossible to agree.

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

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

Parallel with the line of curtailment of economic contacts, the C.P.C. leadership took a number of measures aimed at worsening relations with the Soviet Union.

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

The C.P.C. leadership is organising and supporting various anti-party groups of dissenters who are coming out against the Communist Parties in the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India. For instance, in Belgium the C.P.C. is rendering support to the group of Gripp which was expelled from the Party at its last congress. In the United States support is being given to the subversive activities of the left opportunist "Hammer and Steel" group which has set itself the main task of fighting against the Communist Party of the United States. In Brazil Chinese comrades support factional groups expelled from the Communist Parties (as for instance, the Amazonas-Grabois group).

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

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

Comrades of the C.P.C. are making particular efforts to conduct subversive activities in the Communist and Workers' Parties in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Glorifying the dissenters who have found themselves outside the ranks of the communist movement, the Chinese leaders reprint in their newspapers and magazines slanderous articles from the publications of these renegade

groups, directed against the policy of the C.P.S.U. and against the line of the entire world communist movement.

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

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

The Chinese leaders make sharp attacks on the fraternal Communist Parties and their leaders, who do not want to retreat from the general line of the international communist movement. They have published and circulated in many languages, articles discrediting the activity of the Communist Party of the United States, the French, Italian and Indian Communist Parties. To what sort of abusive expressions do the authors of these articles not resort against prominent leaders of fraternal parties! Among them are "double-dealing" and "right-wing opportunism", "revisionism", "incompatibility with standards of communist morality", "social-democratic degeneration" and "faint-heartedness", "irresponsibility" and "parrotting", "haughtiness and contempt for the revolutionary peoples of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

The Chinese leaders accuse the Communist Parties of the United States and Western Europe of acting "at one with the most adventurist American imperialists". The leadership of the Communist Party of India is described in no other way than as a "clique". Against the leaders of the Communist Parties of France, Italy, India, and the United States is hurled the monstrous accusation of "solicitude for the destinies of imperialism and all reactionaries". And in its letter of June 14th the C.P.C. leadership sinks to insinuations that the C.P.S.U., too, "comes out in the role of a helper of imperialism". No one, except Trotskyists, has yet dared, in view of the obvious absurdity of this, to level such slanderous accusations against the great party of Lenin!

Is it any wonder that imperialist propaganda rejoices at such actions of the Chinese comrades? It is no accident that the bourgeois press time and again shouts about a "crisis" in the international communist movement and urges the imperialist governments to utilise in their own interests the differences caused by the position of the C.P.C. central committee.

The representatives of the C.P.C. left the editorial board of the magazine *World Marxist Review*,—the collective theoretical and information organ of the Communist and Workers' Parties and stopped publication of this magazine in the Chinese language, striving in this way to deprive the Chinese communists of an objective source of information about the activities of the international communist movement.

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

The letter of the C.P.C. central committee says that in relations with the fraternal Communist Parties it is "impermissible for a party to place itself

above the other fraternal parties, it is impermissible to interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties. . . ." This is quite a good statement. But it is precisely the Chinese comrades who themselves resort to such impermissible actions.

Flouting the interests of the world communist movement, they act contrary to the standards and principles outlined in the Declaration and Statement and try to subordinate other fraternal parties to their influence and control.

A vivid example of the special line of the C.P.C. leadership in the socialist camp and the international communist movement, is its position on the Albanian question. As is known, in the second half of 1960 the Albanian leaders came out openly with a left-opportunist platform on the main questions of our time, and began to pursue a policy hostile to the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal parties. The Albanian leadership started an anti-Soviet campaign in their country which led to a rupture of political, economic and cultural ties with the Soviet Union.

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

In their attacks on the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, leaders of the C.P.C. assign a special place to the Yugoslav question. They try to present matters as if the difficulties in the communist movement are being caused by an improvement in the relations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries with Yugoslavia. Contrary to the facts they stubbornly contend that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country.

As is well-known, in 1955 the C.P.S.U. together with the other fraternal parties, took the initiative in normalising relations with Yugoslavia so as to end the prolonged conflict, the main guilt for which lies with Stalin. At that time the leaders of the C.P.C. had no doubts as to the nature of the socialist system in Yugoslavia. Thus the newspaper *People's Daily* noted that "Yugoslavia has already achieved notable successes in the construction of socialism."

An objective analysis of the social and economic processes in Yugoslavia shows that positions of socialism have been consolidated there in subsequent years. Whereas in 1958 the socialist sector in industry amounted to 100 per cent, in agriculture to 6 per cent, and in trade to 97 per cent, now the socialist sector in industry amounts to 100 per cent, in agriculture to 15 per cent, and in trade to 100 per cent. A *rapprochement* between Yugoslavia's position and the position of the Soviet Union and other socialist states on foreign policy questions has taken place in the period following the normalisation of relations.

Why, then, have the Chinese leaders so drastically changed their position on the Yugoslav question? It is hard to find an explanation other than that they saw in this an advantageous pretext, in their opinion, to discredit the policy of the C.P.S.U. and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The Soviet communists know that differences on a number of important ideological questions remain between the C.P.S.U. and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. We have openly stated this and continue to state this to the Yugoslav leaders. But it would be wrong to "excommunicate" Yugoslavia from socialism on these grounds, to cut her off from the socialist coun-

tries and to push her into the camp of imperialism, as the C.P.C. leaders are doing. That is precisely what the imperialists want.

At the present time there are fourteen socialist countries in the world. We are profoundly convinced that in the near future the number will be considerably greater. The range of questions encountered by the fraternal parties which stand at the helm of state is increasing and besides this, each of the fraternal parties is working in different conditions.

It is not surprising therefore that under these circumstances the fraternal parties may develop different approaches to the solution of this or that question. How should Marxist-Leninists act in this case? Should they declare that this or that socialist country, whose leaders do not agree with them, is no longer a socialist country? That would be really arbitrary behaviour. Such a method has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

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

We see with regret how the leaders of the C.P.C. are undermining the traditional Soviet-Chinese friendship and weakening the unity of the socialist countries.

The C.P.S.U. stands, and will continue to stand, for the unity and cohesion of the socialist community, of the entire world communist movement.

## VI

Let us draw some conclusions:

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

All this shows that the Statement of 1960 correctly set the general line of the world communist movement. The task now is to work in accordance with this general line, to develop and specify it in accordance with the conditions in which each individual Communist Party works. Therefore, all attempts to impose some new general line on the world communist and working-class movement, as is done in the letter of the C.P.C. central committee of June 14th, are bankrupt and harmful. To accept this "general line" would mean to depart from the Statement of 1960 and to agree to programmatic theses contrary to the Statement which was adopted by eighty-one parties. Our party will not do this.

Throughout the whole of its history, our glorious Leninist party waged an implacable struggle against right-wing and left-wing opportunism, Trot-

skism and revisionism, dogmatism and sectarianism, nationalism and chauvinism, in all their manifestations both within the country and in the international arena. Our party has been steeled and strengthened in this struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism and does not fear any attacks by present-day splitters and opportunists from whatever quarter.

Life shows that the C.P.S.U., having become a political organisation of the whole people, has consolidated its ties with the masses, has become even more powerful, 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 section. 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 building a new world.

Now, when socialism has won finally and completely in our country, when we are building, stone by stone, the beautiful edifice of communism, our party, the entire Soviet people, are even more convinced that the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism will triumph throughout the world.

Our confidence is shared by the peoples of the socialist countries, by all the working people of the world. They highly appreciate the great contribution made by the Soviet Union to the common cause of the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom, independence and socialism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has stood and continues to stand for close friendship with the Communist Party of China. There are serious differences between us and the leaders of the C.P.C., but we believe that the relations between the two parties, between our two peoples, should be built on the basis of the fact that we have the same aim, the building of a new communist society and that we have the same enemy—imperialism. United the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, by their joint efforts can do much for the triumph of communism. Our friends and our enemies are both well aware of that.

A meeting of the delegations of the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C. is being held in Moscow at the present time. Unfortunately, the representatives of the C.P.C. at the meeting are continuing to aggravate the situation. Despite this, the delegation of the C.P.S.U. is displaying the utmost patience and restraint, working for a successful outcome of the negotiations. The near future will show whether the Chinese comrades agree to build our relations on the basis of what unites us, and not what divides us, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Our enemies build their calculations on a deepening of the contradictions between the C.P.C. and the C.P.S.U. They are now looking for anything from which they might profit. The American *Daily News* wrote recently: "Let us set Red Russia and Red China against each other so that they tear each other to pieces."\* We, Communists, should never forget these insidious plans of the imperialists.

Mindful of its responsibility to the international communist movement and to the peoples of the world, our party urges the Chinese comrades to take the road of resolving the differences and strengthening the genuine unity of

\*Retranslated from Russian

our parties on the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Together with all the fraternal parties, our Leninist party has fought and fights for the unity of the working-class and all the working people, in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

The central committee of the C.P.S.U. declares with the utmost responsibility to the party and the entire Soviet people that we have done and will continue to 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 to ensure the victory of the great ideas of communism throughout the world.

All the working people of the Soviet Union will rally even closer around their own Communist Party and its Leninist central committee and will devote all their energy to realising the magnificent programme for building communism.

#### CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION.

## ***Recent Soviet Booklets***

**MARXISM-LENINISM IS OUR BANNER, OUR FIGHTING WEAPON.** Full text of the speech of N. S. Khrushchov to the plenary meeting of the central committee of the C.P.S.U., held in Moscow on June 18-21, 1963, to discuss "Present Tasks of the Party's Ideological Work." 6d.

**PRESENT TASKS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL WORK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION.** Speech made by Leonid Ilyichov at the plenary meeting of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. on June 18th, 1963. Also the resolution endorsed by the meeting. 6d.

**LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA.** Full text of the letter of March 30th, 1963, suggesting a high-level meeting of the two parties. 6d.

**THE U.S.S.R. AND CUBA.** The speeches of Nikita Khrushchov and Fidel Castro during the visit of the Cuban delegation to the Soviet Union in April/May 1963, together with the Soviet-Cuban joint communique and Fidel Castro's speech on Havana Radio after his return home. 6d.

**THE GREAT STRENGTH OF SOVIET LITERATURE AND ART.** Full text of N. S. Khrushchov's speech at the meeting of party and government leaders with writers and artists, in the Kremlin on March 8th, 1963. 6d.

**HIGHER EDUCATION in the U.S.S.R. by Prof. V. P. Elyutin, D.Sc.,** Minister of Higher and Specialised Education in the U.S.S.R. The structure of higher education in the U.S.S.R., how cadres are trained for all branches of the economy, science and culture, and the problems being tackled in bringing education closer to life. 6d.

**TWO UNIVERSITIES.** The life of the students at the Lumumba Friendship and Moscow State Universities, at which about 4,000 young people from abroad are studying. 1/-

**Annual subscription:** Soviet booklets are published at the rate of about one or two each month, at prices varying from 6d. to 2s. An annual subscription of 10s. will bring you a copy of each booklet as soon as it is published.

*From your bookshop or from*

**SOVIET BOOKLETS**

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