

# MAO AND THE AMERICANS

**WHAT** Mao Tse-tung said to a group of leaders of some Latin-American Communist and Workers' Parties five years ago was told by one of them in an article in Izvestia yesterday.

The article, by Eduard Mora Valverde, one of the leaders of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, was reprinted from the magazine, Problems of Peace and Socialism.

According to Mora Valverde, Mao Tse-tung began the talk by referring to the relations between the U.S. and the People's Republic of China, and said:

"We want no reconciliation with the U.S. The United States must obey us. Otherwise we do not want to enter into negotiations with it.

"If the U.S. does not restore Taiwan (Formosa) to us for another 100 years, it is of no importance. If the U.S. does not recognise us, we also do not want to recognise it."

Chairman Mao also said: "We have learnt much from Foster Dulles. Dulles is our teacher. His

policy of brinkmanship is directed precisely against us.

"But we have also learnt the policy of brinkmanship and we are using it in the conflict over Quemoy Island. . . .

"I believe that no one of you should fear international tension. As to me, I like international tension.

"The United States will understand that the tension of its own making is not favourable for the

U.S., because it may make peace champions and working people throughout the world think, and will bring a greater number of people to the Communist Parties."

Mao Tse-tung devoted most of his talk to the presentation of a thesis, which he developed later, Mora Valverde said. The Chinese leader contended that Marxism today should deal only with the problems of Asia, Africa and Latin America.



**Scanned / Transcribed by**  
**The Socialist Truth In Cyprus**  
**Web: <http://www.KibristaSosyalistGercek.net>**  
**<http://www.kibristasosyalistgercek.net/intro.htm>**  
**E-mail: [info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net](mailto:info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net)**



# Something strange afoot in Friendship Street

Evening Standard Reporter

MOSCOW, Thursday.—

Something strange is afoot in the Chinese Embassy on Moscow's sadly misnamed Friendship Street.

Baggage is piling up in the hall say Western experts here who only a week ago scoffed at reports of a final break and said they could not be taken seriously.

And although the Embassy building—erected in the balmy days of “inviolable friendship” between the two Communist giants—is by far the largest in Moscow only 17 names appear on its diplomatic list.

Including cooks, drivers

security guards and telecommunications engineers perhaps 60 people are now living in a compound built to accommodate 400 or 500.

A Western diplomat whose government sent him here specifically to study relations between Russia and China said to me: “There is no smoke without fire. And there seems to be a lot of smoke at that Embassy at the moment. The probable explanation is that the Chinese are beginning a gradual withdrawal from the Soviet Union.”

Another diplomat—here for the same purpose—added: “Something big seems to be happening.”

# HOW TO AVERT A SPLIT

**H**OW to avert a split in the world Communist movement was outlined in an article in the Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda yesterday.

The threat of a split is a reality with which the world Communist movement must reckon, it said.

"From the point of view of Marxist-Leninists, the emergence of temporary differences between Parties is not some extraordinary event.

"The point is to strive by joint effort to overcome these differences in the interests of the common cause," said the article, the final instalment of Pravda's reprint of an article from the magazine Party Life.

To avert the threat of a split, says the article, "it is necessary for the Chinese leaders to revert to the common platform of the Communist movement."

Another international meeting of Communists could be a milestone in the struggle for unity and most Communist Parties were going on record for its early convocation.

Marxist-Leninists do not want a split, "but unity cannot be obtained through concessions on matters of principle, nor does it come by itself."



# 'Capitalist danger' in the USSR

PEKING Monday.

THE Soviet Union faced the "unprecedented danger of capitalist restoration," the Chinese Communist Party's papers today alleged in the bitterest-yet anti-Khrushchov article.

The article was published jointly in the People's Daily, the Chinese Communist Party's main paper, and in Red Flag, its theoretical journal.

It alleged that Mr. Khrushchov and other Soviet leaders were the political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie and particularly of its privileged stratum."

It declared that the "revisionist Khrushchov clique" had "usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and State."

## "DISCONTENT"

It portrayed the Soviet Union as "seething with discontent" at Mr. Khrushchov's alleged efforts to restore capitalism, and claimed that the Soviet people, including party members, were "using various means to resist and oppose the Khrushchov clique's revisionist line."

The article, entitled, "On Khrushchov's phoney Communism and its historical lessons for the world," was ninth in the series that began last September in reply to a Soviet open letter attacking Chinese policies published exactly a year ago today.

"Ever since Khrushchov seized the leadership of the Soviet Party and State he has pushed through a whole series of revisionist policies which have greatly hastened the growth of the forces of capitalism and again sharpened the class struggle," today's article said.—  
reuter.



## EDITORIAL

# Echoing the Tories

SOVIET peace policy has blown sky-high the Tory pretence that we must have huge nuclear armaments to "defend ourselves against the Russians."

So, to justify the arms programme Sir Alec Douglas-Home has now come up with a crude new version of the old anti-Communist rubbish.

It is now the Chinese — who haven't got any nuclear weapons—who are presented as the people likely to start a nuclear war.

This comes from a man who wants to keep the British bombs and who supports the United States, which has a colossal stockpile of nuclear weapons.

Then Home has the effrontery to say that if China started a nuclear war the interests of the West and the Soviet Union would coincide.

But the real position is that the threat of nuclear war comes from the Goldwaters of the West. And if they launch such a war the Soviet Union and China would stand together, as the leaders of both countries have repeatedly proclaimed.

## Gone mad

There are differences in the Socialist camp, but the Tories have gone mad if they think that the common aim of defending Socialism and defeating imperialism has therefore been abandoned.

Of course Sir Alec knows this is not so. He is just trying to take advantage of the differences for his own reactionary ends.

The tragedy is that he is not being challenged effectively by the Opposition. Indeed, the two front benches agreed on question after question in the foreign affairs debate.

Sir Alec started his speech yesterday by complimenting Mr. Healey and detailing the points of agreement.

The Daily Telegraph commented that the distance between Butler and Labour's Shadow Foreign Secretary on Tuesday "seemed no further than an echo can travel."

The Times said that "as he followed Mr. Butler round the world, Mr. Gordon Walker found relatively few points of disagreement."

## Muted voice

Is not all this the greatest possible condemnation that there could be of the policy of the Labour front bench?

The Tories are pursuing a viciously reactionary policy in South Arabia, Guiana, Malaysia and Cyprus, supporting American aggression in Laos and Vietnam, selling arms to Spain and backing Verwoerd.

Yet there is no real Opposition attack on them. Labour leaders find more to agree with than disagree with in Government policy.

For months now the voice of the Left has been muted. Right Wing pleas "not to rock the boat" on the eve of an election have had their effect.

But to remain silent while policies completely contrary to Socialist principles and to the interests of the Labour movement and the British people are pursued would be a betrayal.

Every Socialist, everyone who wants peace, and everyone who has Labour's future at heart should speak up against bi-partisanship in foreign policy, insisting on a vigorous fight against imperialism and for an end to the arms race.



# WORLD CONFERENCE-VIEW OF BRITISH COMMUNISTS

Daily Worker Reporter

world's Communist Parties cannot agree  
sent on a date for a world conference, they  
to arrive at agreement on the composi-  
convening of a preparatory committee.

This point is made by the  
Executive Committee of the  
British Communist Party in a  
statement today.

The progress of the work of  
such a committee could then  
determine when the world confer-  
ence could be held, says the  
statement.

But the preparatory committee  
must not be confined to a small  
group of Communist Parties, as  
suggested by the Communist  
Party of China.

## Restoring unity

The aim of any world confer-  
ence, say the British Communists,  
"should be to restore the unity of  
our movement."

"There can be no question of  
'excommunication'; but its aim  
also should be to end the present  
position and impermissible prac-  
tices.

"For this adequate preparation  
is necessary. But we reject the  
Communist Party of China's posi-  
tion of endless postponement and  
a further five years of public  
wrangle."

Summarising recent develop-  
ments in the international Com-  
munist movement, the statement  
says that in its letter to the Com-  
munist Party of the Soviet Union  
dated May 7 the Communist Party  
of China has now "adopted a posi-  
tion which is equivalent to refus-  
ing serious bilateral talks with the  
C.P.S.U., and is in opposition to  
a world conference of the Com-  
munist Parties."

## 'Greatest harm'

While there are understandable  
differences of opinion regarding  
the timing of any world confer-  
ence among the Communist  
Parties which support the 1960  
Moscow Statement of the Parties  
these have nothing in common  
with the attitude of the Com-  
munist Party of China, says the  
British statement.

"The approach of the Commun-  
ist Party of China simply means  
the indefinite postponement of any  
real efforts and steps to restore  
the unity of our movement and  
can only cause the greatest harm"  
it adds.

"We will maintain our political  
position and, as and when neces-  
sary, explain it in public state-  
ments and articles so long as the  
present public polemic continues,"  
says the statement, "while re-  
iterating that the best step to  
restore the unity of the world  
Communist movement would be  
an agreement to end the public  
polemic.

"We hope that the Communist  
Party of China will yet respond  
in a positive fashion to the appeal  
of the Communist Party of the  
Soviet Union for bilateral talks."