Workers of all lands, unite!

FILE COPY

INFORMATION BULLETIN

Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Articles and Speeches

4

PEACE AND SOCIALISM
PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE 1964

CONTENTS:

N. S. Khrushchov's Replies to Questions Put by The Ghanaian Times, Alger Républicain, Le Peuple and Botataung

For a New Advance and for the Unity of the International Communist Movement. Statement by the Central Committee, Italian Communist Party

Defend General Line of World Communist Movement against Dogmatic Onslaught. Resolution Adopted by National Council of Communist Party of India

Resolution of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Germany

N. S. Khrushchov's Replies to Questions Put by The Ghanaian Times, Alger Républicain, Le Peuple and Botataung

The Editors of the newspapers Ghanaian Times (Ghana), Alger Républicain and Le Peuple (Algeria), and Botataung (Burma) requested N. S. Khrushchov to answer a number of questions concerning the national-liberation movement in the present period. Below are the questions and N. S. Khrushchov's answers.

1. *QUESTION.* How do you appraise the results of the national-liberation movement of the peoples against imperialism?

ANSWER. The oppressed peoples have performed a great exploit, they have smashed the colonial system of imperialism. This is the main result of the national-liberation movement. Empires that took the colonialists centuries to build up have been destroyed in less than two decades. Until quite recently it seemed to some people that these empires were unassailable bastions. One remembers Churchill's arrogant words during the Second World War when he said he had not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Today there is nothing left of that empire but, as the saying goes, odds and ends.

The abolition of the colonial regimes is now entering its final phase. Over fifty countries have achieved political independence and national statehood. This is a truly historic achievement of the masses who have fought courageously and selflessly.

It would be a gross mistake to underestimate the significance of this victory, to deny that the system of colonial slavery has collapsed and to assert that the winning of political independence is a mere formality. Such assertions would be an insult to the fighters for liberty and would be tantamount to saying that the peoples fighting against colonialism have, in fact, achieved nothing.

The winning of political independence by the peoples is a great revolutionary act of world significance. Imperialism has been deprived of direct rule over extensive areas of our planet and over hundreds and hundreds of millions of people. A huge obstacle barring the path of the

---

Pravda, December 22, 1963.

enslaved peoples to liberty and social progress has been removed. A period of heroic battles fought by those peoples is coming to an end and a new stage in their struggle for emancipation is opening. These peoples formerly fought to destroy the colonial regime and expell the colonial troops and governors; today they are pulling up the roots of colonialism, the economic and political positions of the foreign monopolies, they are struggling for independent, democratic development and social progress.

The achievement of state independence, of course, does not mean complete liberation. The imperialists are attempting, wherever they can, to turn the sovereignty of the young national states into a fiction. But today the peoples are capable of thwarting the plans of the imperialists, of completely casting off the chains of imperialist oppression and exploitation and of using the political independence they have won as a powerful lever in the struggle for economic liberation, for deliverance from many other chains and fetters of imperialism.

To ensure the full independence of the young national states it is essential that their anti-imperialist struggle should not weaken but should develop, that their solidarity with the world revolutionary forces should be strengthened. The events in the Congo, Algeria and other countries have shown that the peoples of the former colonies are by no means guaranteed against the intrigues of imperialism.

Many of the countries that have won political independence are pursuing an independent, anti-imperialist policy. Can one close one's eyes to the fact that in many of the newly-free countries a national regeneration is taking place, the basis of a national economy is being built and culture is developing? How can one fail to see that in the course of the struggle for independence, the masses have been through tremendous political schooling, that their national, anti-imperialist counsciousness has become stronger and that they are more determined to follow the path of democracy and social progress?

One should see how conditions have changed in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America under the present world alignment of forces. It is possible for any country, relying on the support of the socialist countries, on the world working-class movement and on all freedom-loving peoples, to stand up successfully to the onslaught of the imperialists, strengthen its independence, and determine its own fate in its own way.

2. *QUESTION.* What, in your opinion, were the circumstances that determined the collapse of colonialism?

ANSWER. In the first place I should like to emphasize again that the collapse of the colonial system is the result of the heroic struggle of the oppressed peoples themselves. The imperialists are spreading the myth that they, of their own free will, granted the enslaved countries independence out of sheer philanthropy. That is a deception. The colonialists did not quit a single country of their own free will.

Political independence has been won by struggle, and by struggle alone.

The forces of world socialism exerted a decisive influence on the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries for their independence. The Great October Socialist Revolution undermined the world supremacy of imperialism, and the real possibility of driving out the colonialists opened up before the peoples. The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War against the Hitler coalition, the rout of the striking force of world imperialist reaction, and the general upsurge of the world revolutionary liberation movement that began as a result of that victory created favourable conditions for revolution in China and a number of other Asian countries, and for the successful struggle of the peoples for the abolition of the colonial regime.

The formation of the world system of socialist states brought about a radical change in the balance of strength in the world that was to the disadvantage of imperialism. This, to a very great extent, accelerated the development of the national-liberation movement. The flames of the national-liberation revolution swept over Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries gave real support to the fighting peoples and the young national states. This is the lesson taught by the Suez crisis, the failure of a number of imperialist intrigues in the Middle East and the experience of heroic Cuba. The struggle of the oppressed peoples had the active support of the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries. The great revolutionary forces of the day merged into a single stream—victorious socialism, the national-liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the proletarians of the capitalist countries. This ensured the success of the peoples in their storm of the bastions of colonialism.

3. *QUESTION.* How do you appraise the struggle for the abolition of the last colonial regimes?

ANSWER. I think the victory of the oppressed peoples is not far off, it is near at hand. Freedom fighters are smashing the last colonial regimes. In 1960 there were still more than 100 million people bearing the yoke of colonialism, but today, as a result of the valiant struggle of the peoples, more than half of them have liberated themselves. The conscience of mankind cannot, however, remain untroubled as long as the peoples of Angola, "Portuguese" Guinea, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and other countries are being subjected to humiliation and terror by foreign enslavers and racists. All who hold freedom dear cannot reconcile themselves to the continued occupation of South Korea and Taiwan by the U.S. imperialists, or their war against the patriots of South Viet-Nam.

The speedy abolition of the colonial system has become the cause of

all the world's progressive forces. All peoples must be free, there should be no place for colonialism on earth. We believe the situation to be absolutely impermissible in which the Portuguese colonialists, the South African racists and the British and American imperialists, with the support of their Nato alies, still hold about 50 million people in the fetters of slavery.

You will remember that the United Nations Organization adopted, on the proposal of the Soviet Union, a Declaration on the independence of colonial peoples and countries. The colonialists and racists were denounced before all mankind. It must not be forgotten that the Declaration gives, as it were, moral support to the peoples still remaining in colonial bondage. These peoples can achieve liberation only by a stubborn struggle, by their own hands. The socialist states and the countries that have already achieved liberation deem it their duty to assist that struggle in every way, morally and materially.

Every nation that has fought against the colonialists has had the firm support of the Soviet Union and other socialist states. Today we again declare for all to hear that the peoples struggling for their liberation can definitely count on the same support in future. The time of colonial regimes has passed and there is no power that can save them.

4. *QUESTION.* What, in your opinion, is the main content of the national-liberation struggle under present-day conditions?

ANSWER. Each people determines the content and forms of struggle according to conditions obtaining. The conditions in the various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are not identical. I have just spoken about peoples who are fighting for their liberation, for their state independence. Obviously this is the main content of their national-liberation struggle at the present time. In another group of countries, state independence is a screen for the rule of extreme reactionary, tyrannic, puppet regimes that rely on the support of the imperialists. It must be said that here the rule of the colonialists is being retained, although in a somewhat veiled form. The peoples of such countries regard the overthrow of these hated regimes as their most urgent task.

Most of the peoples, however, have already won political independence and naturally other tasks confront them today. Their struggle against colonialism, against imperialism, has acquired other forms and a different direction. Lenin taught us that national liberation cannot be complete unless economic independence is achieved. The struggle for economic independence and social progress has now indeed become the central problem for the vast majority of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The peoples of the newly-free countries are seeking a way out of poverty and hunger, they want to live lives worthy of human beings. Is

it normal that between ten and twenty times less manufactured goods are produced per capita in these countries than in the economically developed countries, that 25 to 30 times less steel and 50 to 100 times less electric power are produced? In this age of the flourishing of science and technology no people anywhere on earth should live under medieval conditions; it is time to put an end to the division of countries into developed and underdeveloped. All peoples have made their contribution to the development of world civilization, all peoples deserve to enjoy all the benefits of modern culture, science and technology.

And so, deliverance from backwardness and poverty, the creation of an independent economy that is capable of ensuring progress, the strengthening of political independence, the development of democracy—such, in my opinion, are the chief problems confronting the young national states. But to do all this, it is first necessary to put an end to the economic supremacy of the imperialists. The foreign monopolies that exploit the wealth of the less developed countries constitute the chief obstacle on the peoples' path to progress. Unless economic independence is achieved, unless the people are delivered from imperialist plunder, it will be impossible to raise their living standards and ensure their well-being.

What is meant by winning economic independence? It means liberation from the domination of foreign capital, the abolition of the colonial structure of the economy, the creation of an independent, sound and viable, ramified economy that is not based exclusively on the export of raw materials. The successful fulfilment of the task will to a considerable extent depend on the speed with which feudal and semi-feudal survivals are abolished and the peasantry, the majority of the population, are freed from usurer and landlord bondage, and from plunder by foreign monopolies.

The experience gained by the liberated coutries has already shown that a state sector if, of course, it is created for the purpose of fighting against imperialist monopolies, is of great importance in effecting the liberation from foreign bondage and developing a national economy. A state sector of this kind facilitates the concentration of funds in the national interests, prevents their fragmentation and accelerates economic development.

The nationalization of the property of foreign monopolies, the development of industry, the creation and consolidation of the state sector, agrarian reform in the interests of the peasantry—these are the measures prompted by reality. The masses are interested in the fulfilment of this general democratic programme, and the national bourgeoisie, provided it is not tied up with foreign monopolies, may participate in its fulfilment. However, the fulfilment of the programme—it is important to stress this—is impossible without internal social reforms and without the anti-imperialist, revolutionary forces being in power.

The winning of economic independence is a complex process. It demands revolutionary enthusiasm and competent administration of the country and the economy.

We are glad to see that the peoples whom the colonialists disdained and considered incapable of ruling the state, are producing from their midst many talented administrators and economic executives. We know very well from our own experience that if the people are free their strength and energy are inexhaustible. The people are capable of overcoming all obstacles.

The imperialists and their yesmen will not be able to suppress the efforts of the people to achieve economic emancipation. It is as inevitable as the political emancipation of the peoples.

Every nation makes its own specific contribution to the solution of the problem of national regeneration. But no matter how the concrete forms and methods of this process may differ, it is clear that the nations can achieve their aim only by struggle against imperialism and internal reaction, only by democratic development and social progress.

5. *QUESTION.* What line of further development do you think the peoples will choose?

ANSWER. The choice of a path of development is a matter for the peoples themselves. Personally, I am deeply convinced that the peoples, some sooner, others later, will decide in favour of socialism. The masses have every ground to expect the liberation struggle to bring them a better life. The peasants want to work freely on their land, freed from feudals and foreign planters. The workers, who want higher wages and radical changes in their living conditions, are in the front ranks of those fighting for a non-capitalist path of development and for social progress for their countries. The intellectuals want to pass their knowledge on to the people, develop the national culture and be relieved of the need to hawk their talents. All the working people want to enjoy political rights without hindrance, they want to participate actively in shaping state policy, and fight for a free and happy life.

National regeneration will be real when its fruits are made available to the whole people. The peoples, however, know from their own experience that capitalism brings them new privations, new sufferings and denigration. They did not rise against the colonialists, and thousands of patriots did not give their lives so that local exploiters, instead of foreigners, could sit on the backs of the working people.

Experience gained in carrying out the general democratic programme shows more and more clearly that capitalism cannot lead the people in the struggle for national regeneration and social progress, cannot serve the peoples as an ideal. It is true that advocates of the "Western

way of life" try to deceive them by painting capitalism in bright colours. But which of the peoples of the liberated countries has not experienced such "blessings" of capitalism as colonial slavery, monstrous exploitation and poverty. At the same time they have before them the example of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This example increases the magnetic power of the ideas of socialism a hundredfold. That is apparently the reason why even those statesmen of the young national states who champion "Western" development and are actually implanting capitalism, do not risk putting forward a capitalist programme openly. They adjust themselves to the temper of the masses and also talk about socialism although they fear social reforms like fire.

As far as revolutionary-democratic statesmen are concerned, they sincerely advocate non-capitalist methods for the solution of national problems, and declare their determination to build socialism. We welcome their declarations. We are glad that the people have produced leaders who have been through the stern school of struggle against colonialism and who have the interests of the masses at heart, who know their needs and understand that socialism brings genuine national regeneration. We fully support the measures they have taken, which are in accordance with the aspirations of the people and are directed against the foreign monopolies and against feudal and capitalist institutions.

The revolutionary-democratic leaders of a number of liberated countries are seeking methods and forms for the transition to a non-capitalist path of development. In the opinion of Marxists-Leninists a suitable form for this transition would be the state of national democracy. It would rely on a united anti-imperialist front of all social forces prepared to fight for independent democratic development. It would open up broad possibilities for drawing the masses into political life, into rebuilding the nation on democratic lines. It stands to reason that this does not preclude other forms of development along the path of national liberation and social progress.

Life itself will introduce much that is new, both in the forms of transition to socialism and in the rate of social change. At any rate, there can be no doubt that life demands progress, and all progress leads towards socialism. Socialism, however, cannot be introduced by decrees, the stage of democratic development cannot be skipped and measures cannot be effected for which the necessary social and economic conditions have not been created and which do not have the support of the masses. The consummation of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution will provide the best possible conditions for the transition to socialism. In many countries the main thing today is to develop this revolution, to draw broad masses of the people into creative revolutionary activity, in the course of which they will go directly forward to the new goal, to socialist reforms. In this way,

while the general democratic tasks are still being carried out, tasks that in themselves are not socialist in character, the prerequisites for the transition to socialism are created.

There is another thing that is not open to doubt. Socialism cannot be built on positions of anti-communism, by opposing the countries in which socialism is victorious, by persecuting Communists, valiant fighters for the national liberation of their countries from the imperialist yoke, ardent patriots and fighters for the new social system, for social progress.

6. *QUESTION.* Where, in your opinion, lies the danger of the new form and methods of the colonial policy of imperialism?

ANSWER. The abolition of the colonial regimes does not mean the abolition of colonialism. In the majority of the liberated countries the imperialist monopolies retain dominant positions in the economy and by the brutal exploitation of the working people extract gigantic profits—according to economists, something like 5,000 million dollars a year. The imperialist powers are also continuing to fleece the economically backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America by means of non-equivalent exchange. By selling them manufactured goods at inflated prices and buying up mineral and agricultural raw materials cheaply, the monopolies "earn" tremendous sums—a further 14,000 million-16,000 million dollars a year. The imperialists have also retained considerable political influence in many of their former possessions. They do not and cannot reconcile themselves to the prospect of the complete abolition of colonialism. The wise Arab proverb may well be applied to them "Don't expect peace from an old enemy."

The time of the MacMahons and Kitcheners, the leaders of colonial pacification and punitive expeditions, has gone for ever. The imperialists now use, in the main, other ways and means which, taken together, form the concept "neo-colonialism". First and foremost the aim is to retain and even strengthen their control over the economic development of the liberated countries. They want these countries to develop on capitalist lines which would actually close the way to national rebirth. They are trying to tie them securely to the world capitalist economy and thus keep them in the position of exploited nations, in the position of agrarian and raw material appendages of the industrial powers. Imperialist monopolies are increasing their penetration of those countries, entangling local capital in a mesh of partnership—needless to say unequal—and subordinating it to their needs. They do everything possible to prevent the creation of a state sector that could be an effective instrument of independent democratic development.

The imperialists are making persistent efforts to get their puppets in power, to embroil the liberated countries in aggressive blocs, such as Seato and Cento, and in reactionary regional alliances such as the OAS, and to maintain military bases on their territory. They spare no

efforts to break the solidarity of the anti-imperialist forces and split the united front of the patriots. They provoke squabbles between liberated countries, strife between tribes and nations, rivalry between political leaders, etc.

The neo-colonialists conceal their campaign against the freedom of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America behind the black flag of anti-communism, behind alleged protection from the influence of the Soviet Union. They wave that flag and try to isolate the most militant forces of the national-liberation movment, split the ranks of the patriots and draw the attention of the people away from the real enemy. By an appeal for "class solidarity" the imperialists attempt to recruit allies for themselves, to unite under their leadership all the propertied classes and groups in the newly-free countries.

U.S. imperialism is today the main bulwark of modern colonialism. It is effecting colonial expansion in Latin America, Asia and Africa, and is ousting the former colonial masters. In the U.S.A. itself racists carry out the disgraceful practices of racial discrimination and deal savagely with the Negro masses who have risen in a just struggle for freedom and elementary human rights.

Colonial expansion by the imperialists of other countries, especially the West-German and Japanese monopolies, also constitutes a serious threat to the liberated countries. The same trusts that fed the brown plague of Hitlerism are now trying to get their hands on the wealth of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The danger of the new forms and methods of colonialism is mainly in their veiled character. Formerly it was easier to recognize the enemy. He acted openly in the person of the insolent colonial civil servant, the overseer with a whip or the foreign soldier with a bayonet. Today he wears the garb of an expert on questions of "aid," a respectable businessman, an economic or military adviser, a young fellow from the "Peace Corps," or an emissary from the International Monetary Fund. That, of course, complicates the struggle against neo-colonialism.

The imperialists are sadly mistaken, however, if they think they can manage to fool the peoples. The anti-imperialist struggle has led to a tremendous growth in the political consciousness of the masses, has increased their alertness to the intrigues of the colonialists, has strengthened their determination to follow the path of national independence and social progress.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist parties are persistently exposing the policy of the imperialists, are helping the peoples recognize the methods of neo-colonialism, and are taking vigorous action against imperialist intervention in the affairs of any people that has risen in struggle for its emancipation and against the imperialist export of counter-revolution.

7. *QUESTION.* Is there not a contradiction between the policy of peaceful co-existence and the national-liberation struggle?

ANSWER. I think that life itself, the experience of the national-liberation movement, has already provided a convincing answer to this question. It is a fact that the peoples have achieved the greatest successes in the struggle for political independence in the postwar period, a period that has, in the whole, been marked by the peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems. It was then that the world colonial system collapsed, and imperialism, held back by the might of the community of socialist states, proved unable to hurl its main military forces against the peoples who had risen in the struggle for their liberation. In this connection I could quote Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, that outstanding fighter against colonialism, who said that if it had not been for the Soviet Union the movement for emancipation from the colonial yoke in Africa would have experienced the full force of cruel and brutal suppression.

Over 50 national states have appeared on the political map of the world under conditions of peaceful co-existence. The flames of a victorious national-liberation struggle leaped to the Western Hemisphere and the glorious Cuban revolution triumphed.

There is nothing unexpected in this from the Marxist point of view, it is fully in accordance with objective laws. The principle of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, if it is understood in the Leninist way, does not mean a reconciliation with imperialism, damping down the revolutionary struggle and curtailing the national-liberation movement. This principle concerns relations between states with different social and political systems. It envisages the co-existence of those countries without wars, without any intervention in internal affairs, and the maintenance and development of normal diplomatic, economic and other relations between states. It goes without saying that it does not by any means imply that the struggle between states with different social systems ceases under the conditions of peaceful co-existence. On the contrary, peaceful co-existence presupposes an economic struggle in the form of economic competition—the capitalists call it rivalry—and also political and ideological struggle. It presupposes vigorous action on the part of the socialist countries and of all the forces of peace and progress against the aggressive and colonialist intrigues of imperialism. But, I repeat, that is a struggle that must develop in peaceful conditions, without any interference in the internal affairs of the co-existing countries.

The national-liberation struggle and the class struggle against capital are a different thing. These are internal questions for every nation. There are, of course, people—bourgeois politicians and even some who call themselves socialists— who would like to extend peaceful co-existence to this field as well. These people try to weaken the

liberation struggle of the peoples against the imperialists and colonialists and also the class struggle of the working people against capitalism. But we Marxists-Leninists know that as long as oppression and exploitation exist in society the struggle against them will not cease. We know that as long as there are national and colonial slavery, the national-liberation struggle will continue. We give that struggle our full support. No Marxist-Leninist has ever regarded peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems as meaning the preservation of the status quo, as a sort of armistice with imperialism, as a "guarantee of protection" against the revolutionary process of national and social emancipation. No one applies this principle to relations between imperialism and the oppressed peoples, since the principle of co-existence does not place a veto on the struggle of those peoples. On the contrary, Marxists-Leninists have always believed that the oppressed peoples can win their freedom only by a determined struggle against their enslavers, when necessary by taking up arms.

That is why we always have been and always shall be against the peaceful co-existence of exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. That is why we favour the peaceful co-existence of capitalist and socialist states and at the same time give all possible aid to the peoples conducting a national-liberation struggle.

As you see, there is not the slightest contradiction between Lenin's policy of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems and the national-liberation struggle. To ascribe any other meaning to the principle of peaceful co-existence is to distort this Leninist principle, to distort our position. We are fighting vigorously against such distortions.

Equally groundless are the attempts to represent the struggle for disarmament as an effort to disarm the peoples who have risen in struggle against imperialism. Is it not clear that disarmament concerns mainly the arsenals of the Great Powers who have the main body of armaments concentrated in their hands. The peoples of the colonies and the newly-free countries, too, stand to gain if the imperialist war machine is dismantled, they stand to gain from the elimination of imperialist military bases in their countries. In the final analysis disarmament will strengthen the security and independence of the young national states. If an end were put to the arms race, fairly large funds would be released in the young national states which could be used to meet the needs of economic and cultural development. The socialist states, in their turn, would also be able to considerably increase their economic, scientific and technical aid to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But as long as the imperialists reject disarmament, the liberated countries are right in strengthening their defence potential.

International tension and the war preparations of the imperialists

prevent the young national states from concentrating on the fulfilment of their own primary tasks. The imperialists, using the cold war hysteria, are trying to draw the liberated countries into military blocs, set up military bases on their territory, force those countries to participate in the arms race.

From what has been said it can be seen that the struggle for peaceful co-existence and for disarmament is a vital issue for the peoples of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Moscow Treaty on a partial nuclear test ban is the first, but nevertheless important, step in the right direction, and it is fully in accord with their interests. The majority of young national states joined the Treaty, and thereby displayed statesmanship and solicitude for the fate of the peace. Further efforts in this direction are needed. We fully support the African states that proposed to turn Africa into an atom-free zone. We offer full support to their struggle against the French imperialists continuing their nuclear tests in the Sahara. Any further steps making for the lessening of international tension and the consolidation of peace will meet with our understanding and support.

8. *QUESTION.* Would you again please explain your position on the issue of peaceful and armed forms of struggle of the peoples against the colonialists?

ANSWER. Our Party has repeatedly outlined its position on this issue, but I will gladly do so again. First of all, I should like to say straight away that there is no universal recipe suitable for all countries and peoples. The employment of one form of struggle or the other depends on concrete conditions, primarily on how strongly the colonialists and their henchmen resist. We know that some of the peoples oppressed by imperialism won their independence by armed struggle. Theirs were sacred wars which we always have supported and continue to support. Others achieved independence by peaceful means. We believe that both these forms are legitimate and expedient when they lead to national liberation.

Guinea, for instance, was able to throw off the colonial yoke without an armed struggle. The mass movement of the Guinean people against the foreign enslavers that continued for a number of years undermined the foundations of the colonial regime and created a situation in which Guinea was able to achieve independence without an insurrection, after rejecting the "French community" which was being imposed on her. The Guinean people have strengthened their independence with the support of the other freedom-loving peoples.

Things took a different turn in Algeria. The Algerian people drove out the French colonialists after many years of bloody armed struggle. Their heroism won the admiration and respect of all freedom-loving peoples. They always had the full sympathy and support of the Soviet people. Nor was it a purely platonic support. The U.S.S.R dispatched

large quantities of weapons to the Algerian patriots free of charge. We also afforded Indonesia, Yemen and other countries serious help in their armed struggle.

We lent all our power to the support of the Egyptian people when they were faced with the necessity of dealing the imperialist aggressors an armed rebuff. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are actively helping the young national states to strengthen their defences, establish and train armed forces to protect from the inroads of the imperialists the independence they have won. We Marxists-Leninists firmly abide by Lenin's principled position—we believe that the peoples do not take up arms and shed their blood of their own free will; the violence of the colonialists forces them to it, and when a people is forced to rise in armed struggle it is the duty of all internationalists to give them every possible aid and support. That is our position in respect of the armed struggle of the peoples for their national liberation.

At the same time, any thinking person who faces reality must see that today the task of most of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who have created their national states, is not only that of defending their country against the aggression of some imperialist power, but that of achieving economic independence, developing the economy, raising the living standard of the people and developing democracy. Nobody will believe that the problems of the national regeneration of the liberated countries can be solved on the battlefield. The important thing for the countries that have achieved national independence is to reconstruct their economic and social system, improve the living standards of the masses, eliminate the dominance of the foreign exploiters and to destroy the political positions of their internal allies. The centre of gravity in this struggle—a struggle that is undoubtedly anti-imperialist in character—lies in consummating the national-liberation, antifeudal, democratic revolution.

9. *QUESTION.* The imperialists are trying in every way to hinder the development of relations between the socialist states and the liberated countries. What is your appraisal of these relations, and what, in your opinion, are the prospects?

ANSWER. The imperialists certainly would give a lot to isolate the newly-free countries from the socialist community. They would like to be left alone with those countries; in that case it would be very much easier for them to implement their policy of dictate, and carry out their neo-colonialist plans. But, as the saying goes, God doesn't give a butting cow horns, and the imperialists are not strong enough to prevent the extension of co-operation between the young national states and the socialist world. As far as we are concerned, we are glad that this co-operation is growing, and see in it one of the logical forms of development of present-day international relations.

History has many examples of alliances between states based on a temporary coincidence of interests, on fortuitous diplomatic schemes. Time passed and those alliances collapsed and were cast into limbo. The relations between the socialist community and the young national states and the national-liberation movement, rest on a different foundation. They are based on a community of basic interests. What is it we have in common? We have a common enemy—imperialism, a common purpose—to end for ever colonial and imperialist oppression, establish durable peace and co-operation on terms of equality between peoples, and ensure the mass of the people a free and happy life.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries do not pursue any aims in respect of the newly-free countries that are contrary to the interests of the peoples of those countries. We do not seek any advantages for ourselves. We have no bases on the territories of these countries and do not want any. Unlike the imperialists, we do not strive to draw those countries into military blocs. Any attempt to enslave or exploit other peoples is alien to the socialist states, owing to the very nature of their social system.

The ideals of socialism require the complete abolition of colonialism, the removal of all inequality from international relations, and an opportunity for every nation to be master in its own house. For this reason every step towards strengthening the political and economic independence of the young national states, towards bringing the national-liberation movement and the world of socialism closer together is also in our interests and we regard it as a real contribution to the struggle against imperialism.

All this gives me good reason to state with full confidence that the relations between the socialist countries and the peoples who have begun an independent way of life have a fine future. For our part we shall do everything necessary to ensure that these relations develop successfully, that they become still closer and more diversified. The peoples of the Soviet Union will always be the faithful friends and brothers of the liberated peoples.

We must protect our friendship in every way, we must rebuff the imperialists who are trying to undermine it; we must also struggle against any attempts to isolate the national-liberation movement from the peoples of the Soviet-Union and other socialist countries and from the world working class; we must expose the harm that is done by advancing geopolitical and even racist slogans as a substitute for the anti-imperialist basis of the solidarity of the peoples fighting for their liberation. Only imperialism and internal reaction would stand to gain from the spreading of racist conceptions in the newly-free countries.

We are certain these attempts will come up against the political maturity of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and will be frustrated.

10. *QUESTION.* How do you appraise the significance and prospects of economic cooperation between the socialist states and the newly-free countries?

ANSWER. In my opinion, the chief value of economic co-operation between the socialist states and the liberated countries is that it helps the peoples of those countries lay the foundations of a national economy and achieve economic independence.

In the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, about 500 industrial and other projects are being built with the aid of the Soviet Union. Total Soviet credits and other allocations for the economic development of the liberated countries have now reached almost 3,000 million new rubles. Over 400 projects have been or are being built with the aid of Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary. The People's Republic of China is also rendering the liberated countries economic aid.

It would, however, be incorrect to evaluate the real significance of aid given by the socialist states on the basis of these figures alone, and not on the basis of the nature and purposes of the aid and its role in the struggle of the young nations for economic emancipation.

The imperialists, as you are aware, talk a lot about their efforts to help the liberated coutries. But what is that aid? Actually it serves as a means of enslaving and exploiting the economically backward countries, clears the way for foreign capital. Their aid, furthermore, is only the return, by means of investment, of a small part of the capital plundered from those countries by the monopolies.

The aid given by the socialist states pursues very different aims. We are sincere in wanting to help those countrie get on their feet, achieve economic emancipation, build the foundations of a modern industry and create a strong state sector, the reliable lever in the struggle against the inroads of the foreign monopolies. Soviet people find inspiration in the words of Lenin whose behest to us was that we help the peoples who are struggling against colonial oppression.

Our economic co-operation is not confined to direct aid but also includes immense indirect help to the young national states. It strengthens their position in negotiations with the imperialist powers. The latter, having lost their monopoly in the granting of loans and credits, in the supply of equipment, in technical knowledge, cannot, as they formerly did, exercise an economic dictate in respect of the developing countries. The support of the socialist states helps those countries to counteract the blackmail of the international concerns and compels the imperialists—they have at times admitted this themselves—to make concessions. As the collapse of their plans for an economic blockade of Cuba, Egypt, Guinea and other countries shows, the imperialists are no longer in a position to strangle economically the liberated countries that are defending their independence and national liberty. The historic significance of this is obvious. The liberated countries,

in their turn, support the Soviet Union and other socialist states by delivering needed goods, by joining us in a common front against imperialism and its policy of dictate and discrimination in international economic relations, etc.

I am firmly convinced that economic co-operation between the socialist states and the newly-free countries will steadily expand. The socialist economy is developing at a tremendous pace, which means that the possibilities for economic co-operation with those countries will steadily grow. The achievements in economic development in the liberated countries will, in their turn, strengthen the basis of that co-operation.

11. *QUESTION.* How do you appraise the role of the young national states in international politics today and in the struggle for peace?

ANSWER. I do not believe there can be two opinions here. The victory of the national-liberation revolutions has brought about radical changes in international relations. Some twenty or twenty-five years ago the colonialists actually kept the oppressed peoples out of world politics, and at international conferences the oppressors spoke in their name. Today the young national states have become a powerful force in world affairs. Even those who do not like this situation, the imperialist politicians, have to admit that today key world problems cannot be settled without the participation of these states.

In most cases the young national states play a progressive role in world affairs. They oppose colonialism and the imperialist policy of war preparations and the arms race, and speak out in favour of peace and collaboration between nations. Most of them reject the imperialists' blackmail and refuse to join their military blocs and to place their territory, materials and manpower at the disposal of the imperialists; they pursue a neutralist policy.

Consider, for example, the amazing changes that have taken place in the United Nations. Since its foundation, the number of member countries has more than doubled, mainly on account of the new Asian and African states.

I am sure that not only the number of young national states but their role in international affairs will continue to grow. Soviet people consider this a great achievement, not only for the peoples of the liberated countries themselves, but for all mankind, and they welcome this development of events. However, to whom much is given, of him is much required. The possibility of actively influencing the solution of the basic issues of international life gives the young national states a serious responsibility in protecting the fate of the peace and world security. Every young national state is able to make its contribution to the struggle for disarmament, for the creation of atom-free zones, for a healthier international atmosphere, and for the cessation of the cold war. By joining their efforts with those of other peaceful states, the liberated countries can play a tremendous role in settling the key

problem of our times—the prevention of war. I have no doubt that the young national states will prove able to bear the responsibility that history has laid upon them, will mobilize their forces for the struggle against the war danger and will become bastions of peace.

The peoples of the newly-free countries are recognizing more and more that without a durable alliance with the peoples of the socialist countries and with the world proletariat, the national-liberation movement could not have scored its excellent victories. This alliance is also vitally necessary to strengthen the independence that has been won and to conduct a successful struggle for economic emancipation. The peoples of the socialist countries and the world working class are as much interested in making this alliance strong and indestructible as the peoples fighting for their national liberation. It is to play an historic role in preventing a new war, in the struggle for social progress and national liberty, for the happiness of all mankind.

Our people are implacable enemies of all bondage and exploitation; they are convinced internationalists. We never have "exported" revolution, and never shall, but we have always supported and shall continue to support in every way the peoples who rise up in the sacred struggle against imperialism. The alliance with the national-liberation forces was and remains one of the cornerstones of our policy. This is stated clearly and definitely in the new Programme of our Party. We shall continue to implement this policy unswervingly.

Our hearts are always with those who fight for freedom. We sincerely wish the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America full victory in their courageous struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, for national liberation and social progress. We shall give them all-round support in their struggle and shall, as always, support them morally, politically and materially. Soviet people consider fighters for national liberation and for social progress their brothers and wish them new successes.

■ ■ ■

For a New Advance and for the Unity of the International Communist Movement

Statement by the Central Committee, Italian Communist Party

For some years now an important discussion has been under way in the international working-class and Communist movement. Latterly, especially owing to the erroneous positions of the Communist Party of China and the serious attacks it has made against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist parties, the polemic and disagreements have grown sharper and acquired the nature of an acute political and ideological struggle. A threat has arisen to the unity of our movement.

In order correctly to assess the situation, it is essential to bear in mind that the present driscussion and differences have arisen at a moment in history characterized by rapid development throughout the world of the emancipation struggle waged by the working classes, the peoples, and the Communist movement. We are living at a time when one-third of mankind is embraced by a system of socialist states and when this system has become the decisive factor of world development. The Communist movement has extended to and is carrying on the struggle on all continents. The old colonial system is disintegrating; the national-liberation movement is developing in Asia, Africa and Latin America, giving birth to new independent states, many of which already play an important role in defending peace and combating imperialism.

The Communist movement has thus entered a new situation characterized by three basic features.

First, a new vast responsibility has been objectively reposed in our movement — a responsibility to the broad masses and to humanity as a whole for whom the forces of imperialism are still causing unbearable suffering and holding out the tragic prospect of nuclear catastrophe.

Second, the changes in the structure of the world have faced our movement with an increasingly imperative need to examine and solve new problems relating to the assessment of the situation, elaboration of strategy and the struggle generally.

Published in *Unita*, October 26, 1963.

Lastly, the new possibilities for advance and the differences between the objective conditions, aims and tasks of the struggle and the level of politico-ideological development of the various parties have given rise to a relative diversity and differentiation in our movement. It is in these features that the roots and objective sources lie of the discussion under way and the difficulties encountered today in the Communist movement.

For many years after the Second World War the Communist movement as a whole was slow in perceiving the changes in the world structure and the conditions of their own struggle and failed to draw all the necessary theoretical, strategic and tactical conclusions therefrom. A certain stagnation was evident in theoretical work, in scientific analysis of the changes in the world and in the separate countries, and in political work.

The positions in the sphere of ideology and practical struggle which the Communist movement won at the Seventh Congress of the International, in the crucible of anti-fascist struggle, in the war against Nazism and fascism, and in struggle for the unity of all working-class and popular forces were not consistently consolidated. These positions were partly relinquished and even contrary positions adopted.

The Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., which generalized the most valuable experience gained by the Communist movement, marked the first important step towards overcoming the lag, the mistakes and regressive tendencies, the first step in combating erroneous or obsolete positions in the struggle to enable the movement to cope with the new responsibility devolving on it and to carry out the new tasks.

The Communist parties, consequently, welcomed the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and the criticism to which it subjected the mistakes and dogmatic and sectarian distortions, all the practices which departed from the Marxist-Leninist line; the parties welcomed the new positions and theses which that Congress advanced (concerning the character and significance of the changes in the world structure and in the balance of forces between capitalism and socialism, the possibility of averting war, the policy of peaceful coexistence, the diversity of ways to socialism, socialist legality and Party democracy) as an important turning point in our entire movement, ushering in a period of renewal.

Therefore the position taken in recent years by the Communist Party of China is grossly erroneous primarily because it attacks and criticizes this turn initiated by the Twentieth Congress. The Chinese Communists' attacks against the line of the Twentieth Congress and the Soviet leadership must be combated. There can be no retreat from the line of the Twentieth Congress. We can and should move forward. If the international Communist movement has reason to be self-critical, it is not because it approved the line of the Twentieth Congress, but because it has not yet drawn all the necessary conclusions — in its

practical activities as well as in the sphere of theory — from the new orientation delineated at the Twentieth Congress.

To the need creatively to advance Marxist thought and our practical activities, to the new positions elaborated by the Twentieth Congress and the Communist movement, the Chinese comrades counterpose a dogmatic concept, a narrow sectarian view of the line and tasks of the Communist movement on a world scale and in the various countries, attacking the C.P.S.U. and other Communist parties and aggravating relations to the point of a split.

It is not easy to understand all the concrete reasons that have impelled the leaders of the Communist Party of China to embark on this course. It is quite possible that the explanation lies partly in the difficulties of economic and political upbuilding in their own country, the consequences of the mistakes made in this area, the magnitude of the problems the Chinese leaders have to solve, and also in the international position in which the Chinese People's Republic has been unjustly placed as a result of the aggressive policy of the U.S. imperialist groups.

Underlying all this, however, is an erroneous assessment of the basic features of the present international situation, of the correlation and significance of the forces combating imperialism today, and of the level the fight for socialism throughout the world has reached. To agree with this erroneous assessment and the line to which the Chinese comrades adhere as a result of this assessment would cause serious harm to the international Communist movement and above all hinder it from fulfilling its new tasks and living up to the new responsibility resting on us today; to do so would tend to cut the Communist parties off from the broad masses at a time when new perspectives of success and victory are opening before us.

Our Party has not forgotten, and never shall forget, the vast importance for all peoples of the Chinese revolution, which was carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party, and its accomplishments. But it resolutely rejects the present positions of the Chinese comrades and the line they propose. Our contribution to the discussion under way in our movement is aimed solely at upholding and elaborating the correct revolutionary strategy.

This necessary political struggle must be accompanied by full awareness that the Communist movement it faced with new tasks in the spheres of both theory and practical activity. The ability of the movement energetically and courageously to solve these problems and to forge ahead is a factor of decisive importance also in combating the opportunist and reformist trends existing in the international working-class movement.

Moreover, we consider it essential to find a way enabling the Communist parties to carry on the struggle for the correct political line without the danger of division and to work for the necessary unity by ways and means according with the present situation.

In the present document our Party proposes to set forth its stand and suggestions as regards the essence of the main issues debated today in the Communist movement, and also as regards the unity of the movement.

I. The Struggle for Peace and Coexistence

1. The Moscow test-ban treaty freed humanity from the deadly peril of contamination of the atmosphere and seas of our planet.

Herein lies the prime and direct significance of the treaty. The fact that the three nuclear powers renounced acts which presented a serious threat to the health and the future of humanity and which have already demonstrated the destructive nature of modern world war, is, besides being a blessing for all peoples, a success for the peace forces generally and the working-class and Communist movement in particular which have fought for years to achieve this aim. The termination of nuclear tests in itself was an admission of the fact that the stockpiles and destructive power of the latest weaponry have reached a point when the arms drive can no longer be justified by considerations of either defence or retaliation. Under these circumstances nuclear war holds out the perspective not only of mutual destruction of the belligerents but also the annihilation of a great part of all humanity.

We hold that it is a grave mistake to underestimate the catastrophic perspectives of nuclear war, and unhesitatingly condemn any tendency to do so in the working-class and popular movement. Even those who, like the Chinese comrades, are wary of overestimating the consequences, are compelled to admit that if imperialism were to start a war more than half of mankind would perish in a nuclear holocaust. This being the case, the Chinese comrades' argument that the survivors would be able to rebuild rapidly and create a higher civilization, the civilization of socialism, is an absurd and dangerous illusion. In reality the atomic conflagration would reduce to ruins the main centres of civilization and might well endanger the very sources of living nature and human life.

To recognize this qualitative change in the instruments of war and, consequently, in the nature of war does not mean, as the Chinese comrades claim, concluding that it is no longer in the power of the popular masses to determine the march of history. The issue is not of recognizing or denying that technology can suppress and condition man's activity, but of recognizing or denying, as a fact of life, the destructive power of the new types of weapons. Man fulfils his mission as the maker of history not by denying or arbitrarily underestimating the reality, but by working to abolish, restrict and destroy that which threatens his life and his future.

Needless to say, to preserve and ensure peace it is not enough merely to visualize the disastrous nature of war. But the Chinese com-

rades are mistaken if they fear that clarity as to what is at stake dooms the peoples to passivity and abject cowardice. On the contrary, the growth of this awareness throughout the world is one of the root causes of the crisis of the policy of the ruling classes and conservative forces generally; it engenders differences and contradictions in their ranks and at the same time acts as a stimulus — and one that is already yielding substantial fruit — to harnessing the energies essential to protect peace.

The safeguarding of peace, the supreme boon, acquires universal, absolute significance. Hence the importance and impact of the choice made by the Communist movement — and by our Party as one of the first — when it posed as its basic task the defence of peace, the freeing of the peoples from the burden of international tension and the arms drive, the defence of humanity against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The working class has always fought to prevent imperialism from unleashing war, and today its class interests have fully coincided with the most human and universal need to guarantee the peace. The alternative, "either peaceful coexistence or destructive war", which the Communist and Workers' parties clearly envisaged in the Moscow Statement of December 1960 underscores the fact that in the nuclear age peace and coexistence are a vital necessity for all — for the states which have nuclear weapons and the states which do not have them, for the socialist countries and the capitalist countries, for the proletariat and for all mankind.

Excluding world war from the life of humanity has become at once essential and possible as a result of two cardinal changes which the processes of history have introduced in the objective reality.

On the one hand, imperialism can no longer impose its will as it did in the past, it is no longer the dominant system. On the other hand, the invention, perfection and dissemination of nuclear weapons have changed the very nature of war. From this proceeds a political line which makes effort towards peaceful coexistence a pivotal element of the fight for socialism. It guarantees the supreme boon — peace — and provides the most favourable ground for the struggle for the emancipation of the working people, for the liberation of the oppressed peoples, and for the achievement and development of socialist society.

Through the struggle for peace imperialism can be trapped in the impasse of acute contradictions into which it has been brought by the march of history.

Indeed, the imperialist leaders are forced to admit that under all circumstances nuclear war would be a disaster for their own countries. This admission, facilitating as it does the exposure and condemnation of all policies of aggression and war provocation, gives rise to new contradictions within the very same ruling groups and, what is most important, opens new opportunities for movements for unity. It is becoming increasingly obvious that peaceful competition of the

two systems and, consequently, the policy of coexistence are vitally important. On the other hand, this corresponds to the very nature of the socialist countries, just as it accords with the principles of defence of peace which inspire the entire working-class movement. Peaceful competition is a challenge to capitalism, an arena of struggle against capitalism and victory over it.

2. Peaceful coexistence is shaped and won in struggle. To achieve even such a limited result as a nuclear truce persistent and multiform effort was required, from the diplomatic and political initiatives of the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries to mass struggles and the peace movement, from the rousing of public opinion by the more conscious scientists to the intervention of religious forces. The resistance encountered and the contradictions and polemics engendered by this halt in the cold war foreshadows the intensity and the scale which the struggle is bound to acquire as more and more important aims are posed.

The Chinese comrades err in underestimating the universal significance of civilization and the anti-imperialist and revolutionary content of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence.

The fight for peace and coexistence does not, nor can it, run counter to the struggle for the emancipation of the working class, of the exploited masses and the oppressed peoples; on the contrary, it opens new perspectives for them while itself deriving inspiration and impetus from that struggle and its successes. The tendency to minimize the universal and revolutionary significance of the struggle for peace, to counterpose the policy of coexistence to the liberation struggle, is all the more erroneous since it undermines unity and tends to retard the movement at the very moment when steps towards relaxation of tension show that the most aggressive and extremist groups in the imperialist bloc can be isolated and defeated.

Fear of detente today compels Western Germany, Gaullist France, Franco Spain and the diehards among the U.S. and European militarists and big capitalists to take an open stand against every tendency and every effort to find some alternative to the nuclear race and the cold war, regardless of the fact that such tendencies are making themselves felt even among the present rulers of the United States.

This shows that by working for relaxation of international tension and by forcing steps to be taken towards disarmament, the contradictions of capitalist policy and economy can be aggravated to the extreme, differences intensified within the political union of the bourgeoisie itself, and new conditions and opportunities created for the working-class movement to build up broad social and political accords and alliances constituting a powerful force not only in the fight for peace but in the fight against the monopoly capitalists, against oppression and colonial exploitation.

Peaceful coexistence implies competition.

Coexistence provides conditions in which the class struggle, the struggle for the liberation of the peoples and for socialism, acquires full independence and is afforded new opportunities for development unencumbered by nuclear blackmail and cold-war barriers. We reject and condemn that diehard narrow "diplomatic" definition of coexistence advanced in the imperialist camp which reduces it to a mere matter of agreement between the great powers on preserving the status quo and the division of zones of influence between the two camps so as to create a static equilibrium and, eventually, a system protecting and guaranteeing the present sphere of imperialist domination.

In advocating coexistence, we advocate neither a truce nor a compromise between socialism and capitalism. In advocating coexistence we in no way advocate rejection of the social, political and ideological struggle of the working class and its revolutionary vanguard or any relaxation of this struggle. More, in order to dispel any confusion as to the significance of the fight for peaceful coexistence on both the world and national levels and its direct link with the struggle of the working class, the working masses generally and the national-liberation forces, we declare that it is a mistake to reduce the concept of coexistence to a mere absence of a universal state of war, as the Chinese comrades do.

Needless to say, peaceful coexistence means above all renunciation by both camps — the capitalist and the socialist — of recourse to war as a means of imposing their respective systems one upon the other.

This can be achieved, however, only by gradually attaining progressively higher aims: solution of disputed issues by negotiation, abolition of the legacy of world war, elimination of seedbeds of the cold war, ensuring the peoples the right to full political and economic independence and to order their destinies themselves.

It is essential to combat discrimination against the socialist countries in the political and economic spheres, to put an end to the absurd non-recognition of and bans against the great Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic. What is needed is activity which will lead, through a series of partial gains—conclusion of a non-agression pact between the two military blocs, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, abolition of foreign military bases, prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and destruction of the existing stockpiles of these weapons — to the abolition of opposing blocs and to general controlled disarmament.

In a word, the aim is to arrive at such a system of international relations under which, with the working-class movement continuing to reject on principle the export of revolution, the imperialist forces would not be able either to unleash world war or to export counter-revolution.

Such should be the programme of coexistence, and it is the task of the working-class and Communist movement today to work resolutely to carry out this programme. The important thing is not to mark time but to press forward along the path opened by the nuclear truce.

It is a mistake to claim that an international detente would act as a brake on the popular and revolutionary struggle. The facts have shown that it is the cold war which creates obstacles to the peoples' struggle. In the capitalist countries the cold war has strengthened the hand of the more reactionary and aggressive groups; it has been a basic factor uniting all the conservative forces under their leadership in defence of the capitalist system with the support or open interference of the leading imperialists powers. The cold war has helped to aggravate and deepen the disunity and discord among the masses. This is clearly evident even in a country like Italy, where the working-class and popular movement has succeeded, by waging a persistent struggle and pursuing a policy of unity and broad alliances, in withstanding the test and moving on from success to success in the fight for peace and democracy.

The cold war has laid a heavy burden on the colonial and dependent peoples. Many countries in Asia, Africa and America have won their independence thanks to the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed peoples, to which the victories and the solidarity of the socialist countries and the working-class movement have made a decisive contribution.

The liberation and upbuilding of the new states, however, have come up against the policy of cold war which the imperialist powers have been pursuing in order to extend their armed intervention in the countries fighting for independence; this policy has complicated and retarded the struggle of many of these countries against oppression, poverty and backwardness.

The Chinese comrades say that peaceful coexistence cannot take the place of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples. The fact is, however, that peaceful coexistence does not presuppose such an alternative. The need and the right of the peoples to win independence, through national-liberation war among other means, has not been nor can it be questioned. On the contrary, peaceful coexistence implies relieving historical progress of the impediment of atomic blackmail, ensuring the working class and the oppressed peoples every opportunity to fight for their independence and freedom without risking the destruction of humanity. The fact is that if we do not wish to limit ourselves to merely proclaiming the need for class struggle and the liberation movement, if we really want to promote revolutionary struggle, it is essential today to remove such obstacles as the cold war and nuclear blackmail.

3. The consequences of the erroneous positions of the Chinese comrades could be seen in their violent and absurd condemnation of the partial test-ban treaty and their inexcusable attacks against the U.S.S.R. The Chinese Communists have gone so far as to deny, in defiance of the obvious facts, the immediate benefits deriving from the cessation of tests, attaching no importance whatever to the struggle waged by the working-class movement towards this end.

They did not even hesitate to contradict themselves by counterposing to this partial but concrete and positive achievement the ultimate aim of nuclear and general disarmament which they themselves had

earlier called a "sheer illusion". They even deny that the treaty has any political significance as the starting point of and a stimulus towards detente in the international arena.

While turning down the treaty, China lays claim to the right to possess its own nuclear weapons and accuses the U.S.S.R. of having prevented or not assisted in the achievement of this aim. Such a position must be repudiated. It fell to the lot of the U.S.S.R. to create a nuclear force (which it built up at the cost of enormous effort and sacrifice) in order to ensure its own defence and the defence of the socialist community. But in view of the risks involved in the spread of nuclear weapons, the U.S.S.R. had to — and still has to — avoid decisions which might be used as a pretext or justification for continuing the arms drive and spreading atomic weapons in the imperialist camp. This is not only a highly responsible and consistent policy, it is the only policy which can ensure success in the fight for disarmament and peace. When the Chinese Communists lay claim to the right to possess their own nuclear power we cannot but conclude — unless we were to assune that they place no faith in the commitment given by the U.S.S.R. to defend China and the entire family of socialist countries, or that they are seeking to secure for themselves some special prestige and power — that in the final analysis they consider disarmament to be utterly senseless and impossible.

True, they say that proposals for general disarmament should be advanced — and indeed advance such proposals themselves — and claim that the imperialists can be forced to agree to "some sort of treaty" in this area.

Actually, however, the Chinese Communists do not go beyond political agitation and condemnation, for they hold that so long as imperialism has not been completely destroyed it would be a delusion to believe that disarmament can really be achieved and a stable world peace established. In this way they question and to all intents and purposes reject the strategy of a revolutionary struggle based on peaceful co-existence and envisaging the advance to socialism as a movement embracing all areas of class contradictions and competition between nations and states, a movement which is forging ahead from success to success. In their abstract striving not to subordinate the development of the revolutionary movement to any other demands the Chinese comrades are caught between the horns of a false dilemma: peace or revolution. They deprive themselves of every possibility of undertaking concrete actions aimed at isolating the forces of war and broadening the front of the anti-imperialist democratic peace-loving forces. And in the end they place their stake on a policy which objectively leads only to an intensification of international tension and, in the final analysis, may result in a catastrophic collision.

The Communist movement and our Party must unequivocally reject this senseless and adventuristic perspective.

II. New Ways of Advancing to Socialism

1. The Italian Communists consider the position adopted by the Chinese comrades in denying the possibility of new roads opening to socialism to be erroneous and harmful.

By taking this position, the Chinese Communists have revealed their failure to grasp the full significance of the changes that have taken place in the world structure. They have revealed their inability to see the new forms of struggle which the international victories of socialism have made available for the working-class and popular movement in the fight for peace and democracy, and still less the changes in the capitalist world which require renewal and development of working-class strategy and tactics.

The forms of capitalist domination have partly changed. On the one hand — owing to pressure from the workers and the people generally who are fighting for their demands, to technological progress, the stimuli provided by the economic competition between the two systems, and other factors — the productive forces in the capitalist world have developed in recent years and the leading groups of the bourgeoisie have embarked on economic policies (diverse forms of capitalist "programming", development of state capitalism, establishment of supranational organizations, etc.) which have influenced the operation of the economic cycle and economic crises as well as employment, expanded the sphere of state economic activity and intensified the process of internationalization of the economy. On the other hand, determined and attended by growing concentration and spread of monopoly as it was, this economic development increased discrepancies between living standards in the different countries as well as within countries, gave rise to new contradictions and new requirements, and led to new serious social consequences. Capitalist exploitation and capitalist oppression have been extended to broader sections of society and are effected through more complex ways and means which constantly and in a variety of ways dovetail with political and state activity.

Throughout the capitalist world there is now greater differentiation and multiformity both in the social sphere and in the sphere of state measures and policies.

In these circumstances it is imperative for the working class to extend its system of alliances and to improve its methods of struggle. It becomes necessary, and at the same time possible, for the working class to advance towards socialism along a path based on alliance not only with the agricultural proletariat and the poor peasants, but also with the masses of small peasant proprietors, the broad urban and rural middle sections and the intelligentsia. With the establishment of such an alliance the struggle for partial and momentary economic and political demands acquires decisive importance as a means of isolating the big capitalists and breaking up the bourgeois bloc, of winning new positions in the fight against the monopolies, achieving a democratic

transformation of the state and carrying out economic and social reforms capable of opening to the working class new roads to power. History has shown that the transition from capitalism to socialism on world scale should be understood not as a general cataclysmic collapse of capitalism but as an interweaving of revolutionary struggles and gains which develop from stage to stage, influence one another and lead to a common goal.

Hence it is necessary to pay more attention to the national and other specific features of revolutionary struggle in the various countries and areas of the world.

A strategy of revolutionary struggle patterned solely after the October Revolution in Russia, or after any other single pattern, can hardly correspond to the real situation and limits the activities, initiative and political weight of the Communist parties. It can only impel them towards pure propaganda activity and passive waiting for developments. The search for national ways to socialism in no way implies breaking up the revolutionary struggle into a multitude of separate and self-contained forms of struggle. On the contrary, this search makes it possible effectively to intervene in all the contradictions of the modern world instead of relying only on the victory of the socialist world or on the national-liberation movement; it makes it possible to work out a truly integral and at the same time differentiated strategy of the international Communist movement.

2. Proceeding from the above, we hold that the possibility of a democratic and peaceful advance to socialism is opening at the present time in a number of capitalist countries, for instance in Italy. The Chinese comrades deliberately distort and falsify our stand, claiming that the way of democratic and peaceful advance to socialism boils down to electioneering and parliamentary activity alone. When we speak of the democratic and peaceful way, we have in mind a way which will enable the working class and its allies to win political power without armed uprising or civil war but which nevertheless consists of a broad, far-reaching, unceasing progression of mass struggle. We have in mind the sum-total of forms of struggle capable of defeating the class enemy in diverse fields and forming a united movement which, under the leadership of the working class, can make its voice heard in production and civil organization, in elected political bodies and in the state apparatus.

In conducting such a struggle we are working not only to change the balance of forces in the interests of the working class and to rally under its leadership the broad masses of the people, but also to carry out such reforms of the economic structure and the political system as would improve the people's living standard and at the same time influence property relations (agrarian reform, nationalization, democratic economic programming, etc.) and state organization. This strategy is diametrically opposed to the policy of renunciation of struggle which the Chinese comrades ascribe to us. Indeed, it is a strategy of struggle

for political power, for the participation of the working classes in the administration of the state already now.

Moreover, the facts themselves give the lie to the absurd falsification concocted by the Chinese comrades. The activities of the working class, the Italian popular movement and our Party in recent years are a long succession of dramatic and heroic mass struggles — from the armed struggle against the fascist tyranny during the Resistance to the sweeping popular movement for land, freedom and peace, the powerful economic and political strikes and the bloody demonstrations of July 1960 which led to the fall of the Tambroni government, an election struggle which gave the Italian workers' parties the biggest representation and the greatest strength ever witnessed in the capitalist countries in both the Parliament and the municipalities, and the creation of a powerful revolutionary mass party.

Consequently, parliamentary activity and the fight to defend and extend democratic rights are only one of the aspects of the struggle waged by the Italian working-class vanguard to forge on to leadership in the country and to reconstruct society.

Full clarity is essential on this question. We reject the position of the Chinese comrades, who underestimate struggle to develop and transform the democratic institutions with a view to giving them a new content and new forms and to link them with the struggle for the emancipation of the working people. The Chinese comrades arbitrarily confuse situations in which parliamentary institutions, elected bodies and definite political rights either never existed or existed only in the most rudimentary forms, and situations in which gains and institutions of this order have an established place in the public consciousness and in the struggles and experience of the broad masses. In putting forward their position the Chinese comrades forget that sectarian underestimation of democratic gains in the past greatly weakened working-class struggle against fascism; they forget that today too there are in the capitalist West, i. e., in the citadel of capitalism, fascist and authoritarian regimes which it will never be possible to overthrow unless the working-class movement and its vanguard devote all their energies to the fight for democracy and the unity of the democratic forces.

We hold that, in a number of developed capitalist countries, the institutions of representative democracy, elected political bodies and the freedoms connected with them can and should be used to promote the struggle against the rule of big monopoly capital, to advance the movement to win the majority of the people and to build a new society. The sum-total of objective and subjective changes in these countries has already led to important changes in the structure of the state.

There has been a considerable expansion of the activity of the state in the economic sphere, direct state intervention in the economy and in production, state capitalism. The interconnection between economics and politics has become close. Many economic demands are beginning to

affect the political sphere. And many political gains are influencing the economy and will no doubt continue to influence it in the future.

At the same time the working-class and popular movement has been building up its organization, though the progress made in this respect varies by countries.

Many countries now have a large number of trade unions. There are unitarian organizations embracing the masses of the peasants, youth and women, and organizations uniting producers and consumers whom objective social processes increasingly compel to renounce an insular mode of economic thinking and to fight for a comon policy and common social aims. In some countries Communist parties have become firmly established and are able not only to steer a correct class and revolutionary course but also to organize the unceasing struggle of the masses with a view to abolishing the gulf between elected bodies and the people and ensuring a constant link between the growing class struggle generally and the struggle conducted in the elected political bodies. So far all this is limited in scale and applies only to a few countries. Nevertheless it points to new methods and areas of struggle through which the working class and its allies can deal blows at monopoly rule, at the bureaucratic machinery and the military and conservative castes.

We believe that in connection with these changes the working class must not hesitate to experiment and search for new ways of reconstructing the state, of winning and organizing political power. We know full well that the mere will to do so is not enough for the working class to ensure a more or less peaceful advance to socialism. This is the aim we set for ourselves. But it is still to be realized. We lived through the tragedy of the fascist tyranny and know how strong is the tendency on the part of the reactionaries to resort to force of arms and suppression of democratic freedoms in order to halt the popular movement. But we also know that the more vigorously the fight for democracy is waged the greater will be the peoples' striving for democratic rights and freedoms; the broader the system of alliances and the stronger the network of united organizations built by the working class in the democratic struggle, the better it will be able, using all the means necessary, to counter the violence employed by the reactionary forces.

The search for new ways of winning power and of giving effect to that power is now of vast importance for conducting a positive dialogue with those social and political forces whose participation is essential for the creation of a new ruling bloc in the developed capitalist countries. In Western Europe the socialist solution which would destroy the fundations of the economic and political power of the big capitalists must, besides providing the people bread and work, guarantee a high rate of growth of production, introduce economic planning providing an outlet for the initiative of each citizen and stimuli to this initiative, give direction to the life of society, ensuring broad autonomy

and political freedoms, and promote free questing in the sphere of culture and a constant exchange of ideas. Only by working in this direction already now and being guided by this perspective will it be possible fully to meet the demands of the masses and to win over and unite the majority of the working class and the nation.

Sectarian positions which ignore these requirements caused no little harm in the past. It is high time to learn from these lessons. It is time to give thought to the objective reasons and the subjective limitations which caused serious setbacks for the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries.

We believe that to ensure the victory of socialism in our country our Party must solve these problems; it is our conviction that posing these problems and closely linking the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism are a necessary condition for progress towards the political unity of the working class and the unity of the democratic forces. We cannot ignore, without falling prey to the infantile disease of extremism which Leninism subjected to severe criticism on the basis of post-First World War experience, the strength of the socialist and Catholic movements and the deap roots they have struck in Western Europe, even in the working class. It is all the more impermissible to ignore these problems now when bitter experience has led to a ferment and new steps forward in the British labour movement and in other sectors of Social Democracy as well as in the Italian Catholic movement, and when the further advancement of the working-class, democratic and the entire West-European Left movement acquires greater urgency than ever.

The dogmatic positions of the Chinese comrades seem to us all the more pernicious now when the entire Communist movement stands in need of more vigorous critical questing, of a deeper analysis of modern capitalism and the latest changes and contradictions in the capitalist world, when it is imperative for the Communist parties of the capitalist world to take fuller account of the concrete conditions in their countries, to extend their contacts with the masses which have not yet been won over to socialism and with other democratic forces, and also to increase their own numerical strength and heighten the initiative and activity of their members in the united democratic and class organizations.

It is not fortuitous that the position of the Chinese comrades leads to a profoundly erroneous line in such vital questions for the working-class movement as the question of unity and the nature and aims of the international mass organizations. Indeed, it is essential to reject any tendency to regard the united international mass organizations merely as products and instruments of Party policy. The Chinese comrades not only adhere to this view but in recent years they have taken steps to turn these organizations into an instrument of their own particular political line which they are pressing on all Communists at the risk of endangering unity.

The Italian Communists will fight for the independence of these organizations. Recognition and respect by all of the independence of the international mass organizations are essential in order to enable these organizations successfully to work each for its particular aims and also for the common aims of peace and progress towards which the broad masses are striving. Only in this way will it be possible to extend the forms of united action with other international mass organizations as well as with united national movements, to remove all artificial barriers and discrimination.

3. The need for new questing arises also in the sphere of the liberation movement of the colonial countries and former colonies. Complete independence and the freeing of hundreds of millions of people and entire continents from the hunger, backwardness and exploitation to which they were doomed by imperialist rule is the basic problem of our time. The worldwide significance of the socialist revolution is demonstrated also by the fact that it has become possible to pose and solve this titanic problem. Without an alliance with the oppressed peoples the socialist world and the working class of the capitalist countries can not even think of overthrowing imperialism, just as the complete liberation of the oppressed peoples requires unity between them and the forces fighting for socialism. This is a great lesson of Leninism.

In recent years the liberation movement of the colonial peoples has grown in scope and accumulated experience of exceptional importance, experience compounded of great victories and also of setbacks. Some peoples are still waging a heroic and tragic struggle for independence, against the most barbarous and bloody forms of colonial and racist rule. Other peoples, having barely won independence, are grappling with formidable problems in the building of their economy, in creating the most elementary civic institutions and a state organization. And there are countries where the anti-colonial movement has been in power for many years and where reconstruction and economic programming have reached the crucial point when the decisive political, class choice has to be made. In Cuba socialism is already being built.

The young Algerian Republic born of a heroic liberation war is also guided by the ideals of socialism. Everywhere the question of the methods, rates and aims of economic development with a view to abolishing the appalling backwardness caused by imperialist oppression is acquiring truly dramatic proportions.

We have before us, then, a picture composed of the most diverse situations. The Communist movement is faced with the serious and difficult task of elaborating and implementing a strategy capable of coping with these diverse situations and counteracting the entire panoply of means and tactics employed by the imperialist groups in an effort to maintain their rule and seize new positions.

In view of this it is imperative to examine the methods by which the imperialist groups today are combining in the various countries

and situations the traditional forms of oppression and violence with the new methods of neo-colonialist penetration. For the fact is that besides attempts to retard, limit and distort the state independence already won, such forms of imperialist infiltration as investment in industry, penetration of capital and a striving towards compromise with sections of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie as well as the agrarian and industrial bourgeoisie are springing up even in the newly independent countries, forms which differ from the open economic plunder of the past and are aimed at indirectly but definitively influencing the choice of the economic and political course, at implementing new forms of subordination to imperialist domination. The search for these new forms of bondage was engendered also by the objective changes now taking place in the economy of the developed capitalist countries and the consequent new demands on the structure of the world imperialist market.

In view of this multiform policy pursued by the imperialists (a policy ranging from colonial terror in Angola to the association of a number of African countries with the Common Market, and from the Alliance for Progress in Latin America to the support given to the new groups of monopoly capitalists in India), as well as in view of the growth of the liberation movement, it is essential to make an analysis of the present class alignments in the various countries, the aims and forms of the struggle and the organizations implementing these aims and forms. The liberation movement today embraces areas of the world as well as social and historical situations extending far beyond the limits of the experience of the Third International and the situations in which it functioned. Above all we are witness to sharp differences between the weight, nature and political orientation of the various groups of the bourgeoisie, depending on whether India or Egypt, Algeria or Guinea, Brazil or the Congo is in question. In some countries there are groups of the bourgeoisie who are closely linked with imperialism; in others, the national bourgeoisie resists imperialist penetration but at the same time is resolutely opposed to any programme of social reform; and in still others large segments of the national bourgeoisie and the progressive intelligentsia, impelled by the needs of current development and the anti-imperialist struggle and also by the example of socialism, are inclined to support economic programming in one form or another as well as progressive social reform. Finally, there are countries where, in view of the fact that the level of their productive forces corresponds to a largely tribal social system, one can hardly speak of the existence of a national bourgeoisie. The weight, place in society and degree of independence and political influence of the working class vary too, depending on the conditions obtaining in each country. In some countries there is practically no working class.

The peasant masses, which in some cases, for example in Cuba and Algeria, were the decisive force in the national-liberation movement

and the element making for the militancy of this movement, are playing an increasing part in the anti-imperialist struggle. Consequently, new problems arise relating to the connection between the struggle for complete independence, the anti-feudal struggle and the advance towards socialism, as well as the question of transition from one stage to another. The entire process of the growth of the anti-imperialist movement and the shaping of its vanguard has acquired specific features and become extremely complex.

Therefore the Chinese comrades make a mistake when here too they try to pattern the revolutionary line after a single model, be it even the great example of the Chinese revolution. They disregard the new situation and the new tasks. Hence the call to revolution so often sounded by the Chinese comrades remains an abstraction so long as it is not linked with the building of a bloc of forces conforming to the concrete situation in each country. Unless this is done, calls to revolution may lead to dangerous extremist adventures. Because of this the dogmatic refusal of the Chinese comrades to search for the new is in the long run bound to present a serious obstacle to the movement they profess to promote.

We do not wish to lecture anyone. We stress the need for critical questing because we are aware of the grave responsibility resting on the working class in the capitalist world, because we are aware of the inadequacy of the support rendered by the Western working-class movement to the colonial revolution, of the limits of this support and also the mistakes that have been made.

But the opportunist wait-and-see attitudes in the ranks of the Western working-class movement cannot be combated merely by displaying political solidarity, essential though it is, with the peoples fighting for independence. The task here is far greater. The Western working class must organize a struggle against both the old and the new methods of interference employed by the imperialist groups and in this way establish a concrete link between the struggle of the Western working class and the colonial revolution, against their common enemy — the big international monopolies.

4. Proceeding from these demands, we consider one-sided and erroneous the general strategy which the Chinese comrades are advocating on the plea that the various areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute the "storm centre of the world revolution" on which the entire cause of the proletarian revolution depends in the final analysis. The Chinese comrades thus assign the primary and leading role to the colonial revolution, the liberation movement of the colonial peoples. This strategic postulate seriously underestimates the significance of the existence and the scale of the system of socialist states, and completely ignores the role which the achievements of the socialist countries in economic competition play in the struggle to spread socialist ideas and to change the world balance of forces, as well as in rendering aid to the national-liberation movement to

enable it to give a rebuff to imperialist economic blackmail and counteract the old and the new forms of imperialist penetration.

For example, the strategic line of the Chinese comrades completely ignores the decisive role which objectively devolves on the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.S.U., it ignores the strength their accomplishments impart to the socialist camp and the entire working-class movement, and the significance which the difficult and complex work of building a communist society in the U.S.S.R. has for the overall progress of our movement. The Chinese comrades' strategic line likewise underestimates the struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries, the significance of this struggle for the defeat of imperialism in its own citadel, at the source of its economic and political domination, and the assistance which this struggle can and should render in destroying the most insidious and up-to-date instruments of neo-colonialist policy.

But the most serious mistake of the Chinese comrades is that their position minimizes the importance of the links and cohesion which should unite the activities of the socialist camp and the working-class and popular movement in the capitalist countries with the revolutionary movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

This is a political issue. The course steered by the Chinese comrades threatens to lead the liberation movement to setbacks and crises. The facts have proved the fallacy of all conceptions which would entrust the defeat of imperialism to the struggle waged by only one of the motive forces of world revolution. In our opinion the view advanced by some sections of the Western working-class movement that the future and the development of the colonial revolution should be regarded as subordinate to the victory of the working class in the metropolitan countries, is erroneous. We likewise consider it a mistake to claim that the world-wide victory of socialism depends only on the economic achievements of the socialist camp.

But we also consider it a mistake to regard the national-liberation movement as the pivot of the world revolution and the decisive force in the struggle to abolish imperialism. A strategy designed to do away with imperialism merely by gradually undermining and destroying its colonial positions is a distorted strategy which does not call for an offensive against the basic pillars of capitalism or the mobilization of all those forces without which the national-liberation movement alone cannot solve the grand problems confronting it, unless it is assumed that the outcome of the struggle will in the final analysis be decided in a world-wide armed conflict. But we reject the perspective of the victory of socialism and the liberation of the peoples through a nuclear catastrophe. Socialism can and must win in conditions of peace.

III. Problems of Socialist Construction

The level of development attained by the socialist countries renders it necessary — as a condition for their continued political and economic advance and the establishment of a reliable system of mutual cooperation — to explore new areas and search for new solutions which cannot be found by the dogmatic reiteration of general formulas.

The grandiose, heroic and profoundly dramatic path traversed by the Soviet peoples in building the socialist society, the experience of other socialist countries, which also encountered difficulties but often of a different nature, and the difficulties and contrasts manifested in the socialist world system at the present time testify primarily to the need to overcome a mystic and primitive approach to the problems of socialist construction. Never losing sight of the decisive historical victories won in the building of a new society free from exploitation and class opression, never losing sight of the clear-cut demarcation line that separates the capitalist system from the superior socialist system, we must bear in mind that the problems associated with the building of socialism, too, must today be examined in all their complexity and approached critically and without prejudice.

The advent to power of the working class and the establishment of the socialist system have created the objective basis for the solution of the great problems of freedom and justice, prosperity and culture, friendship and brotherhood among peoples which no previous society in human history, including capitalist society, was able to solve. The facts point to the tremendous progress already made by the socialist countries, and primarily the Soviet Union, toward the solution of these problems; moreover, they embarked on this path handicapped by extreme backwardness, forced to contend with enormous obstacles in a world rent by the tragic convulsions caused by imperialism.

But experience has shown also that this path was by no means straight and smooth, that it was and still remains a difficult, contradictory and dramatic path. The destruction of capitalism, the elimination of the old exploiting classes implies overcoming the contradictions inherent in class societies which can only be resolved by changing the social system. In socialist society, too, however, certain contradictions of a profound and acute nature remain and make themselves felt. These contradictions are determined by diverse factors: the preservation over a prolonged period of different social classes; the difference in initial levels of economic development between the various parts of each socialist country, and subsequently, when the socialist system arises, between the different socialist countries; traditional and more recent differences of a national character, and lastly, the influence exerted by the heritage and traditions of the past on the political and cultural development of the socialist countries and the relations between them.

To this should be added the subjective factors and limitations determined by the different nature of the revolutionary process in each in-

dividual country, the difference in the character and level of development of class consciousness and the cultural, ideological and political level of the various parties, the particular experience of struggle gained by each party and the diverse methods by which this experience is combined with that of other parties. In this way a picture may be obtained of the problems of the socialist revolution on a truly world-wide scale.

It is precisely in the totality of all these factors that one must seek the origin of the difficulties, the problems, the causes of friction in the socialist camp today, and — in a more general sense — the origin of that profound differentiation which characterizes the development of the socialist countries. Failure to understand that this differentiation is an objective factor of the present situation, that a good many countries are today taking their own particular road to socialism, is the source of serious errors. For this reason, too, it is necessary to opose the campaign which the Chinese comrades are conducting against socialist Yugoslavia, depicting is as a country where capitalism is being restored, thereby repeating and emphasizing appraisals and judgements that have been repudiated by the Communist parties.

The way to overcome the difficulties and remove the causes of the present friction is not by anathemas or — still worse — by launching a struggle for the domination of the Communist movement by any one party or state — which is evidently what the Chinese comrades want. Such a course can only lead to serious clashes, to disastrous dissension, to splits. The correct way, on the contrary, is to take full account of the sum-total of the problems arising in the socialist camp, their roots and interrelations, and to strive, with due foresight and realism, to remove the causes of the trouble.

It seems to us that it is particularly important today to examine, both theoretically and on a practical, political plane, the role played in the socialist camp , and indeed in the entire modern world, by national factors and motives. Lenin foresaw that the historical heritage of nations would for a long time exert a tremendous influence on the building of the socialist society. But, besides this, it is necessary to ascertain whether new obstacles and of what nature may appear as a result of the particular way in which one or another socialist country came into being, its organization and leadership, and of errors committed in the past (and also more recently) in the relations between these states. We have here a whole province as yet inadequately investigated by Marxist thought, a province of paramount importance for the full application in principle and in practice of internationalism in the relations between the socialist states. This question, incidentally, has a direct bearing on other questions of vital importance for the unity and progress of the entire socialist camp, viz., the search for more advanced forms of international division of labour, and the building of relations between the socialist states consistently founded on mutual solidarity and full equality.

The socialist countries can hardly expect to attain the great objectives they have set themselves today unless their economy and development plans are properly dovetailed. Through international division of labour this coordination would enable the entire socialist camp and each country separately to increase their production capacity, achieve a higher rate of growth of productivity, a new level of technological development, and a steady improvement in the living standards of the population.

Eliminating the serious lag that exists in this respect is evidently the primary condition for raising the living standards of the peoples building socialism, for mutual assistance between the socialist countries, as well as for the help they must render the peoples fighting for economic independence, and in a more general sense, for victory in the economic contest with capitalism. On the other hand, if the international division of labour in the socialist camp is to be fruitful and effective, it must be based solely on mutual understanding and on consultations and democratic decisions adopted by all the socialist countries on an equal footing.

This type of cooperation between nations and states, which has no precedent in the history of mankind, cannot be built up overnight. It becomes all the more complicated and difficult when it is a matter of passing over from simple forms of economic solidarity to measures involving organic coordination, and when established routine, backwardness and even past mistakes have to be overcome in the process. But the new problems and circumstances arising from the very victories of the socialist camp cannot be ignored without serious consequences. When, for example, the Soviet Union embarks on the difficult task of transition to a higher stage of socialism this is an objective necessity conditioned by the same forces which were set in motion by the building of socialism, by the higher degree of maturity of the socialist society as a whole and also by the necessity to compete with capitalism. The very striving of the Soviet peoples for a better life is engendered by the new requirements, by the fact that the masses have become aware of these requirements, and by a will to progress that cannot be stifled. It would be absurd, indeed impossible, to demand that the Soviet people should halt their progress. On the contrary, it is necessary to urge them to continue to forge ahead boldly and unswervingly in order that their new gains might give fresh impetus to the socialist camp as a whole, to all the peoples fighting against imperialism. It is necessary, on the contrary, to strive for a system of democratic cooperation in the socialist camp as would make it possible consistently to maintain a just balance between the development needs of the various countries in the interests of the struggle and the common cause.

It is of primary significance not only for economic development but also for the continued success of the socialist countries, for the entire working-class and Communist movement, to overcome and finally eli-

minate the unlawful restrictions, violations of democratic principles and socialist legality which too long cast a shadow on the ideals of socialism and impeded the economic upbuilding and the democratic development both of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. These grievous violations created serious obstacles to the spread of socialist influence in the world, and, moreover, armed our enemies with a weapon which they are still using against us. The dissemination of our ideas to the countries still under capitalism will be all the more successful if the economic accomplishments in the socialist countries are accompanied by the development of democracy in all aspects of the life of society.

Hence the defence by the Chinese comrades of the methods based on the personality cult is both erroneous and dangerous. The extension of socialist democracy and the participation of the masses in the adoption of all cardinal decisions affecting the socialist society are vitally necessary for the full development of the creative forces of the socialist system in the economic and political spheres, for building the new culture and art and in order to win more millions of people all over the world for our just cause.

IV. On the Unity of the International Communist Movement

1. In view of the serious problems confronting our movement and the existing differences, discussion between the Communist parties is both inevitable and essential. Unity on the basis of correct revolutionary orientation should be achieved as a result of political and theoretical quests, through the interchange of experience and opinions among all the parties. It is, however, of the utmost importance that the debate, the political and ideological struggle, should be conducted in such a way as to avoid exasperation and rupture. It would be a grave mistake to allow the difficulties, the divergencies and the differentiation existing today to induce us to abandon the struggle for the ideological and political unity of the Communist movement on an international scale. On the other hand, the disruptive and factional activity carried on latterly by the Chinese comrades is damaging this unity and should be rebuffed.

Unity and international solidarity are for us Communists an integral and inalienable part of our ideology, one of the basic reasons for the existence of every Communist Party. It is the foundation of the whole strategy of our struggle against imperialism, for peace and peaceful coexistence, for the liberation of peoples, for socialism, a condition of the successful approach to those new ideological and political tasks which now confront us. Any weakening of this unity can only benefit the forces of imperialism.

The unity of the Communist movement is founded on identity of class interests, community of socialist objectives, on proletarian internationalism and the doctrine by which the Communist parties

are guided. It is necessitated by the strength and aggressiveness of the class enemy.

The problems, the forms, the nature of this unity, however, cannot be assessed by yesterday's criteria; the many new factors, objective and subjective, in the present situation must be taken into account. Hence we affirm that any return to the organizational forms which existed in the past is out of the question. The only conceivable, realistic and necessary course in the present situation is *unity through difference and autonomy.*

There is no contradiction between the demand for unity in our movement and the demand for autonomy and independence for every Party. What does autonomy for each Party signify? It signifies full respect for the principle of non-interference by any one Party in the internal life of other parties, while allowing for necessary debate and confrontation of opinions. Autonomy means that each Party is responsible to its own people for its own policy only and for its own contribution to the general orientation and the progress of the movement as a whole, but cannot bear direct responsibility for the policy or actions of other parties in whose decisions it has not participated, particularly when such decisions conflict with the general principles guiding our movement. And what is most important, autonomy implies a search in each country for that revolutionary strategy and tactics, those ways forward and forms of struggle that could enable each Party to take full account of the concrete conditions and specific features of the given country and thus become the leading force in the working-class and popular movement.

Implicit in this intensive search, and in the revolutionary path charted by each Party, is the thesis concerning the need for a common struggle against imperialism, fidelity to the principles of Marxism and proletarian internationalism, militant solidarity with the socialist states, with the working people of all countries, with the oppressed peoples fighting for their emancipation. That is how we understand our autonomy and how we propose to continue to carry it into life. But there is nothing in this autonomy that could lead to narrow national exclusiveness. On the contrary, it is becoming the most effective means of enabling each Party to make the most tangible contribution to the elaboration of a common strategy, to the development of theory, to the progress of our entire movement and to consolidating the unity of this movement on a higher plane.

2. It is precisely on the basis of this principle of "unity through difference and autonomy" that the forms of contact and cooperation between the Communist parties and the method and tone of discussion within our movement should, in our opinion, be examined.

Our Party is of the opinion that bilateral contacts should be the principal form of communication, debate and cooperation between the parties.

These should not be formal contacts; they should be established

in such a way as to lead to genuine debate and confrontation of positions, to frank and fraternal discussion of points at issue, to an objective and profound examination of one another's position and experience. Our Party has done much work in recent years in the sphere of bilateral contacts and exchange of delegations.

We intend to continue and expand this activity, sending delegations to the socialist countries and the countries of Western Europe and as often as possible receiving delegations of other parties in our own country, endeavouring in this way to extend contacts also with parties and revolutionary movements in other continents (especially Latin America and Africa). We believe that a deeper study of their problems and needs is essential at the present time, and that they, in turn, may possibly find some of our own experience of interest to them.

Highly useful too, in our opinion — as the initial efforts in this direction made in Western Europe (the conference of 17 parties in 1959) have demonstrated — are contacts, meetings and cooperation between parties in various areas of the world which have major problems and tasks in common. Here, too, it might be advisable to establish more regular forms of consultation and coordination of action. Inasmuch as this concerns us in particular, we shall work as before to establish such forms of contact in the Common Market area and throughout capitalist Europe.

We realize that there are times when it is of particular importance to hold international conferences of the entire Communist movement for the purpose of jointly enriching and deepening the assessment of the world situation, clarifying the basic lines of our world strategy or examining some particular issues. The basic consideration in convening such conferences, however, should be the real possibilities they offer for deepening the analysis of the situation and elaborating a joint orientation, defining clear-cut conclusions and consolidating the unity of the movement as a whole. The usefulness and effectiveness of such conferences depend to a large extent on proper timing, adequate preparation, a clear and realistic approach to the questions to be discussed and the objectives which can and should be achieved.

As regards the timeliness of convening another international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties in the near future in view of the situation now obtaining in the Communist movement, our Party considers it its duty to make some reservations on this score. Such a conference might well find itself confronted today with the choice of two alternative solutions, both of which would be prejudicial to the Communist movement: either the further aggravation of the present contradictions to the point, perhaps, of a split, or else a completely formal and unsatisfactory compromise. It is unlikely that the conference would be able to approach the analysis and elaboration of the new problems in an objective spirit and thus to take an effective if only partial step towards consolidating the political and ideological unity of our movement. And this is precisely the direction

in which we must work at the present time. But for this, certain conditions and possibilities are essential which evidently do not yet exist at the present time and which require a great deal of complex preparatory work.

For progress to be made in this direction and also for the fruitful development of the discussion between the Communist parties generally, it is important that the method and tone of the debate should not exacerbate the disagreement, should not lead to a rupture and split, but should contribute to an objective and realistic confrontation of positions.

Of course it would be utopian blindness not to see that in the present conditions the discussion of the differences and the struggle for the correct political line are bound in many respects to develop into a passionate controversy.

However, quite another thing — and something which must be resolutely condemned — are the insults, anathemas and charges of betrayal which the Chinese comrades were the first to hurl at other Communist parties including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which has made and is still making the greatest contribution to the cause of the socialist revolution, peace, and the emancipation of the peoples. Quite another matter are also the appeals, the disruptive activity, the impermissible factional activity in which the Chinese comrades are engaging. Quite another thing, equally reprehensible, is the arbitrary distortion of the theses and policies of other parties, a method which has evidently become the stock-in-trade of the Chinese comrades in their slanderous attacks on our Party. And lastly, a cause for grave concern is the fact that the aggravation of the polemic has gone so far as to have invaded and adversely affected the sphere of state relations between the socialist countries.

Our Party which has participated in the discussion in the international Communist movement, and intends to continue to do so even more actively in the future, has sought and always will seek to avoid any form of discussion that might exacerbate the polemic. Firmly upholding, as we have always done and always will do, our positions, our ideological and political orientation, our heritage won through the struggle and experience of all our comrades, rejecting and exposing the attacks and erroneous stand taken by the Chinese comrades, we shall continue to do everything in our power to ensure that the discussion is conducted on the basis of the fraternal relations, the understanding and mutual respect which should always exist between Communist parties.

3. All these years, even at the time of the dramatic events in the international Communist movement and the socialist countries, and today too in connection with the debate with the Chinese comrades, we have carried on an animated, serious and democratic discussion within the Party and have succeeded in rebuffing the attacks of our opponents and foiling the efforts of all those who have sought in

vain to force our Party to abandon its correct political line for sectarian or opportunist positions, and of all who have tried to sow distrust and corruption in our ranks.

More and more of our comrades have been giving deeper thought to the political line of the Party, acquiring a more profound understanding of its substance, not only through theoretical study but through practical ideological and political struggle as well. In this way the Party has acquired a more mature critical revolutionary consciousness.

Under these circumstances the new and complex problems confronting our Party, particularly in connection with the present situation in the international Communist movement, should help us to overcome any reluctance to break with habitual positions, should foster the full development of initiative, revolutionary spirit and revolutionary steadfastness in all fields — theoretical, cultural, political and practical.

As regards the independent contribution we want to make to the discussion and the present struggle, we shall continue our efforts to deepen our ideological and political line of advance to socialism. Our participation in the discussion between the Communist parties, all our initiative on the international plane, will centre around the major problem of the role which the working class of Western Europe can and should play within the framework of the world-wide strategy of the struggle for peace, for democracy, for socialism.

It is quite clear, however, that the contribution which a large revolutionary, democratic and popular force such as our Party is destined to make in the major issues of elaborating and carrying out world revolutionary strategy is not only a contribution to the discussion; it is at the same time, and above all, a contribution compounded of struggle, successes and victories testifying to the validity of the road to socialism which we are offering our country. Hence it is of the utmost importance to link as closely as possible the discussion under way in our ranks with our activities in the country, our struggle for peace and for a new course in Italian policy, both foreign and domestic, with our dialogue and search for broader contacts with the popular masses and with all working-class and democratic forces. At the present time when preparations are under way for our national conference, we must draw from the present discussion fresh stimulus for the political and ideological consolidation of the Party, for the expansion and improvement of its organizational activity, for developing inner-Party democracy and, at the same time, for strengthening political unity, cohesion and discipline in our ranks.

■ ■ ■

Defend General Line of World Communist Movement against Dogmatist Onslaught

Resolution Adopted by National Council of Communist Party of India

The National Council of the Communist Party of India notes with deep concern and anxiety the serious turn which the ideological differences in the international Communist movement have lately taken.

The world Communist movement is today not only armed with a common ideology — Marxism-Leninism. It has common goals and is also equipped with a common programme, brilliantly set forth in the November 1957 Moscow Declaration and the November 1960 Moscow Statement. Moreover, the international Communist movement, which has registered stupendous success and victories is enriched by the living experience of the international working class and all other world revolutionary forces.

Under these circumstances, there is no reason why the differences in the ranks of the Communist movement should have at all reached the present critical stage, threatening a split in the movement.

The National Council of the C.P.I. considers it necessary to state here that this present disturbing situation has arisen primarily because the leadership of the Communist Party of China has now moved far away from the collective, general line of the international Communist movement, launched an all-out offensive against this unanimously agreed line and confronted the entire movement with its own so-called general line, particularly elaborated in the 14th June Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

This alternative line, unilaterally decided by one single party, runs counter to the Moscow Declaration and Moscow Statement, Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Further, the leadership of the Communist Party of China has chosen to push its own line through methods which defy the norms laid down in the Moscow Statement and violate the international discipline of the revolutionary working class.

For a long time now the international Communist movement and

Reprinted from the *New Age*, October 27, 1963.

its general line have not been faced with such a challenge from within its ranks. Beginning with the divergent views on some separate questions, the leadership of the Communist Party of China has extended its differences to a wide range of principles, raised new questions and elaborated a dogmatic, sectarian and adventurist platform which is being pressed forward as the only correct line for the world Communist movement.

The National Council of the C.P.I. is of the opinion that when the collective view of the world Communist movement is so challenged and assailed, it becomes the internationalist duty of all Marxist-Leninist Parties to defend the common line and unwaveringly uphold it. Without this the fraternal parties cannot discharge their responsibilities towards the working people of their own countries and to the international working class movement.

For, adherence to the general and the collective decision of the world Communist movement is inseparable from the tasks of determination by the fraternal parties of their concrete policies and tactics — in short the political line — for their respective countries. In view of these considerations, the National Council deems it necessary to briefly examine the so-called general line of the C.P.C. leadership and state the views of the Communist Party of India on it.

Chinese Leadership's Stand Analyzed

The National Council of the C.P.I. is fully conscious that a correct, Marxist-Leninist analysis of *the character of our present epoch* is essential for working out the strategy and tactics of the international working class and world revolutionary movement. This task has been magnificently discharged by the November 1957 and November 1960 Moscow meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties and the conclusions are set forth in the Declaration and the Statement.

The main content of our epoch is that it is an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. The most distinctive feature is that the world socialist system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of human society. These factors eminently signify the great change in the balance of world forces, giving rise to real opportunities for solving the cardinal problems of our time in a new way.

The C.P.C. leadership discounts, if it does not virtually ignore, these two highly important aspects of the present epoch. It appears that the C.P.C. leadership still understands the epoch as one of only imperialism and proletarian revolution.

Naturally it almost passes over the real opportunities which are the offspring of the epoch and this incorrect appraisal would seem particularly pronounced when it comes to the questions of concrete policies and practice. This departure of the Chinese leaders would perhaps explain the root of their dogmatic and sectarian position on many other important questions of both theory and practice.

The National Council of the C.P.I. notes that the C.P.C. leadership has radically revised the collective, Marxist-Leninist standpoint about *the main contradiction in modern society.* According to the C.P.C. leaders, the principal contradiction is not between capitalism and socialism but between imperialism and national liberation.

This departure on the question of the main contradiction leads to another erroneous conclusion. The Chinese leaders contend that the focal points of the contradiction in the world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the national-liberation struggles are being conducted. The Chinese leaders have gone to the length of saying that the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles in these areas.

All this is a complete misinterpretation of the contradictions in the modern world and is contrary to the propositions of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

Even before the world socialist system came into existence, the contradiction between capitalism and socialism was regarded by Marxists-Leninists as the main contradiction. With the emergence of the world socialist system and the tremendous manner in which it is influencing the world developments, as well as the advance of the international working-class movement, this contradiction has immensely sharpened. It is astonishing that the C.P.C. leadership should have abandoned the correct Marxist-Leninist understanding now of all times.

The National Council of the C.P.I. fully acknowledges the great revolutionary role of the national-liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and the shattering blows they are delivering to imperialism. There must be no underestimation of this great revolutionary force. But with all these, the decisive role in the development of human society and the world revolutionary process is not played by the national-liberation struggles but by the international working class and its chief creation — the world socialist system.

It is not difficult to see that the national-liberation struggles by themselves do not end the socio-economic basis of imperialism — state-monopoly capital — in the imperialist countries. This is a task for the revolutionary working class of these countries to accomplish. Further, it is the international working-class movement and the socialist camp which ensure the success of national liberation.

The Chinese view of the focal points of contradictions is again wrong and contrary to Marxism-Leninism. The National Council is of the opinion that the focal points are precisely those where the main contradictions of our epoch are being resolved — that is, the contradictions between capitalism and socialism. These are being resolved, first and foremost, where the most organized and powerful forces of socialism stand face to face with the forces of imperialism.

This means that the contradictions between the world socialist

system and the world capitalist system are focal points, if one would prefer this description. The line of the C.P.C. seeks to replace the social class standpoint by a geopolitical approach. The National Council naturally rejects this view of the Chinese leaders.

The National Council notes the new proposition of the so-called "intermediate zone" which the Chinese leaders have advanced. At the very outset, the Council considers it necessary to point out that such a concept does not find even a mention in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement.

The Chinese leaders put the U.S.A. in one bracket and all the other imperialist powers, advanced capitalist countries and the newly liberated nations in another bracket to describe them as constituting the so-called "intermediate zone". This is a perverse and politically misleading picture of the present-day world.

No one will deny the inter-imperialist contradictions between the U.S.A. and other imperialist powers, nor the U.S. designs of world domination. But it is highly misleading to present the other imperialist powers as if they were mere objects of such designs of the U.S. imperialists.

The Moscow Statement, which the C.P.C. leaders have revised even on this point, however, lays stress on the imperialist military blocs such as NATO, CENTO and SEATO, which are first and foremost spearheaded against the socialist camp, as also against other countries, especially those in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Chinese concept of an "intermediate zone" is liable to lead to an underestimation of dangers posed by the imperialist blocs and to the blunting of vigilance against them. This thesis of the C.P.C. underplays the neo-colonialism of Britain, France, West Germany, Japan and so on.

It underplays the grave threat arising from the revenge-seeking West German imperialism to which the Moscow Statement draws particular attention. The National Council cannot accept this wholly wrong and harmful thesis of "intermediate zone".

In this connection, the National Council cannot but point out that, while inventing an unrealistic and harmful thesis about the so-called "intermediate zone", the Chinese leaders and the June 14 Letter do not have a word to say about the vast peace zone, comprised of the socialist countries and the non-aligned, newly liberated nations pursuing the broad policy of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism in the world arena. Their contributions are highly appraised by the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement but the C.P.C. leaders seem to have written them off.

Prime Task

The Moscow Statement regards the fight for peace as the prime task of all Communists. The Communists and Workers' parties, in their Declaration and Statement, firmly hold the view that the real possibility

has arisen for averting a world war by the combined efforts of all peace forces. To fight for preventing world war demands, above all, active struggles and efforts in all directions for peaceful coexistence. General and complete disarmament is a principal way of ensuring peaceful coexistence.

From their various theses and pronouncements, as well as from their concrete policies and actions, it is apparent that the Chinese leaders, while verbally recognizing the possibility of preventing war, do not look upon the struggle for peace and for peaceful coexistence in the confident spirit of the Declaration and the Statement or from the standpoint of these programmatic documents of the world Communist movement. In the first place, they put more or less equal emphasis on the possibility of averting war and on the possibility of its breaking out, whereas the clear position of the world Communist movement is that the possibility for the prevention of war is already greater and is growing day by day.

The Chinese view is that war cannot be eliminated from the life of society so long as imperialism exists. This is in flat contradiction with the line of the Statement which recognizes the possibility of eliminating war even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world. The position of the C.P.C. in effect amounts to the acceptance of inevitability of war so long as imperialism remains.

The Moscow Statement says that the only alternative to a destructive war is peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems and calls upon all Communists, especially the Communists in socialist countries, to conduct resolute struggles for the victory of the policy of peaceful coexistence, for compelling the imperialists by such struggles to accept peaceful coexistence.

In their view of the burning problem of war and peace facing mankind, the November 1960 Appeal and the Statement regard peaceful coexistence as the "cornerstone" and the "foundation" of the foreign policy of the socialist countries. The Chinese leaders repudiate this approach and declare that it "is wrong to make peaceful coexistence the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries". The National Council of the C.P.I. considers that this departure from the common line not only greatly weakens the role of the socialist countries in the world affairs but complicates the struggle for peace.

General and complete disarmament is regarded by the international Communist movement as a principal way of ensuring peaceful coexistence. There exists the real possibility for the realization of this objective, although the task is by no means easy.

The Moscow Statement presents this as a "fighting slogan of the masses" but the Chinese leaders say that it is an "illusion" to expect general and complete disarmament so long as the system of imperialism and of exploitation of man by man exists. Even while conceding that there may be "some kind of agreement on disarmament", the C.P.C. leaders

understand the struggle for disarmament not as a question of principle but only as a means to expose imperialism. The line of the C.P.C. leaders on such a vital issue is thus clearly a repudiation of the Moscow Statement.

The National Council of the C.P.I. is of the view that the Chinese position can only weaken the struggle for disarmament and minimize the importance of concrete steps in this direction.

In this connection, the National Council of the C.P.I. cannot but take serious note of the line of the Chinese leaders on the Moscow Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. Although the June 14 C.C. C.P.C. Letter ostensibly recognizes the possibility of banning nuclear weapons, they have nonetheless chosen to attack this important constructive step which, *in addition to restricting nuclear tests and hindering the nuclear arms race, brightens the prospects for a total ban on all tests and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.*

Although the rocket-nuclear shield created by the Soviet Union ensures the security of all socialist countries, including the People's Republic of China, the C.P.C. leaders would like the People's Republic of China and other socialist countries equipped with nuclear weapons. But this can only help the acceleration of the nuclear arms race on the part of the imperialists.

Slander Denounced

For taking the initiative and signing the Treaty, the Soviet Union is equated with the imperialist powers — U.S.A. and Britain — and all this is indiscriminately described as a "nuclear monopoly". Further, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. is accused of "allying with the forces of war to oppose the forces of peace, allying with the United States to oppose China, and allying with the reactionaries of all countries to oppose the peoples of the world". These slanderous and absurd statements would lay bare the real attitude of the Chinese leaders towards the struggle for resisting the nuclear arms race, the banning of such weapons of mass destruction, for disarmament.

The National Council of the C.P.I. repudiates the stand of the C.P.C. leaders and acclaims the Test-Ban Treaty as one of the most significant constructive steps in the direction of nuclear disarmament. This step has already contributed to some palpable relaxation of international tension and strengthened the forces of peace. The Test-Ban Treaty eminently conforms to the interests of all peace-loving people.

The National Council would like to recall here the attitude of the C.P.C. leaders in the critical days of the Caribbean crisis. When the Soviet Union first took all practical steps for the defence of the Cuban Republic against an impending invasion and then, after foiling it, took wise measures to prevent a thermonuclear flare-up, the Chinese leaders assumed the role of critics. They called the delivery of missiles to Cuba, which was an important factor in thwarting the imperialist

invasion plan, an "adventurism" and they decried the withdrawal of the missiles which averted the nuclear war as "capitulationism".

The international Communist movement rightly criticized the behaviour of the C.P.C. leaders in relation to the Caribbean crisis, for from the beginning to the end it was highly irresponsible and contrary to the line of the world Communist movement.

The National Council of the C.P.I. has already stated its view on the policy of the C.P.C. leaders in regard to the India—China border question and has always considered the Chinese line as contrary to the spirit and letter of the Declaration and the Statement, as contrary to the guiding principles of peaceful coexistence.

The National Council has also pointed out the great damage the Chinese leaders have done by their nationalistic and adventurist policy to the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity, to the common front against imperialism and to the democratic movement within India. The only beneficiaries of this policy have been imperialism and reaction; democratic and progressive forces suffered all along the line.

Negative Example

The National Council would only like here to add that in the case of India, the Chinese leaders have demonstrated *how not to* work for Afro-Asian solidarity or for the success of the policy of peaceful coexistence. The attitude of the Chinese leaders on the India—China question had given a foretaste of some of their theses now elaborated in their so-called general line.

The policy of peaceful coexistence calls for purposeful and painstaking efforts in all directions for mobilizing all peace forces in a common struggle against imperialism and war. In this context, the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement evaluate highly the positive role of the newly liberated, non-aligned nations.

It is in particular the task of the socialist countries to draw these nations closer to the socialist camp. But the so-called general line of the C.P.C. leadership discounts the role of these non-aligned countries in the struggle for world peace, against imperialism and colonialism.

It is no wonder that the C.P.C. leadership should have adopted such a negative and harmful attitude towards India in clear violation of the world Communist movement.

Further, an active policy of peaceful coexistence is inconceivable without negotiations and even, on occasion, without certain concessions and compromises. But the C.P.C. leadership more often than not, denounces the moves for the relaxation of international tension and against cold war, for improving the East-West relations, etc., as "embellishing imperialism", "cowardice", "surrender to nuclear blackmail", "betrayal of revolution" and so on.

These groundless accusations not only underline the special, diver-

gent line of the C.P.C. leaders but are apparently aimed at discrediting the policy of peaceful coexistence.

The National Council further notes that in putting themselves against the line of the Declaration and the Statement, the C.P.C. leaders often ascribe views to the leaderships of the C.P.S.U. and of other fraternal parties which they, in fact, have never held at all. For example, the C.P.S.U. leadership and others are accused of renouncing class struggle in pursuance of the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. But they have always maintained that, far from renouncing class struggle, peaceful coexistence presupposes intensified ideological, political and economic struggles between socialism and capitalism in the world arena.

Further, peaceful coexistence also implies sharp class struggles within the capitalist countries, which indeed are also facilitated by the struggle for peace. It is a pure invention on the part of the Chinese leaders that some people in the international Communist movement have proposed peaceful coexistence between the oppressed peoples fighting for national liberation and the oppressors, the imperialists.

On the contrary, the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal Communist parties have always held that the national-liberation struggles should be intensified and that they help the struggle for peace just as the latter creates favourable conditions for the success of national-liberation movements. Policy of peaceful coexistence only means that the debate between socialism and capitalism in the world arena must not be settled through war. As far as the world Communist movement is concerned, it regards peace as an ally of socialism — a conclusion which one altogether misses in the Chinese statements.

On the question of "local wars", the C.P.C. leadership confuses the issues by mixing up the local wars started by the imperialists and the just national-liberation wars which are not only necessary but inevitable so long as imperialism and colonialism remain. The Communists have always supported such just wars of national liberation and will continue to do so. But it is the confirmed view of the international Communist movement that the possibilities have arisen today for bridling the imperialists and preventing them even from starting local wars.

The National Council is with the rest of the world Communist movement in taking a very serious view of such aggressive local wars, for a local war in the present thermonuclear age may easily touch off a nuclear conflagration. It is evident from the Chinese statements that they do not take the same view about the possibility of preventing local wars but, on the contrary, are at pains to explain how some local wars in the recent years have not led to a world war. This is a dangerous approach and is contrary to the standpoint of the Moscow Declaration and Statement.

Nuclear Weapons

The National Council also disagrees with the attitude of the C.P.C. in regard to the assessment of the *nuclear weapons* and the character of *a thermonuclear war.* The Council is of the definite opinion that in order to rouse and activize the masses against nuclear weapons and a thermonuclear war, it is absolutely essential to inform them of the destructive powers of these weapons. Hence the Council is of the view that the declarations such as "atom bomb is a paper tiger" or "atom bomb is not terrible at all" can only mislead the people and disorientate the active struggle for nuclear disarmament and against nuclear war.

Equally does the National Council disagree with the statement that a civilization thousand times superior will be built on the ruins of imperialism destroyed by a nuclear war. The Communists want to build a better civilization not on ruins brought by nuclear war but without having to go through a nuclear destruction.

The National Council is of the opinion that such statements do not help to rouse the masses with the boundless confidence that war can be prevented and imperialism wiped off the face of the earth without a world war. Such observations are liable to create wrong impressions about Communists and are not in conformity with their historic mission to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

Liberation Struggle

The National Council of the C.P.I. finds that on the question of *national-liberation struggles,* the C.P.C. leadership has advanced a number of formulations and theses contrary to the Declaration and the Statement. They manifestly contradict the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In their latest theses, the Chinese leaders do not recognize that it is the international working class and world socialist system which ensure rapid and decisive victories for national-liberation struggles and the consolidation of the newly won independence.

The Chinese leaders also ignore the Marxist-Leninist appraisal of the Moscow Statement which highlights the fact that the struggles of the working people building socialism and communism in the socialist countries, the revolutionary movement of the working people in the capitalist countries, the national-liberation struggle of the oppressed nations and the general democratic movement merge into the powerful current that undermines and destroys world capitalism. The C.P.C. leaders view the national-liberation struggle not as a component of this integrated world revolutionary process but in isolation from the socialist camp and the international working-class movement.

They counterpose the national-liberation struggles to the struggle

for peaceful coexistence, to the democratic struggles of the working people in the capitalist countries as well as to the policies pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in defence of world peace. The Chinese leaders minimize the great role of the socialist camp and of the working class in the imperialist countries in supporting and quickening the process of national liberation.

This line of the C.P.C. leaders can only lead to the isolation of the national-liberation struggles and weaken them. From the theses of the Chinese leaders the most urgent task of strengthening the bonds of the national-liberation movement with the socialist camp and the working-class and democratic movements in the capitalist countries does not at all emerge. The National Council of the C.P.I. cannot but feel deeply concerned at such an erroneous approach and such theses.

National liberation is not completed with the attainment of political independence. It is continued in the newly liberated countries in the manifold anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic tasks for winning economic independence and generally for national rebirth. All these tasks are a part of the world-wide national emancipation process, undermining the very foundations of imperialism and colonialism. In fulfilling these tasks, the friendship and cooperation between the socialist countries and the newly liberated nations, especially the disinterested economic assistance by the socialist countries to the latter, are of decisive importance. Such assistance, as has been seen, plays a great anti-imperialist role.

The international Communist movement attaches great importance to this aspect of national-liberation struggles. But the June 14 C.C. C.P.C. Letter simply ignores all this. The National Council of the C.P.I. takes it as a serious deviation from the common line of the world Communist movement.

In this connection, the Council repudiates the irresponsible criticism by the Chinese leaders of the Soviet assistance to India. The Council wouid like to emphatically state that economic assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has played a singularly useful part in consolidating India's independence and in resisting imperialism and domestic reaction on the part of the Indian people. It is surprising the C.P.C. leaders should have guided themselves by some exclusive, narrow considerations, which have nothing in common with proletarian internationalism.

The December 1960 Moscow Statement outlines the prospects of non-capitalist development as the best way to abolish age-long backwardness and improve the living standards of the people in the countries which have newly won their political independence. The Statement, however, elaborates the concept of the state of *national democracy* which, given the correct political line and militant struggles of the people, my serve as a form of transition to the road of socialist development. But the June 14 C.C. C.P.C. Letter and the so-called general line it adumbrates brush aside this concept and prescribe the

slogan of "people's democracy or all newly liberated countries, irrespective of their stage of development."

The Chinese leaders do not explain as to how people's democracy, which is a form of dictatorship of the proletariat, can be established in those newly liberated underdeveloped countries where there is no working class or a Communist Party. The slogan of people's democracy for these countries cannot but lead to the weakening of the national-democratic front.

Forms of Transition

The National Council of the C.P.I. thoroughly disagrees with the one-sided, dogmatic approach of the Chinese leaders in regard to the question of *form of transition to socialism.* While fully taking into account the possibility of both peaceful and non-peaceful transition, the Declaration and the Statement explain what is particularly new in the situation. They explain that in the present epoch, with its great change in the relation of world forces in favour of socialism, possibilities have arisen in a number of countries to win state power by the working people through peaceful means and without a civil war.

No one has, of course, suggested that the ruling classes are going to relinquish power voluntarily or capitalism will "automatically disappear". The Marxist-Leninist view is that, whatever the form of transition, peaceful or non-peaceful, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are essential for transition to socialism.

And it goes without saying that a socialist revolution cannot be accomplished without sharp class struggles and without a militant mass revolutionary movement. It is, therefore, entirely wrong for the C.P.C. leaders to suggest that the leaderships of the C.P.S.U. and of some other parties have given up the concept of class struggle or socialist revolution.

The departure of the Chinese leaders from the Declaration and the Statement lies in the fact that they do not recognize the possibility of the peaceful way and all their arguments are precisely aimed at justifying their own view that nonpeaceful means is the only way, and negating the line of the Moscow documents. According to them, the thesis about peaceful transition is based on "historical idealism" and they argue that there are no historical precedents for peaceful transition.

It should be stated here that Marxists-Leninists never guide themselves by mere historical precedents. Nor can an advanced theory be developed only on the basis of what happened yesterday.

In this connection, the National Council would like to state that what form the transition will take in this or that country depends on a whole complex of objective and subjective factors, both external and internal — mainly internal. It is for the Communist parties of the countries concerned to decide the question of form and not for other fraternal

parties to dictate. The Chinese polemics against the fraternal Communist parties like the Italian and the French Communist parties on the question amount to interference in their internal affairs.

Twentieth Congress

The National Council of the C. P. I. notes with amazement the denunciation by the C. P. C. leadership of the conclusions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the C. P. S. U., including the great C. P. S. U. Programme adopted by the latter. The Communist Party of India had welcomed and acclaimed these two historic C. P. S. U. Congresses and once again records its highest appreciation of them.

The 20th Congress of the C. P. S. U. was highly appraised as a historic event by the Communist and Workers' Parties, including the Communists of China, not only severally but also collectively. This unanimous appraisal is embodied in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. These two Moscow documents fully appreciate the historic significance of the decisions of the 20th Congress as well as their contribution to the cause of Communist construction and in initiating a new stage in the world Communist movement.

It is further put on record in these documents of the world Communist movement that the decisions of the 20th Congress have promoted development of the entire movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The C. P. C. leadership has now come out against all the major conclusions of the 20th Congress of the C. P. S. U. and characterized them as "the first step along the road to revisionism".

Against the Cult

The C. P. C. leadership is particularly up in arms against the struggle against Stalin's personality cult, which the 20th Congress initiated and which has been crowned with great success not only for the C. P. S. U. and the Soviet people but for the entire international Communist movement. Despite certain reservations, the C. P. C. leadership had earlier publicly supported, in the main, the struggle against the personality cult. Now it has made a complete *volte face* and is decrying the struggle for combating the harmful consequences of the personality cult as something which is "in effect directed against Marxism-Leninism".

The National Council stands solidly in support of the struggle against the personality cult. This is another crying evidence of the Chinese leaders' break from the collective positions of the world Communist movement — from the Declaration and the Statement. Any concessions to the ideology and practice of the personality cult would be extremely harmful and indeed dangerous for the international Communist movement. There is no need to revive this question which has already been settled.

★

The polemics and attacks of the C. P. C. leaders against the historic 22nd Congress, which summed up the great experience of building socialism and charted the course for full-scale Communist construction would again seem incomprehensible. The Council considers it necessary once again to state here that the Programme of the C. P. S. U. faithfully embodies the conclusions of the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement and upholds the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The National Council of the C. P. I. is in full agreement with the fraternal parties that what unites the Communist movement is far greater than what divides it. The Council also shares the view that if there is a firm adherence to the general line and the guiding principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the differences that may occasionally arise for a variety of reasons in the ranks of the Communist movement can be overcome.

But the Council is at the same time conscious that if the general line is repudiated side by side with efforts to push an alternative line by one or other major party which is in power, the task of overcoming the differences becomes extremely complicated and difficult. The National Council has, therefore, no illusion that the present differences are going to be resolved either easily or at an early date.

However, the National Council of the C. P. I. still hopes that the fundamental loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism will ultimately prevail over the departures from them. With this hope, the National Council expresses its full agreement with the C. P. S. U. and other fraternal parties which have repeatedly proposed to the C. P. C. leadership ending of the open polemics.

Here the National Council wishes to put on record its high appreciation of the constructive proposal for ending polemics, which the C. P. S. U. leadership made at the bilateral talks last July and which has been since repeated. The Council, at the same time, expresses its regret that the C. P. C. leadership should have turned down the proposal. It is, however, hoped the leadership of the C. P. C. will see reason and agree to ending open polemics in the interests of the entire world Communist movement and of its unity. This step is both urgent and essential for further constructive efforts with a view to solving the internal problems of the international Communist movement through resumptions of bilateral talks between the C. P. S. U. and the C. P. C. and, if necessary, by holding another Conference of the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties.

■ ■ ■

Resolution

of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Germany, on the differences between the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the world Communist movement

The Central Committee endorses the assessment of the differences between the international Communist movement and the leadership of the Communist Party of China given in the report of Max Reimann. Approving the standpoint of the Political Bureau on these issues, it reaffirms that the Communist Party of Germany remains loyal to the general line of the Communist and Workers' parties laid down at the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. The Central Committee emphatically denounces the attempts made by the Chinese leaders to impose on the world Communist movement a "general line" directed against the jointly agreed decisions and running counter to Marxism-Leninism; in essence this line can only be characterized as dogmatic, adventurist and nationalist.

1.

In all its policies our Party is guided by the ideas of the Moscow Statement of 1960 that the Communist parties regard the struggle for peace as their paramount task and that world war can be averted as a result of the changed balance of forces. The persistent policy of peace pursued by the socialist countries and the world Communist movement has proved its worth, having immeasurably enhanced the prestige and influence of the Communist parties. Relying on the jointly agreed decisions of the Moscow meetings, the Congress of our Party held in 1963 showed the working class and all peace-loving forces of the Federal Republic the path of struggle for peace, for a policy of peaceful coexistence, disarmament and mutual understanding with the German Democratic Republic.

In view of the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons any struggle for social progress is now inseparably linked with the struggle to avert nuclear war. Neither the socialist and communist construction in the socialist countries nor the spread of the national-

---

Wissen und Tat, Nos. 1—2, January—February 1964.

liberation struggle and the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries for democracy and socialism can be regarded in isolation from this most pressing task, that of preventing nuclear war which would take a toll of millions of lives, exterminate whole nations and throw far back the development of mankind.

That is why our Party considers the Chinese leaders' underestimation of nuclear weapons and the consequences of nuclear war to be both adventurist and reckless, and their speculations about building a "higher civilization" on the ruins left over from an atomic war to be a mockery of the humane spirit of our world outlook. It is the Bonn militarists who seek to minimize the danger of atomic weapons and atomic war in order to conceal from the West German population the criminal and dangerous character of their policy of atomic armament and revenge. Our Party considers it its duty perseveringly to explain to the people the danger arising from this policy and rally them for resolute action against atomic armament.

Although they have affixed their signatures to the decisions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings which speak of the real possibility of averting world war, the Chinese leaders still stubbornly cling to the idea that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists. They take the line of military solution of the contradiction between the two world systems and juggle with the concept of "prodding" the revolution through "revolutionary war", a concept, it should be said, refuted by Lenin himself. This adventurist line derives from overestimation of the forces of imperialism and from disbelief in the forces of socialism and peace. It only serves to disarm the masses and undermine their faith in the success of the struggle against the imperialist instigators of war.

These facts and the experience of recent years show that the Soviet Union and the other socialist states in alliance with the peace forces of the whole world are capable of curbing the warmongers and frustrating imperialist aggression. This was confirmed by developments during the Suez conflict and the Caribbean crisis. On August 13, 1961, this was reaffirmed on German soil when the German Democratic Republic supported by other Warsaw Treaty members fortified its state frontier in Berlin, thereby putting a halt to the military adventure of the West-German imperialists and saving peace.

The Chinese leaders have renounced the struggle for peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems which is the sole way to safeguarding and consolidating peace. Their practical steps are in sharp contrast with the agreed decisions of the world Communist movement and lead to the intensification of international tension and the cold war, to the policy of brinkmanship. The Chinese leaders attack and slander the Soviet government and the governments of other socialist countries which are doing their utmost to lessen tension and reach concrete agreements in the spirit of peaceful coexistence.

The attitude which the Chinese leaders adopted on the question of the border conflict with India, the compromise over the Caribbean crisis and the conclusion of the Moscow partial test-ban treaty is typical of their position. Today it is clear to everyone that thanks to the wise and resolute policy of the Soviet government headed by N. S. Khrushchov, the independence of revolutionary Cuba has been strengthened and world peace saved.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the G.D.R. and other socialist countries, aimed at achieving détente, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, aids those forces in the capitalist countries, especially in the Federal Republic, which are opposed to militarism and imperialism. The policy of peace pursued by the G. D. R. and its proposals for a treaty of accord and good will between the two German states correspond to the sentiment of peace supporters in Federal Germany and meet with increasingly wider response. Our Party and all peace-loving people in the Federal Republic consider it one of their most essential tasks to fight for concrete steps towards détente and disarmament, for the establishment of businesslike relations between the two German states, for the triumph of the policy of peaceful coexistence in the F. R. G.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany emphatically denounces the slander against the Soviet Union spread by the leadership of the Communist Party of China in connection with the Moscow partial test-ban treaty. We regret that the Chinese leaders have embarked on a course which, to all intents and purposes, aids such militarists as Strauss, Adenauer, de Gaulle and the Pentagon "wildmen". One cannot but be surprised by the desire of the Chinese leaders to have their own atomic weapons, their insistence on increasing the number of atomic powers, which can only bring grist to the mill of the German imperialists who are stretching their hands to lay hold on atomic weapons.

Our Party regards the Moscow treaty as a success for the forces of peace, as one of the first steps towards lessening international tension which should be followed by other steps such as the prohibition of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the cessation of underground testing, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries, the establishment of inspection stations against surprise attack, and the creation of atom-free zones. We call on the working class and all the peace-loving people of the Federal Republic to redouble their efforts in order to make Federal Germany abandon its claims to atomic weapons and negotiate with the G. D. R. government on renouncing the use of violence and armament.

The Chinese leaders are trying to counterpose the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems to the class struggle and socialist revolution. But it is precisely peaceful coexistence that is the most concentrated expression of the class struggle between the two

systems, between the socialist and capitalist states. The struggle for the policy of peaceful coexistence in the Federal Republic is the most relentless form of class struggle and the struggle of the people against aggressive monopoly capitalism, against imperialism. The facts of life, the experience of the international working-class movement have shown that peaceful coexistence, far from weakening the class struggle, creates more favourable conditions for the development of the democratic, anti-monopoly struggle of the masses in the capitalist countries, for the movement for national independence, and for building socialism and communism in the socialist countries. Developments confirm the idea of the Moscow Statement that peace is a true ally of socialism.

2.

In their statements the Chinese leaders revise the basic principles of the 81-Party meeting concerning the character of our epoch and the determining role of the working class and of the socialist world system which is becoming the decisive factor of social development. They represent the national-liberation movement as the main force, regarding Asia, Africa and Latin America as the "storm-centres of the world revolution". The fundamental contradiction of our time, according to them, is not the contradiction between the two world systems — socialism and capitalism — but the contradiction between imperialism and the national-liberation movement.

All this amounts to naked revision of the fundamental thesis of Marxism-Leninism — the teaching on the hegemony of the proletariat in the world revolutionary process, the leading role of the working class in the struggle against imperialism and for socialist change. Without the victory of the working class, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the rise and consolidation of the socialist world system, the great victories of the national-liberation movement would have been impossible. The power and influence of the socialist world system have given a tremendous impetus to the anti-imperialist struggle in all its forms and on all continents. Hence the need to rebuff the attempt made by the Chinese leaders to counterpose the national-liberation movement to the socialist states and the revolutionary working-class movement, and to separate them. This attempt is explained by their striving to gain nationalist prestige and power, and can but weaken the general anti-imperialist front of struggle. The closer the ties of the national-liberation movement with the Soviet Union, the socialist world system and the entire revolutionary working-class movement, the greater will be its successes.

The Chinese leaders also question Lenin's thesis that the socialist countries exert their main influence on the world revolutionary process by their economic achievements. But it is indisputable that the force of example, the practical proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism in economics, science and culture, in meeting the material

and cultural needs of the people, is exerting and will continue to exert an ever-growing influence on the minds of the workers in the capitalist countries.

The existence of the first worker-peasant state on German soil, its signal success in building socialism all along the line, in raising labour productivity as well as scientific and technological advance, its notable social and cultural achievements, already today render important aid to the working class and all people in the Federal Republic. These successes have a beneficial effect on the struggle waged by the West German working class, helping the trade unions to wrest concessions from the capitalists. The example of the G. D. R. will make the ideas of socialism still more attractive in Federal Germany.

The Central Committee rejects this adventurist viewpoint of the Chinese leaders prompted by their disbelief in the possibility of socialism's economic victory over capitalism. We reaffirm the following thesis of the Policy Statement endorsed at the Congress of our Party in 1963: socialism does not want war nor does it need war, it will prove its superiority over capitalism in peaceful competition.

3.

At our Congress we outlined the steps to be taken in the struggle for peace and democracy, for united action of the working class, for a broad alliance in defence of the constitutional and democratic rights of the people, for social rights and against monopoly rule. For it is only by stepping up the struggle for these immediate aims that a political change can be effected in the Federal Republic and conditions created in which the popular movement would be able to set more profound and far-reaching democratic and social aims and oust militarism and monopoly.

This path has been confirmed by the entire experience of the German working-class movement since the time of the Brussels Conference of the Communist Party in 1935. It has been reaffirmed by the truly historic victories scored on this path by the working people of the Democratic Republic under the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Therefore, our Party resolutely condemns the attempt of the Chinese leaders to impose a sectarian, adventurist line on the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries, the conditions of which they completely fail to understand. This policy runs counter to the decisions jointly adopted at the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. The Communist and Workers' parties of these countries have won major victories in the struggle for peace, for the social and democratic demands of the working people, for profound social and democratic changes, for an all-embracing anti-monopoly movement of the people. The Leninist road leading the masses to the struggle

for socialism is not the line of "revolutionary" phrasemongering, sectarianism and isolation from the masses, which has been proclaimed by the Chinese leaders, but the path of united action with the Social Democrats and all the democratic forces, the path of a broad alliance of all the anti-monopoly sections of the people in the struggle for peace and democracy, for ousting and defeating militarism and imperialism.

All facts show that the Communist parties have increased their influence by following this road, that by implementing this policy the militancy of the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries has been enhanced, despite the Chinese leaders' attempts to prove the opposite, and that this movement has become more mature both organizationally and ideologically.

Our Party steadfastly abides by the thesis of the Moscow meetings concerning the possibility of a peaceful road of the socialist revolution under specific historical conditions, and rejects the Chinese leaders' attacks on this thesis. We are guided by Lenin's idea that the revolutionary party of the working class should master all forms of the class struggle. At our Congress in 1963 we declared that our Party favours the peaceful road of the socialist revolution in the Federal Republic, and that the possibilities of taking this road are growing as the balance of forces is changing in favour of socialism, both in the world arena and in Germany. At the same time we said that the intensity and forms of class struggle will depend not so much on the working class as on the degree of resistance and use of violence by the reactionary forces.

4.

Our Party indignantly rejects the slander levelled by the C.P.C. leadership at the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee and Comrade Khrushchov. This has nothing whatsoever in common with businesslike discussions customary among comrades, among Communists.

The Communist Party of Germany has long and glorious traditions of fraternal and militant alliance with the C.P.S.U., and it will not keep silence when the Party of Lenin is insulted and reviled. As the 1960 Statement points out, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been and remains the universally recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement. This movement regards its decisions and its Programme as the guiding documents of creative Marxism-Leninism.

Although in the past the Chinese leaders themselves recognized the historic importance of the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and of overcoming the personality cult and its consequences, today they claim that it was "erroneous and harmful" to

raise this question. Developments after the Twentieth Congress and the experience of our own Party have demonstrated that overcoming the personality cult has yielded very fruitful results, that the restoration of the Leninist spirit and style in both theory and practice, the re-establishment of the Leninist standards of Party life, have freed the great cause of communism from mistakes and distortions caused by the Stalin cult, and have led to an unprecedented advance of the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and the international working-class movement as a whole. The creative decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. ushered in a new stage in the development of the international Communist movement.

It is with great surprise that the Central Committee of the C.P.G. notes that the leadership of the C.P.C. grossly violates the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties, interferes in the internal affairs of other parties, including our own Party, and sets up factional groups, using the Trotskyites and other renegades to split the Communist parties. The Chinese leaders have launched similar splitting activities in the international democratic organizations. It is not fortuitous that the Bonn militarists use the materials issued by the Chinese leaders in order to discredit the policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and the G.D.R., to propagate their policy of armament and revenge, and also to sow confusion in the West German working-class movement. Thus the imperialist reactionaries derive direct benefit from the anti-Soviet slander and disruptive activity of the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

The Communist Party of Germany consistently works for the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the agreed decisions of 1957 and 1960. We hope that the Chinese leaders will return to this path, and we will welcome this. The Central Committee of the C.P.G. believes that it would be expedient to accept the proposal of the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal parties on ending open polemics in order to discuss the differences in a businesslike and comradely atmosphere. Our Party also believes it essential to convene, as soon as possible, an international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties in order to make secure the unity of the world Communist movement on the fundamental positions of Marxism-Leninism.

The C.P.G. persistently fights against both revisionism which, in our conditions, seeks to disrupt our close and militant alliance with the S.U.P.G. and the G.D.R., and against Left opportunism, dogmatism and sectarianism which hinder the broad development of mass work.

The Central Committee calls on all Party organizations and all members to implement the decisions of the 1963 Congress of the Party and redouble their efforts so as to enable the working class and all peace-loving forces in the Federal Republic to make a worthy contribution to the world-wide struggle to safeguard and consolidate peace, for democracy and socialism.

Workers of all lands, unite!

FILE COPY

Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Articles and Speeches

INFORMATION BULLETIN

5

PEACE AND SOCIALISM
PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE 1964

CONTENTS:

For the Unity of the World Communist Movement
Resolution adopted by the Fifth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Greece (October 1963)

Resolution of the Central Committee, East Pakistan Communist Party

Statement of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Australia

On the Ideological Position of the Communist Party of China
(An article from Political Affairs of October 1963, No. 10)

For the Unity of the World Communist movement

Resolution adopted by the Fifth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Greece (October 1963)

1. The Communists of all countries are deeply distressed by the situation created in the world Communist movement by the stand taken by the leaders of the Communist Party of China. Propounding anti-Marxist views and conducting disruptive activities, the C.P.C. leaders have embarked on a dangerous course threatening to split the world Communist movement. While hypocritically professing to agree with the line jointly elaborated by this movement the Chinese leaders are actually revising it and counterposing to it their own anti-Marxist dogmatic line. In conducting their subversive and disruptive activity they especially viciously attack and slander the C.P.S.U., the recognized and tested vanguard of the world Communist movement; they openly come out against the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. which mark an important stage in the movement and have been unanimously endorsed by all the Communist and Workers' parties.

2. The Chinese leaders fail to see that the radical change in the balance of forces in favour of socialism makes it possible already in our time to avert a new world war. Not only do they not concede that the defence of peace is a basic issue of the day and the prime duty of all Communist and Workers' parties, but they are more and more openly opposing the policy of peaceful coexistence and international détente. This is evident from the attitude they have taken in recent years towards the efforts of the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries to reduce international tension, from the deterioration of their relations with India, a great neutral country, and their adventuristic and wholly irresponsible position during the Caribbean crisis. This can also be seen from the hostility of the Chinese leaders to the Moscow Treaty, which is a victory for the peace forces and an important step towards détente. The Chinese leaders have gone so far as to describe the policy of peaceful coexistence consistently pursued by the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries and even the heroic selfless struggle waged by the Communist and Workers' parties in the forefront of their peoples as betrayal and surrender to imperialism.

In our epoch, the epoch of nuclear weapons, the policy of peace and

peaceful coexistence which the great Lenin advanced is the only way to rid humanity of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe; the alternative facing mankind is either peaceful coexistence or thermonuclear annihilation. The Chinese leaders' claim that the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence is a brake on the development of the class struggle and revolutionary mass struggles has nothing in common with reality. It is precisely in the conditions of peaceful coexistence that a grand class struggle has been developing in the capitalist countries; in these conditions more than 50 countries have freed themselves from the fetters of colonialism and their peoples have embarked on building their independent nationhood. Thanks to the struggle waged by the socialist camp and the peoples of all countries, peaceful coexistence makes it more difficult for the imperialists to export counter-revolution and for the reactionaries generally to implant anti-communism and chauvinism, to foster militarism and to divert the people from struggle to resolve pressing national problems. The more durable the peace the more favourable the conditions for repelling the forces of fascism and defending and developing democracy.

To this profoundly humane Marxist-Leninist policy of peace consistently pursued by the Communist and Workers' parties the Chinese leaders counterpose the non-Marxist theory of impelling the peoples towards insurrection through war and the theory of export of revolution.

The viewpoint of the Chinese leaders, who declare that the peoples should not fear a thermonuclear catastrophe even if it means the destruction of half of humanity, and that a new, and a thousand times finer, civilization will thrive on the ruins left by thermonuclear war, is an outrageous distortion of the essence of socialism, which is permeated with the spirit of peace and humanism; it is defamation of Marxism.

The entire political line and activities of the Chinese leaders show that they have departed from the Leninist principles in the basic issue of our time, the issue of war and peace, that they have departed from the jointly elaborated line of the world Communist movement, that they are sinking deeper and deeper into the bog of dogmatism and sectarianism, that they have taken the road of political adventurism.

If the erroneous line of the Chinese leaders were to prevail in the question of war and peace, this would weaken the positions of socialism on a world scale, isolate the Communist and Workers' parties from the masses, and aggravate international relations; it would make it easier for the imperialists to plunge humanity in a thermonuclear disaster.

3. The leaders of the C.P.C. are revising the Leninist principle of the leading role of the international working class in the world revolutionary movement and the thesis of the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings that the basic contradiction of our time is the contradiction between imperialism and socialism; they counterpose

to this thesis the theory that the basic contradiction is now the contradiction between imperialism, on the one hand, and the colonial and dependent countries, on the other. Nobody questions the vast importance of the contradiction between imperialism and the colonial and dependent countries, but the fact remains that the development, outcome and the very fate of the national-liberation movement are inseparably linked with the existence and strengthening of the socialist camp, with the struggle waged by the international working class, and are determined by these factors.

The Chinese leaders use their utterly erroneous theory concerning the basic contradiction of our time to justify their thesis that the centre of the international revolutionary movement is not in the countries of the socialist camp but in countries waging the national-liberation struggle. On these grounds they seek to isolate the national-liberation struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples and to set it against the international working class and the socialist camp. They cultivate nationalism, chauvinism and race discrimination. They seek to impose their hegemony and their anti-Marxist and adventurist policy on the world revolutionary movement. In pursuance of these ends, they are striving to make their country a nuclear power, completely ignoring the fact that this would leave the door open for the imperialists to disseminate nuclear weapons, for the nuclear arming of the West-German revenge-seekers and the Japanese militarists. The references to national defence with which the Chinese leaders seek to justify their aspirations do not hold water since it is common knowledge that the nuclear strength of the Soviet Union covers the defence needs of the entire socialist camp.

4. Failing to understand the new problems arising at the present stage of the anti-monopoly struggle, to comprehend the possibility of broad anti-monopoly alliances being formed and to appreciate the role and significance of the fight for democracy, the leaders of the C.P.C. accuse the Communist and Workers' parties of the capitalist countries which are pursuing a policy of anti-monopoly and democratic unity of having renounced the revolution. The Chinese leaders do not see the close connection between the struggle for democracy and the struggle to implement — on the basis of revolutionary mass activity — radical changes in the economic and political life of society, to curb the monopolies more and more and to remove them from power, and to win new positions in the fight for national independence and social progress. In a word, they fail to see that the struggle for democracy is an inseparable component of the struggle for socialism. Blind to the historical changes taking place in our time in favour of the forces of democracy and socialism, they refuse to concede the possibility of the socialist revolution being carried out, under certain circumstances, by peaceful means.

5. The personality cult, which is alien to Marxism and which caused so much damage to the world Communist movement and was con-

demned by all the Communist and Workers' parties, the C.P.C. included, today finds zealous defenders in the Chinese leaders. They represent the impermissible violations of socialist legality, arbitrary actions and crimes committed in the period of the Stalin cult as secondary, incidental and even inevitable mistakes attending the conquest of power by the working class. By means of this thesis they seek to justify the personality cult regime they maintain in their own country, to cover up their mistakes and the failure of their policy. The theoretical justification and practice of the personality cult by the Chinese leaders discredits socialism and brings grist to the mill of international reaction and Social Democracy, which represent the personality cult as something inherent in the socialist state.

6. The Chinese leaders distort the meaning of the correct thesis that in building socialism each socialist country should draw on its own forces and means, and propound the theory that these countries should build autonomous national economies and limit their relations with one another only to trade. By advocating such a policy they weaken the unity and the economic and political strength of the socialist camp.

7. The above theses, as well as a number of other erroneous anti-Marxist postulates advanced by the leaders of the C.P.C. in their letter of June 14, 1963, and other documents, stem from a lack of faith in the ability of the working class of China to build socialism in alliance with the peasantry, from a lack of faith in the possibility of the victory of the socialist system in peaceful competition with capitalism, from a lack of faith in the ability of the international working class to win in the conditions of peaceful coexistence. The views of the Chinese leaders coincide in many respects with the views of the Trotskyites, who did not believe that the working class was able, by its own forces, in alliance with the peasantry, to overcome the internal contradictions and difficulties encountered in the building of socialism, and searched for a way out in war, in "permanent" revolution. It is not fortuitous that international Trotskyism welcomes and supports these views of the Chinese leaders.

8. As their ideological differences with the international Communist movement deepen, the Chinese leaders are intensifying their subversive and disruptive activity. The fact that they have carried the ideological differences into democratic non-party organizations, their inexcusable attacks and subversive activity against the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal parties, the slander, misrepresentation and invective they have resorted to in their hostile sallies against fraternal parties, interference in the affairs of Communist parties, the encouragement they give to renegades and factionalists and their efforts to recruit turncoats in various countries — all this shows that the leaders of the C.P.C. have gone beyond the bounds of Party ethics and violated the standards accepted in the world Communist movement. The fact that they are carrying the differences into the sphere of relations

between states is particularly harmful and dangerous, as is their hostile attitude to the Moscow Treaty. All this shows that dogmatism and sectarianism have become the main danger in the world Communist movement today.

9. The erroneous sectarian and dogmatic positions of the C.P.C. are refuted also by the experience of the Communist Party of Greece. The dogmatic, sectarian policy of the former leaders of the Greek Communist Party had a harmful effect on the working-class and democratic movement. This policy was the main reason for the defeat of the popular democratic movement which remained strong even after intervention by the British imperialists, and for many years it was a serious impediment to the reorganization and regrouping of the democratic forces as well as the forces of the Communist Party. It was the predominance of dogmatism and sectarianism in the Communist Party of Greece that explained the rise of the personality cult which acquired dangerous forms and led to an abnormal situation in the Party — a situation marked by gross violation of the Leninist standards of Party life, diminution of the role of the Central Committee, and persecution and elimination of rank-and-file members and functionaries.

The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. had a salutary effect on the democratic and working-class movement in our country. In the light of these decisions, the Sixth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee (1956) rectified the sectarian and adventurist line taken previously, and outlined the correct policy. The meeting corrected the previous erroneous orientation on the socialist revolution as the immediate objective and established that the immediate revolutionary changes in Greece were bound to be of an anti-imperialist, democratic nature. Proceeding from this correct orientation, the Communist Party of Greece made it the central aim of its political activity to build a broad patriotic and democratic front of struggle for national independence, for the restoration of democracy and for peace. With the conditions generally more favourable owing to the consistent policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, this line enabled our Party to win important positions and to play a decisive part in promoting the democratic movement. The advance of the movement could be seen, in particular, in the growth of the popular mass struggle, which acquired after the 1961 electoral coup a scale unprecedented in the postwar period, leading to the fall of the Karamanlis government and ushering in an open crisis of the regime of national betrayal.

10. From the very beginning the Communist Party of Greece condemned the erroneous dogmatic positions and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders. It unreservedly supports the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties in the struggle for the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of the Leninist principles and decisions of the Moscow meetings. The Communist Party of Greece most resolutely con-

demns the outrageous campaign of lies and provocations conducted by the Chinese leaders against the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union. These attacks against the glorious Party of Lenin and the first socialist country, which have always displayed true and unwavering devotion to the principles of proletarian internationalism, and which, selflessly and in the spirit of fraternal solidarity, have helped the peoples in their struggle to free themselves from imperialist slavery and to build a new life, show how low the Chinese leaders have fallen in their anti-internationalism.

The Fifth Plenary Meeting stresses that while there should be no let-up in the struggle against revisionism, which remains the main danger in our country, it is imperative to strengthen and systematize ideological work and the struggle against dogmatism, the danger of which is increasing in our country too as a result of the subversive activities of the Chinese leaders. The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee believes that in the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement which the leaders of the C.P.C. are undermining it is necessary to put an end to the open polemic in this movement in order to prepare the ground for an international conference. However, so long as the Chinese leaders continue their attacks against the line jointly elaborated by the international Communist movement and keep up their subversive and disruptive activity, the Communist Party of Greece, like the other Marxist-Leninist parties, will consider it its duty to intensify the struggle to isolate all those who would revise the jointly elaborated line of the world Communist movement and persist in their efforts to split this movement. This is the precondition for effective struggle against imperialism, for the victory of the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

On the Differences Within the World Communist Movement

(Resolution of Central Committee, East Pakistan Communist Party, March 5, 1963)

Certain differences have become apparent within the world Communist movement — such as the differences between the Communist parties of the Soviet Union, China and some other parties. It has not happened today. It has been going on for the last few years.

In 1956, at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (C.P.S.U.) four new and important decisions were taken. They are: (a) due to the emergence of socialism as a world system, the birth of many newly independent peace-loving states, the mighty advance of the peace-loving forces of the world and their joint efforts, a time has come when the attempts of the imperialists to start war can be curbed and war can be prevented; (b) the real possibility of peaceful coexistence between capitalist and socialist states has arisen; (c) in some of the capitalist countries the possibility of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism exists; and (d) to fight against some of the mistakes of Comrade Stalin, especially against the personality cult.

These decisions of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U. initiated a great deal of discussion in the international Communist movement and on certain questions differences arose in some of the Communist parties.

Under these circumstances, in November 1957 a conference of the representatives of the Twelve Communist and Workers' parties of the countries where the working class is in power, including the representatives of the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, was held in Moscow. The conference unanimously adopted and issued a Declaration relating to the analysis of the international situation and the tasks confronting the world Communist movement.

The Declaration of 1957 stated that today it is possible to prevent war and that the possibility exists for some of the capitalist countries of peaceful (without civil war) transition to socialism. It also stated that the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U. had further developed and brought up-to-date the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and socialist countries. The foreign policy of the socialist countries rests on the firm foundation of the

Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between the two social systems.

But later differences again arose among some of the Communist parties, especially between the parties of the Soviet Union and China, regarding the interpretation of the basic propositions of the Declaration. These differences were openly put forward.

Faced with this situation, in November 1960 a conference of the representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' parties was held in Moscow to settle the differences through collective discussions, consultation and exchange of mutual experiences. After three weeks of prolonged discussion, the conference unanimously issued an explanatory Statement. The Statement expressed its allegiance to the Declaration of 1957 adopted by twelve parties and declared that the historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U. had initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement and had promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. All the Communist and Workers' parties resolved to abide by the evaluations and decisions regarding the general programme of the struggle against imperialism and for peace, socialism and democracy put forward by the Statement of the 81-Party conference.

Regarding Our Acceptance of the Moscow Statement

Our Central Committee unanimously accepted the 81-Party Statement. On October 24th, 1961, our Central Committee adopted a resolution in this respect. Our understanding of the formulations of the Statement, viz., concerning war and peace, peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism, peaceful (without civil war) transition to socialism, the tasks facing the newly independent countries at the present stage, the role of the national bourgeoisie of those countries, etc., was stated in the resolution. The resolution has been circulated within the Party. (Discussion regarding the 81-Party Statement, 24. 10. 61.)

But at present acute differences have again openly arisen among different Communist parties, especially between the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, regarding the interpretation and significance of the propositions of the 81 parties' Statement. This has naturally given rise to various questions and confusion within our party. Moreover, after the unanimous acceptance of the twelve parties' Declaration of 1957 and the 81 parties' Statement of 1960, differences are again arising between the two great Communist parties of the world — the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. It is apparent from this that there are fundamental differences between the two parties. It is therefore all the more necessary to express our opinion clearly on the questions on which the differences have arisen.

Of course, however deep the differences may be, there is no disagree-

ment as regards the basic objective of establishing socialism and communism throughout the whole world. We think that the differences concern some important theoretical questions relating to the attainment of that objective. There is no reason for any apprehension and anxiety that due to these differences the international Communist movement will fall apart. On the contrary, Marxism-Leninism will emerge out of this controversy all the more developed.

Questions on Which There Are Differences

The Communist parties of both the Soviet Union and China are great parties. Both have great experience. It is not possible for us to collect all the arguments and points that they have put forward in support of their respective views and to review and analyze them thoroughly. Hence, we are stating our own opinion regarding those basic questions which we believe have given rise to the differences. In this connection it is necessary to state that our Party is a small party. Experience of the revolutionary struggle, understanding of Marxism-Leninism and resources — in all these respects our strength is limited. We bear this fully in mind as we state our opinion.

We have received some articles published by the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China. We have deeply thought over those articles before stating our opinion, and have drawn on the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U., the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 to arrive at our decision.

As we understand it, the issues on which there now are differences between the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China are: (1) The possibility of preventing war and establishing peace and how to realize it; (2) peaceful coexistence and peaceful economic competition between the two social systems; (3) peaceful (without civil war) transition to socialism; (4) the attitude of the socialist countries towards the national-liberation movement of the dependent countries and the newly independent countries; (5) Soviet policy and activities at the time of the Cuban crisis; (6) the Sino-Indian border conflict; (7) the policy of the socialist countries towards Yugoslavia and its leadership and (8) the role of the Albanian leadership and their relation with other parties and socialist countries.

Attitude Towards the Declaration and Statement

Firstly, it is necessary to state that the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 are two documents relating to the strategy and tactics of the world communist movement. All the Communist parties of the world — at whatever stage they may be — have accepted the propositions of these two documents as the guiding principles for all their activities. Every Party must abide by the decisions of these documents.

Secondly, the propositions put foward in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 regarding the prevention of war, the possibility of establishing peace, peaceful coexistence and peaceful economic competition, the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism and other matters, we Communists cannot regard as mere temporary tactics or methods for achieving temporary gain. They are the basic policies of the present-day international Communist movement. The Communists cannot renounce these policies for any temporary gain, any temporary reasons or on any provocation. Only honest and correct pursuance of these policies can lead to the abolition of capitalism and imperialism, to the well-being of the people, to the advancement of socialism and the establishment of communism under the leadership of the working class.

Thirdly, we also think that the 81 parties' Statement leaves no doubt as to the possibilities of peaceful coexistence and of preventing war. Though the danger of war exists, at present war can be averted. This is a real possibility which was positively and unequivocally put forward. It was categorically stated that the concrete and positive tasks confronting the Communists are to work for the materialization of these possibilities into actual realities. In the Statement there is no scope for any kind of negative or uncertain attitude.

War and Peace

War is a constant companion of capitalism and imperialism. Communists are always against war. At the time of the First World War, the Communists under the leadership of Lenin, in order to resist and put an end to the war, raised the slogan of "turning the imperialist war into civil war". At the end of the first world war, with the emergence of the first socialist country in the world a new situation arose. Lenin in that situation advanced a new policy for determining the relations between different states — the policy of peaceful coexistence in place of the policy of violence and application of force. The Soviet Union from the very day of its birth worked tirelessly to ensure the success of this policy and to prevent a Second World War. But due to the then prevailing circumstances, these efforts of the Soviet Union were not fruitful.

After Second World War, socialism expanded, many new countries became free and the crisis of imperialism deepened. On the other hand, the imperialist clique under the leadership of American imperialism, the arch enemy of the people of the world, has been carrying on preparations for a third world war. Moreover, the discovery and development of nuclear weapons have greatly increased the devastating character of the war. If war were to break out today, human civilization would be in danger. This is not a halluciation of a panic-stricken mind. This is the actual reality.

On this background the Statement of 1960 declares that "the pro-

blem of war and peace is the most burning problem of our time"... Imperialism has already inflicted two devastating world wars on mankind and is now threatening to plunge it into an even more terrible catastrophe by starting a third world war. More than once in the past years the imperialists, by starting local wars, have brought mankind to the brink of world disaster. It is the policy of the imperialists, especially the American imperialists, to keep the world always "on the brink of war".

If war breaks out today it will be a thermo-nuclear war which will cause unheard-of destruction to entire countries. It will reduce the key centres of world industry and culture to ruins. It will bring death and boundless suffering to hundreds of millions of people. Countries not directly involved in it will also not be spared the cataclysm. Imperialism spells grave danger to the whole of mankind. Today any war between states may develop into such a devastating world war. The peoples must now be more vigilant than ever about this menace of war.

History has placed a great responsibility for warding off imperialist war provocations and averting a new world war, first and foremost, on the international working class. The Communists have always fought for peace and under the present circumstances they regard the fight for peace, as their prime and main task. "The Communists regard it as their historical mission not only to abolish exploitation and poverty on a world scale and rule out for all time the possibility of any kind of war in the life of human society but also to deliver mankind from the nightmare of a new world war already in our time..."

"The democratic and peace forces today have no task more pressing than that of safeguarding humanity against a global thermo-nuclear disaster."

Today there is also a real possibility of preventing war. It was absent before. It is true that as long as imperialism exists there will be the soil for war, and that the nature of imperialism does not change. But today war is not inevitable as it was before. Those days are gone when the imperialists could decide at will whether there should be war or not. In the world today real forces have appeared, such as the strength and unity of the socialist camp, the rise in the intensity of the national-liberation movement, the many victories won in the struggle for national independence and the breakdown of the colonial system, the increase in the strength of the peace forces, etc., which are capable of foiling the imperialists' plans of war. Moreover, some sections of the bourgeoisie in the advanced capitalist countries as well do not want war and seek peace. Some incidents of the past few years have proved that war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the socialist world camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces.

The decisions of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U., the Declaration

of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 specifically put forward before the international Communist and working-class movement this new possibility of preventing war and called upon them to wage a struggle for the materialization of this possibility. Some people interpret the Declaration and the Statement as placing equal emphasis on "both possibilities", of war and of peace, and hence hold that a "policy of action" must be adopted to meet both of them.

In our understanding such an interpretation of the Declaration and the Statement is erroneous. It is true that the danger of war exists and this danger has grown. We must always be alert and vigilant against this danger. The might and the defence arrangements of the socialist countries must be strengthened. And should the imperialist maniacs start war, the people will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it. But the Declaration and the Statement nowhere stress the "equal" possibility of both war and peace. On the other hand, these documents pose the possibility of establishing peace realistically, unequivocally stating that it is the positive task of the Communists to fight to avert war, to work for the materialization of the possibility of preventing war into an actual reality.

Today the Communists must realize the positive responsibilities of preventing war and of establishing peace that rest upon them. If instead, the Communists think that there are equal possibilities of both war and peace "and pursue a policy of action to meet both possibilities", this will actually lead to an arms race and the intensification of the cold war. The Communists cannot adopt such a policy. Only the imperialists pursue the policies of "cold war" and "keep the world at the brink of war". Pursuing this policy the imperialists increase international tension, mislead the people by taking advantage of this, and, increasing arms production, pave the way for the big monopoly capitalists to pocket enormous profits. Following this policy the imperialists are impelling the world towards the path of war. The Communists have always rejected this dangerous policy of cold war. They regard it as their responsibility to work for the lessening of international tension as an integral part of their duty of preserving world peace. Hence the Communists cannot adopt any "policy of action" that might lead to the intensification of the "cold war" and international tension.

Today there is the real possibility of preventing war and establishing peace. It is not for the Communists to create any confusion on this score. On the contrary, they must create confidence amongst the masses in this real possibility and arouse them to the struggle for peace.

The Communists do not want war; they fight against war, for peace. But this does not imply the renunciation of the national-liberation struggle of the dependent countries against imperialism, of the revolutionary class struggle against the reactionary ruling clique in any country, or of civil war if it is imposed by that ruling clique. By the word "war" alone, the Communists mean war between states. The

word "war" has been used in this sense in the report of the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U., in the Declaration of 1957 and in the Statement of 1960. We must bear in mind the difference between war waged between states and liberation struggle, revolutionary class struggle and civil war. The Communists oppose war. But they justify and support the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, the class struggle of the working class and the masses against reaction inside a country, and civil war. If by preventing war peace can be maintained, favourable conditions are provided for the development of the national--liberation struggle of the oppressed people and the class struggle or civil war of the people in the varous capitalist countries. On the other hand, the liberation struggle and the class struggle or civil war weaken the position of imperialism and capitalism and immensely contribute to the prevention of war and establishment of peace. So, as an integral part of their struggle for foiling the imperialist war efforts and for establishing world peace, the Communists must always support the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the revolutionary class struggle or civil war in the capitalist countries. The Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U., the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 have placed this lesson before us.

The U.S. imperialists are the main instigators of war and the main enemy of the people of the world. To resist all the war efforts of the imperialists and indefatigably to expose their policy of aggression against other countries, their policy of war, to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues and manoeuvres of the imperialists, to rouse the hatred of the people against the warmongers, to organize the peace forces still better, continuously to intensify the mass actions for peace, to intensify the liberation struggle of the oppressed nations, to promote co-operation between the socialist countries and those countries which have no interest in war and to struggle for the removal of war bases from those countries where the imperialists have established such bases — these are struggles for preventing war and establishing peace.

To achieve peace, the Soviet Union has put forward the demands for complete and general disarmament, abolition of the nuclear war bases, dismantling of military blocs, conclusion of a peace treaty with both Germanies, etc. It is the duty of the Communists of all countries to mobilize public opinion in support of these demands and thereby force the imperialists to accept them.

We must bear in mind that peace will not come by itself. Peace will not be achieved due to a "change of heart" on the part of the imperialists. Peace can only be achieved by waging a relentless battle against the imperialist warmongers at every step.

Peaceul Co-existence And Economic Competition

It is one of the basic policies of the socialist countries to work for the prevention of war and for the preservation of peace. Thus, "the

foreign policy of the socialist countries rests on the firm foundation of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence and economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries". This principle implies the settlement of the international disputes through negotiation, respect for the equality of states, respect for the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of states, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, extensive development of trade and cultural and scientific ties between nations and peaceful competition to decide which of the two social systems — socialism or capitalism — is superior.

After the birth of the Soviet Union, Lenin advanced the principle of peaceful coexistence. Lenin then uttered the prophetic words that the socialist countries would influence the development of the world revolution chiefly by their economic construction. Today Lenin's prediction has been fully borne out. The economic construction of the socialist countries and their development are causing revolutionary transformation in the world. It is positively and directly proving the superiority of socialism over capitalism day in and day out and turning the socialist camp into an invincible fortress.

The development of socialism is influencing the people of the world more and more. The disinterested help rendered by the socialist camp is encouraging the newly independent countries to free themselves from the influence of the imperialists and to take to the path of independent development; it is influencing the democratic sections of the people of every country. We can see this process going on in our country too.

It is said in the Statement of 1960 that "in a world divided into two systems (socialism and capitalism) the only correct and reasonable principle of international relations is the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems advanced by Lenin ... Peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems or destructive war — this is the alternative today. There is no other choice."

It is also said in the Statement that "in conditions of peace (as a result of peaceful coexistence) the socialist system increasingly reveals its advantages over the capitalist system in all fields of economy, culture, science and technology. The near future will bring the forces of peace and socialism new successes. The U.S.S.R. will become the leading industrial power of the world. China will become a mighty industrial state. The socialist system will be turning out more than half the world industrial product. The peace zone will expand. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependencies will achieve new victories. The disintegration of the colonial system will be completed. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace will be absolute. In these conditions a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on the Earth, with capitalism still existing

in a part of the world." Though war is a constant companion of capitalism, capitalism will then become so weak in relation to the forces of socialism and peace that it will not be possible for capitalism to wage a war. "The victory of socialism all over the world will completely remove the social and national causes of wars."

The Statement of 1960 also stated that throughout the world today a struggle is going on between two social systems — a struggle in which the superiority of the socialist system is becoming increasingly obvious.

The significance of these formulations of the Statement of 1960 should be thoroughly realised. It should be borne in mind that the present time is the time of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale. Today time is working for socialism against capitalism.

Socialism does not need any war to expand. Never has war given birth to socialism. Though socialism emerged and expanded during the first and second world wars, it would be wrong to think that socialism was established and expanded through war. Socialism has emerged and expanded due to the internal socio-economic conditions of the capitalist countries. Nevertheless, the overwhelming crisis that the imperialists faced at the time of the first and second world wars facilitated the victory of the socialist revolution. But today the imperialists are facing an unprecedented crisis without any war. The existence of the socialist system in the world and its great might, the rise in the intensity of the national-liberation struggle, the disintegration of the colonial system — these are the factors which have resulted in this crisis of the imperialists.

On the other hand, today people in every country are being drawn towards socialism through their own experience.

The working class on its own initiative will establish socialism in each country. This is the objective law of revolution. In this respect, the existence of the socialist system in the world, the economic prosperity of the socialist countries, the actual proof of the superiority of socialism over capitalism and the deep crisis of the imperialists are encouraging and inspiring the oppressed peoples in all countries more and more to fight for socialism. In conditions of peace the socialist countries will achieve undreamed of prosperity and under its influence the people's fight will be intensified in every country and their victory will be hastened. The experience of our country too confirms that the maintenance of peace in the international arena creates favourable conditions for our struggle for the consolidation of independence and the establishment of democracy.

Peace and peaceful coexistence, then, pave the way for victory in the struggle for socialism and democracy. This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and the international influence of the socialist countries and promotes the prestige and influence of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries. On the

other hand, war brings immense destruction to mankind. Hence the policy of peaceful coexistence accords with the interests of mankind as a whole.

The question may arise: if a policy of peaceful coexistence between socialist and capitalist countries is pursued, what will be the position of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples against the imperialists? Will the Communists not continue these struggles or support them? Moreover, what will be the form of the fundamental contradiction that exists between the socialist countries and the capitalist countries in the international arena?

The Statement of 1960 answers all these questions. The Statement says: "The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence favourable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence."

Thus, the policy of peaceful coexistence does not mean renouncing the class struggle in the capitalist countries or the liberation struggle of the dependent countries. These struggles should be intensified to consolidate peaceful coexistence.

The Statement also points out that "peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist Parties, for the triumph of socialist ideas."

Moreover, economic competition also will continue between the socialist and capitalist countries. Thus, peaceful coexistence implies the continuation of the ideological and economic competition between the socialist and capitalist systems. It is a form of class struggle between the two social systems in the international arena. But this class struggle will not assume the form of war. "Ideological and political disputes between states must not be settled through war."

The Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 have firmly stated the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence in the sphere of the foreign policy of the Socialist countries. The Communists uphold the principle of coexistence resolutely. For this reason the Communists tirelessly fight "for the complete cessation of the cold war, disbanding of military blocs and dismantling of military bases, for general and complete disarmament under international control, the settlement of international disputes through negotiation, respect for the equality of states

and their territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, extensive development of trade, cultural and scientific ties between nations."

We believe that the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries are faithfully pursuing this policy of the Declaration and the Statement in relation to foreign affairs.

The Cuban Question

In this connection the question of the justification of the Soviet action in sending missiles to Cuba and withdrawing them afterwards arises.

To ward off the imminent attack of the U.S. imperialists the Socialist Cuban Government requested the Soviet Government to send missiles there. The Soviet Government, by despatching missiles to Cuba for Cuban self-defence, fulfilled its internationalist responsibility. It can not be regarded as an adventurist action. The Cuban Government was apprehensive that if the Soviet Government did not directly come forward to the aid of Cuba in this way, the U.S. imperialists might attack at any time. In such a situation the Soviet Union did the right thing by sending missiles there. There was no other way open to defend Cuba.

When in became known that the Soviet missiles had been stationed in Cuba for her defence, President Kennedy ordered U.S. warship to blockade Cuba and made preparations for war. At the same time he, in a letter to the Soviet Premier, put forward the suggestion that if the Soviet Government withdrew missiles from Cuba, the U.S.A. would not attack that country. The Soviet Union accepted the compromise proposal.

This compromise of the Soviet Government with the Government of Kennedy can under no circumstances be termed a "display of weakness" or "capitulation" in the face of imperialist threats. Such a compromise accords with the policy of peaceful coexistence. The solution of all differences by peaceful means through compromise and negotiation — this is precisely one of the basic elements of the policy of peaceful coexistence. When the necessity arises, one has to enter into compromises with the imperialists. But the compromises must be in conformity with the interests of the people.

In the case of the compromise on Cuba, the people's interests were safeguarded. Firstly, the independence of Cuba was preserved and safeguarded. The danger of imminent attack on Cuba by the U.S. imperialists was removed. No doubt, it has not been removed forever. But today the imperialists have had positive proof that if they attack Cuba, they too will have to risk paying a heavy price. In the circumstances the hotheaded imperialists will have to think twice before considering another attack on Cuba. This action of the Soviet government saved the people of Cuba from a devastating war. Moreover, the

existence of Cuba and her progress in socialist construction with the help of the socialist camp will continue to influence the whole of the Western hemisphere. The Soviet Union has positively demonstrated that the socialist system is a guarantee of the existence of Cuba.

Secondly, the acceptance of this compromise proposal by the Soviet government removed the danger of war created around the Cuban situation. The actions of the Soviet government at the time of the Cuban crisis, the heroic struggles of the socialist government of Cuba and her people on the basis of their fivepoint demand, and the strong protest by the whole socialist camp and the peace-loving people of the world against the aggressive designs of the U.S. imperialists once again foiled the U.S.A. conspiracy to attack Cuba and provoke a war. Mankind welcomed the avoidance of a world war with a sigh of relief. The faith of people throughout the world in the peace policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was strengthened. This is a great achievement.

To keep missiles in Cuba after Kennedy's assurance that the U.S.A. would not attack Cuba would have been tantamount to pursuing a policy of "brinkmanship". Such a policy would not have benefited the people of Cuba. On the contrary, it would have increased the danger of war. It would have been an act of adventurism.

Hence the compromise of the Soviet government with the government of Kennedy in regard to the Cuban crisis was justified. However, in this connection there is a question in the mind of some friends: did the Soviet government consult the Cuban government in all these matters or did it take unilateral decisions? Some friends also believe that the Cuban government too has expressed disagreement with the Soviet method of work. These questions can be settled through mutual discussion between the governments of the two socialist countries — the Soviet Union and Cuba.

On the whole, we think that in regard to the Cuban question the basic policy followed by the Soviet government was correct.

Various Forms of Transition to Socialism

Before the Twentieth Congress of C.P.S.U. we held the view that the working class can seize power only by non-peaceful means (civil war). We held that any struggle for the seizure of power was bound to be non-peaceful. It was also by non-peaceful means that the working class actually seized power in different countries.

But at the present age a new possibility has been created. After the Second World War a radical transformation has taken place in the world. Now the imperialists can no longer dictate the events of the world. In one-third of the world, the people are building socialism. Against this background, the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 put forward before the

international working-class movement a new possibility — that of peaceful transition to socialism in our time.

These documents stress the fact that "the working class and its vanguard — the Marxist-Leninist Party — seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole, with the national interests of the country."

It is pointed out in these documents that today opportunities have been created in a number of capitalist countries for the working class to seize power by peaceful means. The unity of the working class, a united mass front, the broad unity of the people etc., are essential to seize power by peaceful means without civil war and to ensure the transfer of the basic means of production into the hands of the people. Under these circumstances the working class by defeating the reactionary anti-popular forces can secure a firm majority in Parliament, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, transform Parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create necessary conditions for the realization of socialism by peaceful means. "All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism."

This aspect of the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in the present epoch should be correctly understood. It does not imply that seizure of power and transition to socialism will be possible by a sheer majority of votes in Parliament, without the class struggle of the workers and peasants against the exploiters and the united struggle of the people against the reactionary ruling clique. To understand it in this light would be a grave error. On the contrary, these documents declare that in the context of ceaseless and broad development of the class struggle of the workers, peasants and urban middle strata, the working class can gain a majority in the Parliament and, by transforming the bourgeois Parliament into an instrument serving the interests of the working people, create conditions for the transition to socialism by peaceful means, avoiding a civil war.

Today the forces of socialism and democracy have gained unprecedented strength throughout the whole world. Today socialism has become a world system and capitalism is weaker than before. The achievements of socialism are drawing the workers, peasants and intelligentsia of the capitalist world towards socialism. The ideas of socialism are conquering the minds of the working people and exerting an influence on broad sections of the people. The ideal of socialism is also influencing the bureaucracy, the police and the army of the capitalist countries.

In these conditions, in the context of a broad and ceaseless struggle of the people, a situation may arise in a number of capitalist countries

when the reactionary ruling clique will be unable to use fully even the bureaucracy and the army against the people; in such a situation the possibility of the working class seizing power and transition to socialism without civil war will arise.

Some friends question this possibility and argue that until now nowhere in the world has the working class been able to seize power peacefully. Moreover, the more the reactionary ruling clique will be isolated the more desperate they will be. Because of this it is unlikely that seizure of power by peaceful means will be possible in any country.

In reply, it can be said that it is wrong to argue that what has not happened in the past will not happen in the future. Human society changes and it has already witnessed many changes. Even in the first decade of the Twentieth Century there was no socialism in the world. Today socialism has become a world system. More than one hundred years ago, when socialist society did not exist anywhere, Marx, perceiving the basic laws of socio-economic development, predicted its victory. In the same way today, after observing the political, social and economic changes that have taken and are taking place, the possibility of transition to socialism by peaceful means in a number of capitalist countries is being put forward. In this connection it can be mentioned that at one stage of the Russian revolution, Lenin also spoke about the possibility of the seizure of power by peaceful means. Consequently, today when the socialist forces have made great advance and capitalism is becoming weaker every day, the possibility of the "seizure of power by peaceful means in a number of capitalist countries can not be ruled out".

But this does not imply that it will be possible to seize power in all the countries by peaceful means alone. It was categorically stated at the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 that in the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism must be borne in mind. "Leninism teaches and experience confirms that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or other stage of the struggle for socialism.

"The actual possibility of the one or the other way of transition to socialism in each individual country depends on the concrete historical conditions."

Whatever the way of transition to socialism, it is certain that without the firm unity of the workers and the toiling peasantry and their ceaseless class struggle under the leadership of the working class and its Party, there is no possibility of seizure of power and transition to socialism. Moreover, Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in order

successfully to carry out the socialist revolution, the working-class party must acquire the skill of waging all forms of struggle, peaceful and non-peaceful, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary, and must be prepared to pass over very quickly from one form to another.

Attitude Towards the National-Liberation Struggle and the Newly Independent States

The socialist countries are the true and sincere friends of the peoples fighting for liberation and the countries which have thrown off the imperialist yoke.

It is the duty of the socialist countries to help in all respects the countries still suffering from colonial enslavement to attain their national independence. The abolition of colonialism will be of great importance in easing international tension, abolishing imperialism, and consolidating universal peace.

Some friends have some doubts as to whether the Soviet Union is giving proper help to the liberation struggles of the different oppressed nations. But we find no reason for any such doubt. We note with pleasure and pride that the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries are giving all possible support — political, diplomatic, economic and even military — to the struggles for independence of the nations enslaved by imperialism. We have witnessed this role of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries in the liberation struggle of Algeria, in Laos, on the question of the liberation of Goa and West Irian, and other cases.

The socialist countries recognise the sovereignty of the newly independent young states. On principle they reject any kind of interference in the internal affairs of these countries. Moreover, the Communists consider it their international duty to help these peoples consolidate their independence. They help and support these countries wholeheartedly in achieving progress, creating a national industry, developing and consolidating the national economy and training national personnel.

These countries are opposed to war and imperialism and seek to ensure their independent national development. The Communists cooperate with these countries in the struggle for world peace and against imperialist aggression.

All the socialist countries, the international working class and the international Communist movement consider it their responsibility to render moral and material assistance to those peoples who are fighting to free themselves from the imperialist and colonial tyranny. But the Communists do not believe in the export of revolution. At the same time they fight resolutely against the imperialist export of counter-revolution. The choice of social system is the inalienable right of the people in each country. The Communists are opposed to the export of both revolution and counter-revolution from the outside.

The Communists consider it their internationalist duty to call on the peoples of all countries to unite, to rally all their internal forces, to act vigorously to prevent or firmly resist imperialist interference in the affairs of any people who have risen in revolution. These peoples can fully depend on the mighty socialist camp for all kinds of help in resisting such interferences.

We found the Soviet Union and other socialist countries performing this role in helping revolutions and in resisting imperialist interference in countries like Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Laos, Cuba and Yemen.

To help the young states in their national development, to help them to free themselves from the bondage of imperialist economy, means creating mighty opposition to imperialist colonial exploitation. Though these countries do not belong to the socialist social system, the socialist countries render them aid with no strings attached whenever such assistance is needed to develop their independent national economy and raise the standard of living of the people. The independent development of these countries does not strengthen world imperialism but weakens it. The fight of these countries against joining the imperialist war blocs helps to preserve their independence as well as to resist world war.

We think that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in rendering assistance to India, Egypt, Iraq and other countries are clearly pursuing this policy, we think that the efforts of the socialist countries to render help to our country, even though it is closely connected with the imperialists and also belongs to various imperialist military blocs, are quite justified. The assistance of the socialist countries will strengthen our economy, weaken the domination of imperialist economy, help raise the standard of living of the people and increase the appeal of socialism for our people. This will weaken the positions of the imperialists in our country and thus also help the work of resisting world war.

This policy of the socialist states towards the young states is a form of international class struggle against imperialism. It leads to the defeat of imperialism and ensures the advance and victory of socialism.

Sino-Indian Border Conflict

Now let us discuss the questions that have been raised regarding the Sino-Indian border conflict.

The armed conflict that recently took place between China and India was nothing but a border conflict. China is a socialist country. The fundamental basis of the foreign policy of China is peace, peaceful coexistence and friendship with young independent states. She neither did nor can follow a policy or plan of action to conquer Indian territory by invading her. By unilateral declaration of a cease fire in the border conflict, withdrawal of her forces from the occupied areas and return of the wounded Indian prisoners of war and arms and

ammunition, China has given positive proof of her peaceful intentions. We praise these actions of China.

Nehru Government is spreading slander against China by depicting her as an "aggressor" and "expansionist". No progressive force can be deceived by this slander of the Nehru Government and regard China as an "aggressor". Terming the border conflict a "war", the Nehru Government on this plea is accepting arms aid from the imperialists, trying to create and maintain warphobia inside the country and declaring a state of "emergency", arresting Communists on a wide scale and depriving the people of their democratic rights. No progressive force can support these reactionary steps of the Nehru government.

The Chinese government has repeatedly sought peaceful settlement of the border conflict. The Nehru government has created obstructions in this matter. To occupy advantageous positions in the disputed border area, the Nehru government penetrated in some places into territory under Chinese occupation and provoked armed clashes. The rabid Right reactionaries of India supported and instigated these actions. The imperialists are also engaging in provocation here. The Nehru government tried to keep the border conflict alive in its own political interests. What the reactionary forces of India want by keeping this conflict alive is to draw the Indian people away from the political ideology and influence of socialist China, to isolate the progressive forces of India and to obtain economic aid from the imperialists.

But these facts do not lead to the conclusion that the government of India is a government of finance capital and bureaucratic monopoly capital, and that in the interests of those elements and to avoid an economic crisis, the government of India is keeping this conflict alive and on this pretext making arrangements for investing more capital in military production and for militarization of the economy and has tied India to the U.S. war chariot.

As we understand it, the government of India is basically a government of the national bourgeoisie. A section of this bourgeoisie belongs to the Right. Moreover, the monopoly capitalists too have immense influence on this government. It is due to their influence that in internal affairs the Indian government pursues a policy that is reactionary in many respects, that it receives economic aid from the imperialists and also collaborates with the imperialists in many respects.

However, prompted by the interests of the national bourgeoisie, the Indian government does not want war and in external affairs it is basically in favour of peace. In spite of the various reactionary policies and actions of the government, India is a young peace-loving state. The Nehru government has also made valuable contributions against the imperialist aggressive policy and in favour of world peace. India is working towards independent economic development and the socia-

list countries are also helping it in this respect. Neither do we believe that India wants to occupy Chinese lands by invading China.

We believe that, considering India's position as a newly independent country, the policy of non-alignment and peace followed by her government in external affairs, the character of the Indian government as a whole and the basic tasks of isolating the American imperialists in the international arena, preventing war and securing peace, all our efforts should be directed at keeping India in the camp of peace. With a view to this, every effort must be made for a peaceful solution of the border dispute. With the opening of the door for a peaceful settlement of the border dispute, the progressive forces of India also will be able to activize themselves properly and to strengthen India's policy of non-alignment and peace by mobilizing public opinion against the rabid Right reactionary forces.

Much harm has been caused by the Sino-Indian border dispute developing into a large-scale armed conflict. Taking advantage of this, the rabid Right reactionaries of India have raised their heads and are actively seeking to involve India in a closer "friendship" with the U.S. imperialists. The Nehru government and the Right reactionaries have acquired an opportunity to sow suspicion and confusion about China in the minds of the people of India. As a result of this, it is the progressive forces of India who are suffering damage and those who are gaining advantage are the imperialists.

We consider it important that in the interests of world peace and the democratic movement of India there should be a peaceful settlement of the Sino-Indian border conflict immediately. This conflict is a mere border dispute which can be settled through negotiations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. We hope that the governments of China and India will peacefully settle the border dispute on the basis of the Colombo proposals.

The Question of Yugoslavia and Albania

Controversies have developed regarding Yugoslavia and Albania. It is necessary to say a few words about these controversies.

The Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 severely criticized the "revisionist" theories of the Yugoslav leadership. There is no doubt that the Yugoslav leadership is committing "revisionist" mistakes. The world Communist movement is unanimous on this point. But some parties are of the opinion that, in spite of the mistakes of the Yugoslav leadership, it cannot be denied that the peoples of Yugoslavia have waged many struggles for socialism and are building socialism. Moreover, the Yugoslav leadership has rectified some of their mistakes in the meanwhile. Hence Yugoslavia should be considered to be a socialist country and efforts should be made to bring her back into the socialist camp and to rectify the mistakes of the Yugoslav leadership through fraternal criticism and help.

Some other parties have protested against this. They are of the opinion that the Yugoslav leadership is arch-revisionist and has discarded Marxism-Leninism. In fact, that Yugoslavia has abandoned the path of socialism and taken to the path of capitalism. Hence, Yugoslavia cannot be considered to be a socialist country.

Our opinion regarding this controversy is that all the parties should get together and reconsider the question of Yugoslavia and take new decisions, if such are found necessary, after discussing all the aspects of the question. The basic question of whether a socialist economy is being built up in Yugoslavia should be given very serious consideration.

Some parties are of the opinion that the leadership of the Albanian Party is committing serious Left sectarian and dogmatic mistakes. A number of other parties fully support the Albanian leadership. However, all agree that Albania is a socialist country.

Our opinion on this question is that there should be a discussion on this point among all the parties, especially among the leaderships of China, the Soviet Union and Albania. The deviations of the Albanian Party to which reference has been made should also be rectified. It is also necessary, in the interests of the unity of the socialist camp, to re-establish normal and fraternal relations between Albania and the other socialist states.

Our Appeal

In conclusion, we are of the opinion that today some of the differences within the world Communist movement, especially the differences between the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, are being expressed in such aggressive language as to create confusion in the international Communist and democratic movement. Taking advantage of this, the imperialists are spreading slander against the ideology of communism. There is nothing wrong in the Communist parties having differences on one or another issue and openly discussing those issues. But when discussion turns into mutual recriminations, dogmatism, impatience and ill behaviour towards the opponent, the result is definitely harmful. The differences between the parties of different socialist countries have gone so deep that even cooperation among socialist countries is being hampered in some cases. To us this is very distressing. This situation must be ended.

The ideal and the aim of the different socialist states and Communist parties are the same. Among them there is no clash of class interests whatsoever. The differences among them have no objective social basis. They are purely subjective. It is possible to settle these differences through mutual discussions and consultations. Hence, without regarding its own opinion as absolutely infallible and beyond revision, it is necessary for a party to enter into mutual discussion and consultation

with other parties, displaying a readiness to abide by the collective decisions of all on the differences.

We appeal to the Communist parties of China and the Soviet Union and all the Communist parties of the world to end the public polemic now. The Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China should start mutual discussions and all the differences should be settled in another world Communist conference held after proper preparations.

■ ■ ■

Differences in the Communist Movement

The following statement was issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia, on August 23, 1963

Differences in the world Communist movement have aroused much public interest. They are being discussed, not only by Communists, but in many other circles.

The international differences have been reflected in the Communist Party of Australia through the activities of a splinter group headed by E. F. Hill, a former leading member of the Party, now expelled.

Because of the importance of the issues, and the wide public interest, the Communist Party of Australia has decided to publish its views on the main problems.

These views have been reached after discussions within the Party over a long period and especially since January 1961, following the meeting of 81 Communist Parties in Moscow in November, 1960.

The Communist Party of Australia actively participated in that meeting, raising its opinions on the issues debated at the time.

Our delegates to that meeting worked for unity and were fully satisfied with the discussions, in which differing viewpoints were frankly thrashed out.

Our Party welcomed the Statement unanimously adopted by the meeting as resolving the questions in dispute and opening a new chapter of unity in the world Communist movement.

The 19th Congress of the Party held in June, 1961, unanimously endorsed the Statement as being a correct analysis of the situation in the world today, and fully in line with our own Party Programme.

The Communist Party of Australia rejects the criticisms made by the leaders of the Communist Party of China of the policy and work of the majority of Communist Parties, including our own.

We consider that the Chinese Party has seriously departed from the 81 Parties' Statement, and that the Hill group is advocating in Australia a policy which likewise departs from it.

Such a policy, if put into practice, would inflict great losses on the Australian working-class movement.

In rejecting these views, we by no means forget the great achievements of the Communist Party of China, which has led the Chinese people to victory over imperialism and feudal oppression and in

---

- Abridged

building socialism. Nor do we subscribe to the imperialist anti-China campaign.

However, the leaders of the Communist Party of China not only advocate an incorrect line for the international movement. They try to impose this line upon other Parties, spreading their views in many publications in Australia and other countries.

We reject the Hill group's assertion that our Party should not have "taken sides", as this could only mean that we are not entitled to decide for ourselves but must follow others.

The Communist Party of Australia decides its own policy. It carefully considers all views, but does not blindly support the policy of any other Party.

Of course, what the Hill group really wanted was to force upon our Party the incorrect line of the Communist Party of China.

After failing dismally in this, the Hill group engineered a series of "resignations" which were hailed by the press as a "great crisis" and "a big split" in the Communist Party of Australia.

No such great crisis appeared, although the D.L.P. and other reactionary forces are trying to use the actions of those who split away to disrupt unity in the labour movement.

* * *

The issues being debated in the world Communist movement are indeed momentous ones, dealing with questions of concern to all humanity.

The Communist Party of Australia therefore restates its policy for peace, defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the Australian working people, and for achieving a Socialist Australia.

Can War Be Prevented?

The differences in the world Communist movement are not differences as to whether imperialism is the cause of war, nor are there any differences on the need to expose and fight the policies of U.S. imperialism, the chief instigator of war.

They are differences as to whether it is possible to prevent the imperialists from launching a new world war, and how to achieve this great aim.

For many years the Communist Party of Australia has held the view that in today's conditions it is possible to avert such a war, even though imperialism exists and is still powerful.

When the Party was discussing the draft of its programme "Australia's Path to Socialism", which it adopted in *1951,* L. L. Sharkey wrote:

> "The Draft Programme declares that war can be finally outlawed when the rule of monopoly capital and its servants has been ended and the rule of the people substituted in its stead.

"This does not mean that the people cannot impose their will to peace while capitalism still exists. Quite the contrary. The people can foil the plans of the capitalist warmongers and establish a durable peace."

(Communist Review, August 1951)

The Party took this view because of the historic changes which had taken place after World War II. These changes greatly weakened imperialism, limited its capacity to dictate to the world and strengthened the hand of the peace-loving peoples everywhere.

Three Great Changes in the World

The first great change is that whereas the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in 1939, today there are 14 socialist countries, with 30 per cent of the world's population and 35 per cent of world production, a percentage rising with every year that passes.

The second great change in the world is the breaking-up of the colonial system. Since 1945, dozens of nations have won political independence, and most now take up a neutralist position which in the main aids the cause of peace. They continue their struggle to end all forms of colonialism, old and new. The national liberation struggle undermines imperialism by taking from the imperialist powers great sources of wealth, manpower and bases. It is a powerful part of the great new forces for peace.

The third great change is the much increased strength of the peace movement in the capitalist countries themselves. Headed by the working class, progressive people and peace fighters of different classes and views are uniting to oppose war and fight for disarmament.

Twelve years ago the Australian campaign to "Ban the Bomb" was called a "Communist plot to undermine the free world". Today, the vast majority agree that this is a very necessary step and welcome the nuclear test ban treaty.

The 81 Parties' Statement says:

"War is not fatally inevitable.

"The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all peace-loving forces...

"Experience shows that it is possible to combat effectively the local wars started by the imperialists, and to stamp out successfully the hotbeds of such wars."

The Communist Party of China signed this statement. E. F. Hill and his followers agreed with it then. Yet today the Communist Party of China and the Hill group say that this is "an illusion".

"Left" Impatience Weakens Peace Struggle

To cast doubts on the possibility of preventing war, whatever the motive for doing so, is to belittle the peace forces and thus, in reality, to assist the imperialists.

The "leftist" group which has deserted the Communist Party of Australia says that the Party's policy of uniting with all who want peace is weakness. They say we are "soft on the imperialists" and demand that the "peace movement must be anti-imperialist".

Their demand for a narrow, "pure" peace movement, limited to people who fully understand that imperialism is the source of war, arises from impatience in the long and difficult task of uniting all who want peace, and lack of understanding that the masses of the people, not small groups, determine history.

It shows lack of faith in the ability of people to learn from their own experience in working for peace that imperialism is the source of war.

The Communist Party of Australia has never sought to dominate the peace movement, and will continue to co-operate with all genuine peace forces, while also putting forward its own independent views and policy for peace.

Is Disarmament an Illusion?

The Communist Party of Australia stands by the 81 Parties' Statement, which declared:

"Through an active, determined struggle by the socialist and other peaceloving countries, by the international working class and broad masses in all countries, it is possible to isolate the aggressive circles, foil the arms race and war preparations, and force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament."

This view is now rejected by the Communist Party of China. Their letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"Certain persons now actually hold that it is possible to bring about 'a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars' through 'general and complete disarmament' while the system of the exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion".

No Communist Party doubts that the struggle for general and complete disarmament will be long, difficult and complicated. It will be opposed by the powerful monopolists who profit from armaments and by the rabid militarists, just as even the limited ban on nuclear tests is opposed by the extreme war wing of the U.S. monopolies and by de Gaulle.

But the combination of forces described by the 81 Parties can eventually force disarmament on the warmongers. The struggle for disarmament expresses the dearest wishes of the peoples and helps to mobilise them to act for peace.

Should we abandon it because it is hard and complicated, or should we rely upon the masses and work to bring their decisive force into action?

The Communist Party of Australia declares unreservedly for the struggle, and will do its part to carry it to success in Australia.

In speaking of the struggle for disarmament, the 81 Parties' Statement says:

"It is necessary to wage this struggle on an increasing scale and to strive perseveringly to achieve tangible results", including the banning of atomic testing.

That is why the treaty halting most kinds of nuclear weapons tests by the three main nuclear powers has been hailed by widely representative voices from most parts of the world as a very important though limited advance in the direction of peace.

Yet this treaty has been denounced by the Chinese Communist Party and Government as "a dirty fraud" "which harms the interests of the people of the whole world and the cause of world peace."

Such statements are a grave dis-service to the struggle for peace, and a blow against the attraction which socialism and the Communist Parties have increasingly exerted on the peoples because of their championing of the cause of peace.

The Communist Party of Australia, like the great majority of Communist Parties, welcomes the test ban treaty. This achievement helps the struggle to prevent the French tests, to remove U.S. bases from Australia, secure nuclear free zones, ban nuclear weapons, and win disarmament.

Peaceful Coexistence is the Basis for World Peace

Socialism is increasingly demonstrating its superiority over capitalism. The great advances already made by socialist countries in production, living conditions, science, education, freedom for individual development and high moral standards stand in sharp contrast to the stagnation and slow rates of growth, crisis in education and science, denial of freedom, stunted development of human personality and moral decay evident in monopoly capitalism.

The Soviet Union will overtake the United States in total production, and production per head of the population. The other socialist countries will advance similarly. The appeal of socialism to the people of countries dominated by monopolies will become still greater.

Struggle Essential

This does not mean that socialism will be achieved by "force of example", or that peaceful coexistence will miraculously do away with monopoly capitalism. Only the struggle of the working class, leading the majority of the exploited people, can end capitalism.

Peaceful coexistence does not mean ending class struggle. On the contrary, it provides favourable conditions for its development in capitalist countries. Cold war conditions favour the forces opposing progress.

Thus, in supporting the 81 Parties' view that the socialist countries make "peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems the cornerstone of their foreign policies", the Communist Party of Australia leads the fight against the pro-monopoly policies of the Menzies Government and its support for U.S. aggressive plans.

The Communist Party of China, which, together with India, earlier enunciated the Principles of peaceful coexistence, now says it is wrong to confine "the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries... to peaceful coexistence."

The "left" group in Australia, crudely reflecting the Communist Party of China's view, alleges that our Party wants peaceful coexistence with the capitalists. All the experience of the working class proves this laughably false. The capitalists certainly do not agree!

In fact, the fight for peaceful coexistence in Australia is precisely a sharp *class struggle* for peace, living standards and democratic rights, directed against the pro-war, profiteering, anti-democratic policies of monopoly and the Menzies Government.

This is the *real content* of the struggle for peaceful coexistence in Australia and every capitalist country.

Internationally, the struggle for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems is a "form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism." (81 Parties' Statement).

The Cuban Example

Peaceful coexistence implies both struggle and negotiation, standing firm and compromising. The Communist Party of China rejects in practice negotiation and compromise. This is shown in its opposition to the nuclear test ban, and to the Soviet Union's actions in the Caribbean crisis last October.

The U.S.A. was building up for an invasion of Cuba. Kennedy had pledged full support for the Cuban exiles and was arming and training them.

The Soviet Union took additional steps to help the Cubans. Kennedy blockaded Cuba and threatened war. Cuba prepared to defend itself, the Soviet Union negotiated and peace was saved; peace which left Cuba sovereign and independent, stronger than ever, with Kennedy pledged before the world not to invade Cuba. And that promise has been carried out in the many months since, despite predictions that it would be violated.

This concrete example of peaceful coexistence, of struggle and compromise, was attacked as a "Munich", as the bartering away of Cuban independence. No Chinese proposal as to an alternative line of

action was forthcoming, except absurd statements about "Cuba beating the U.S.A. on its own."

In the article "More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us", it is stated:

"..during the Cuban events certain people first committed the error of adventurism and then committed the error of capitulationism, wanting the Cuban people to accept humiliating terms which would have meant the sacrifice of the sovereignty of their country." (p. 189)

Leaders of the "left" group in Australia echoed these views.

The reality is quite different, as Fidel Castro stated:

"The action of the U.S.S.R. which, to protect a small country thousands and thousands of miles away, put into the balance of a big war the wellbeing forged in 45 years of heroic labour and tremendous sacrifice is now evident in all its greatness.

"History has never known of such solidarity. That is internationalism. That is Communism.

"The imperialists have failed all along the line to strangle the Cuban revolution because in all cases, economically, militarily and morally, Cuba had the U.S.S.R. on its side."

The Communist Party of China, which claims that it "prints both sides", has never mentioned this statement by Castro, nor has the Hill group!

Communists Support National Independence Struggle

Since its formation 43 years ago, the Communist Party of Australia has done its utmost to rally the Australian people to support the aspirations and struggle of the oppressed colonial peoples for national independence.

To mention but some instances: support for China's struggle against imperialism since 1925, including the campaign against sending materials for Japan's war industry, and to boycott Japanese goods in 1937 and 1938; support for the Indonesian revolution in 1945 and 1946 and for the return of West Irian to Indonesia; support for India's struggle for freedom from British rule; support for the peoples of Indo-China in their struggle against the French and now against U.S. intervention.

The Communist Party of Australia has always campaigned for the rights of the Aboriginal people, opposed the "White Australia" policy, and fought for the right of the people of Papua-New Guinea to self--determination and against colonial exploitation of them by Australian monopoly.

The Communist Party consistently campaigns for Australian foreign policy to be based upon friendship towards and support of the struggle for national independence of the nations of South East Asia, South Africa and elsewhere.

The Communist Party of Australia campaigns against Australian support for U.S. intervention in Vietnam, for withdrawal of U.S. forces

and observance of the Geneva Agreement. It demands the withdrawal of Australian troops from Malaya, opposes Malaysia as a scheme to maintain colonial rule over the peoples of the region, and calls for a pact of peace and friendship with Indonesia.

Our stand correctly merges patriotism with internationalism. Our stand for peace and friendship with South East Asia and in support of national liberation movements is part of the working-class struggle against Australian monopoly capitalism, which is hostile to the newly--emerging nations of South East Asia and supports imperialist military pacts and aggressive plans in this area.

Yet the Communist Party of China and the Hill group say that our Party, and other Parties, do not support the national liberation movement and even oppose national revolutions!

The Communist Party of China says that peaceful coexistence is being interpreted by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in particular to mean peaceful coexistence between oppressor and oppressed nations.

This is in complete contradiction with well-known facts. Extensive aid in many forms has been given to Indonesia, Egypt, India, Cuba, and many other countries newly independent or fighting for independence.

The struggle for peace, for general and complete disarmament assists the struggle for national liberation. In turn, the national liberation movement greatly helps the struggle for peace and disarmament.

To pose the fight for peaceful coexistence against the national liberation movement, or vice versa, is to split and weaken the anti--imperialist forces.

Defeat the Menzies Government

Our present work is directed to defeat of the Menzies Government. We reject as completely false Mr. Calwell's assertion that the Communists "don't give a rap whether the Menzies Government goes or stays." We advocate election of a Labor Government, while calling for support of Communist candidates and the truly working-class policy they will advance.

We believe that defeat of Menzies and election of a Labor Government can be the first step along the road of struggle for a new direction of Australian home and foreign policy in the interests of the working-class and its allies.

A Labor Government is already pledged to implement a number of reforms. It is also pledged to changes in foreign policy, including a nuclear-free southern hemisphere, recognition of the People's Republic of China, pacts of friendship with Indonesia and other South East Asian countries.

But the policy of the A.L.P. leaders (reformism or so-called "Democratic Socialism") is not the answer to the basic problems before the

Australian working class and nation. Only a real socialist policy, founded upon the scientific working-class theory of Marxism-Leninism, can solve these problems.

Our aim is the formation of a single united working-class party, guided by scientific socialism.

This can be achieved only through the experience of the working class in the class struggle, including experience of reformism in office.

This support for election of a Labour Gouvernment is determined by both the immediate and long range interests of the working-class.

Immediate interests can be served by reforms, gained mainly by working-class unity in action. The long range interests of the working-class demand the building of a united movement for socialism. This will be helped by experience of the inadequacy of a Labor Government.

These views are based on detailed analysis of the situation in Australia, and application of Marxism-Leninism to it, extending over many years.

However, this line is now "not revolutionary enough" for the Hill group, which condemns it as "soft on imperialism, soft on reformism, creating illusions."

They demand "more revolutionary" policies and tactics, because they say, the struggle of the Australian working-class will "very soon be crowned by the all-embracing liberating success of socialism."

This wishful thinking makes them impatient with the line of our Party. In place of the slow, hard work of uniting with the workers who support the A.L.P., they advocate "stepping up the attack on reformism."

They say the leaders of the A.L.P. leftwing are the most dangerous of the reformists because they prevent the workers coming over to the path of revolution.

Lenin long ago advised Communists everywhere against such impatience, in "'Left-Wing' Communism: An Infantile Disorder." "...we in Russia have been concerned by a long, painful and bloody experience of the truth that revolutionary tactics cannot be built up on revolutionary moods alone. Tactics must be based on a sober and strictly objective estimation of *all* the class forces in a given state (in neighbouring states and in all states, i.e. on a world scale), as well as an evaluation of the experience of revolutionary movements. To express one's 'revolutionism' solely by hurling abuse at Parliamentary opportunism, solely by refusing to participate in parliaments, is very easy; but just because it is too easy, it is not the solution of a... very difficult problem."

One of the main differences between the Communist Party of Australia and the Hill group is whether to do the necessary hard, patient work or to take the easy road of hurling abuse. It is the difference between the working-class, revolutionary and the "petty-bourgeois in a frenzy."

The Hill group finds support for its impatience in some extraordinary views of the Communist Party of China about the contemporary world.

For instance, the *People's Daily* editorials on the anniversary of the Moscow Declaration and Moscow Statement (*Peking Review* No 47 and 48, 1962) said:

"The workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, patriotic and revolutionary national intellectuals, and patriotic and revolutionary national bourgeoisie of various countries *who constitute more than 90 per cent of the world's population, are always for revolution.*" (Our emphasis.)

Can we accept the proposition that 90 per cent of the world's population always favor revolution? Or is this an example of tailoring the facts to support attacks on most of the Communist Parties of the world?

How Can Socialist Australia Be Achieved?

The Communist Party's programme, first adopted in 1951, answers the question in this way:

"Socialism can only be achieved through working class struggle... Socialism will be achieved only by carrying on the class struggle to the establishment of People's Power in Australia.

"Socialism involves the abolition of monopoly capitalism, socialisation of the giant monopolies and their use for the benefit of society."

The question then arises: can this social revolution be achieved without civil war?

The Programme says: "The Communist Party at all times stands for a peaceful solution of the political, economic and social issues of our time."

Peaceful transition does not mean that the capitalists are expected to hand over without a struggle. The Programme states:

"The active people's movement, which unites the majority of our people under the leadership of the working class, is essential for winning a genuine People's Government. It will develop as a result of many struggles — large and small — which our working people will wage in defence of their interests.

"This mighty organised movement of the people led by a united working class will win real people's political power and a People's Government. The machinery of state will be transformed and the agents of the monopolies in positions of authority in the civil service, police, judiciary and the armed forces will be replaced by determined and loyal supporters of the people's power.

"Our parliaments will be filled by true representatives of the people's movement...

"The People's Government... will immediately proceed to... break the power of the small clique of industrial, banking and land monopolies, as the essential condition for opening the way to the building of socialism."

"...in carrying through these decisive measures to implement the

democratic will of the people, every effort of the capitalist class to defy the People's Government and Parliament will be resisted and defeated.

"The Government will rely on the strength of the organised workers to ensure that the programme decided upon by the people's representatives in Parliament is operated in practice, and that all attempts to resist or sabotage it are defeated and the enemies of the people brought to justice."

This Programme has been substantially the same since 1951, and none of the Hill group ever opposed it, until recently. Now they accuse the Party of having "lost its revolutionary spirit," of believing that the capitalists will peacefully hand over their privileges, and so forth.

These accusations are inspired by the propaganda of the Communist Party of China which has launched an all-out assault against the concepts that socialism can be achieved without civil war and that parliament can be "transformed from an instrument serving the class interests of the capitalists into an instrument serving the working people." (Statement of the 81 Parties.)

The Chinese Party, which signed the 81 Parties' Statement, now describes these views as "social democracy" and "Parliamentary cretinism," and accuses those parties which uphold the 81 Parties' Statement and seek to apply its principles to their own class struggle of "paralysing the revolutionary will of the proletariat," and "forsaking the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Communist Party of Australia will continue its work of preparing the revolutionary forces of the working class with the aim of ending monopoly capitalism through class struggle.

We will continue to strive to create a people's movement strong enough to prevent the ruling class unleashing a bloody civil war.

We will continue to work for establishment of a People's Government which will smash monopoly power and the old state apparatus, putting in its place a truly democratic people's power led by the organised working class, and capable of successfully resisting all efforts of monopoly capitalism to regain its lost power.

In so doing, we are heeding Lenin's injuction to seek the forms of transition to socialism which accord with the conditions of our country.

As R. Dixon said in the discussion of the Programme unanimously adopted in 1951: "... the Draft Programme opens up new broad perspectives. It calls for the building of a people's movement, based upon an alliance of workers and farmers, which would create the conditions for the establishment of a genuine government of the people expressing the will and power of the people.

"A people's movement, capable of such tasks, could be built only through the development of a vast, all-sided activity in defence of peace and the needs and interests of the people, in which full account is taken of traditional democratic organisations and institutions in this country, including parliament."

Was it Right or Wrong to Combat the Cult of the Individual?

The Communist Party of China and the Hill group now strongly criticise the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for its exposure of the weaknesses and serious mistakes of the latter years of Stalin's leadership.

The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"To raise the question of combating the cult of the individual is actually to counterpose the leaders to the masses, undermine the Party's unified leadership which is based on democratic centralism, dissipate its fighting strength and disintegrate its ranks."

The Communist Party of Australia's view is that it was the cult of the individual which had those bad effects. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by boldly exposing the cult at its 20th Congress and combating it, restored correct relationships, strengthened the Soviet Party and helped the whole world Communist movement.

The Communist Party of China, at that time, praised the C.P.S.U. for its action. In 1960, it signed the 81 Parties' Statement which welcomed "the victories of the Communist Parties in a number of countries in the struggle against deviations, elimination of the harmful consequences of the personality cult. ..."

In that period, the *People's Daily* published two articles.

One of those articles, "Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," said:

"The Chinese Communist Party congratulates the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on its great achievements in this historic struggle against the cult of the individual."

"During the latter part of his life, Stalin took more and more pleasure in this cult of the individual, and violated the Party's system of democratic centralism and the principle of combining collective leadership with individual responsibility. As a result he made serious mistakes such as the following: he broadened the scope of the suppression of counterrevolution; he lacked the necessary vigilance on the eve of the anti-fascist war; he failed to pay proper attention to the further development of agriculture and the material welfare of the peasantry, he gave certain wrong advice on the international Communist movement, and, in particular made a wrong decision on the question of Yugoslavia."

In Australia, the denunciation of the cult of the individual has not undermined the Party's unified leadership. On the contrary, it has strengthened it.

It is the Hill group, which supports the cult, that wants to weaken the authority of elected leading committees.

It is indeed strange that the Communist Party of China has now departed from its previous balanced stand and taken such a one-sided position. Especially when it is recalled that in 1945 the effects of Stalin's errors, as they showed themselves in China, were criticised by

the Chinese Party's "Resolution on Some Questions in the History of our Party": —

"In many places, where sectarianism in cadres policy was further complicated by an erroneous anti-espionage policy, large numbers of good comrades were wrongly indicted and unjustly punished; this led to the most lamentable losses inside the Party. Such sectarian errors weakened the Party to an immense extent. . . ."

History has confirmed the Communist Party of China's view of seven years ago:

"We Chinese Communists are firmly convinced that as a result of the sharp criticisms made at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. all of those positive factors which were previously suppressed as a result of certain mistaken policies will inevitably spring to life, and the Party and the people will become still more firmly united in the struggle to build a communist society such as mankind has not yet seen, and win a lasting world peace." (Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.)

Absurdities Instead of Argument

In its attacks on fraternal parties in socialist and capitalist countries alike, the Communist Party of China has made far-reaching and fantastic assertions, in disregard of the facts.

Not satisfied with accusations of "revisionism" and "treachery" and "supporting, prettifying and collaborating with imperialism," the Communist Party of China tries to dig up a social, class basis for such charges.

It says that in socialist countries (especially the Soviet Union) there is a move to restore capitalism by social groups or classes which still exist in all socialist countries, while in capitalist countries "certain persons" in the leadership of the Communist parties are corrupted representatives of the labour aristocracy.

Is this not fantasy? The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has adopted the great Programme for Building Communism, but the Communist Party of China sees in this programme steps "tantamount to helping restore capitalism." What is the "theoretical" basis for this? The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963, says:

"Certain persons may say that their society is already one without classes. We answer: No, there are classes and class struggles in all socialist countries without exception.

"Since remnants of the old exploiting classes who are trying to stage a comeback still exist there, since new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there, and since there are still parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers of state funds, etc., how can it be said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary?"

What "new capitalist elements are constantly being generated there"

— i.e. in the Soviet Union? The only answer apparently is "... parasites, speculators, idlers, hooligans, embezzlers. ..."

Truly a new contribution to Marxist thought! It is implied that there is a "class of hooligans, idlers ... etc." Back in 1848 Marx described these, in the Communist Manifesto, not as a class but as a "passively rotting mass."

Not many years ago, the Communist Party of China was able to make a more balanced judgment on individuals under socialism and even communism.

"Therefore, not everybody will be perfect, *even when a communist society is established.* But then there will still be contradictions among people, and *there will still be good people and bad.*" (Historical Experiences of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat — emphasis added.)

Correctly, nothing was said then of a "class of bad people!"

Something more is meant, of course. It is hinted at in talk of "Political degeneration and new bourgeois elements (which) may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries. ..."

Hill and others say that the Communist Party of China believes that the leaders and functionaries of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Soviet state are a new class, which has become corrupted and comfortable, afraid of war and revolutions.

This is what the Trotskyites said in the 1930's. In our times, it is said by the extreme "Yugoslav revisionist" Djilas. It is strange indeed to find the Chinese comrades, who are always loudly opposing Yugoslav revisionism, propagating the Djilas "New Class" theory!

To back up the "theory" that capitalism is being restored "in a certain form," it is necessary to assert that communism is not in the process of being built in the U.S.S.R. The Communist Party of China's letter of June 14, 1963 says:

"In their present level of economic development *all* socialist countries are still *far, far removed* from the higher stage of communism in which 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' is put into practice." (Emphasis added.)

This was not always the Communist Party of China's view about either the U.S.S.R. or China. In *Peking Review,* No. 44 of 1958, an article hailed the "Great Soviet Plan to Build Communism."

In *Peking Review,* No. 43, 1958, a resolution of the Chinese Party's Central Committee corrected views which hailed the communes in China as heralding immediate transition to communism, but then set out the following perspective:

"... the transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people is a proces which may take ... *five or six years or even longer.* Even with the completion of this transition, people's communes, like state-owned factories, are still socialist in character. *Some years after* that the social product will increase greatly, the communist consciousness and morality of the entire people will be raised to

a much higher degree, ... differences between worker and peasant, town and country ... mental and manual labour — the legacies of the old society ... — and the remnants of unequal bourgeois rights — will gradually vanish; and the function of the state will be limited to protecting the country from external aggression. ... *At that time Chinese society will enter the era of communism.*" (Emphasis added.)

It therefore could scarcely be said that five years ago the Communist Party of China believed that China was "far, far removed from communism."

Their estimate for China may have been over-optimistic, but that is no argument against the plan for building communism in the U.S.S.R. Still less does it indicate that there is danger of the restoration of capitalism there.

In fact, the successes already achieved in communist construction prove that the aim set by the C.P.S.U. Programme for building the base of communism by 1980 is well within reach.

In arguing against the Soviet statement that the State in the U.S.S.R. has now become a "State of the whole people" the Chinese comrades use the same method of dogmatic assertions, quoting the book without really examining the facts. They say that there are class differences between worker and peasant and that this invalidates the concept of the "State of the whole people." They ignore the fact that there are no longer antagonisms between worker and peasant in the U.S.S.R.

Their slanderous suggestion that "leaders of certain Communist Parties represent the interests of the labour aristocracy" has no more foundation in fact than their charges that the C.P.S.U. is "restoring capitalism."

Both these arguments are put forward, it appears, not because their authors are convinced they are true, but as Part of a frantic search to find something to build up a case and buttress up other assertions.

The Communist Party of China uses the question of relations with Yugoslavia as a means to bolster its case that the majority of Communist Parties are "revisionists" and "traitors to the working class."

Yugoslavia

The Communist Party of Australia has waged the necessary struggle against the ideas of Yugoslav revisionism as called for in the 81 Parties' Statement.

There is now no sympathy or support anywhere in our Party for these ideas. Should the need arise, the necessary steps will be taken.

In line with the 81 Parties' Statement and in accordance with the facts of the Yugoslav economy, the Communist Party of Australia regards Yugoslavia as a socialist country, taking as welcome and sensible the efforts to strengthen relations between Yugoslavia and other socialist countries.

Taken as a whole, the arguments advanced by the leaders of the

Communist Party of China are couched in language which is uncomradely in the extreme.

The manner of reasoning, and quoting from Marx and Lenin as from a catechism and in the most abstract fashion, departs from their previous practice and violates what Lenin described as "the most essential thing in Marxism . . . the concrete analysis of concrete conditions."

Lenin also said:

"We do not regard Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that in has only laid the cornerstone of the science which socialists *must* further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."

The Communist Party of Australia tries to follow this advice in its theoretical work.

How Not to Work for Unity

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued a statement on July 13 entitled "We Want Unity, Not a Split" *(Peking Review,* No. 29. 1963.) Is this true?

The C.P.C. attitude towards other Communist Parties and to the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties does not help to create conditions for unity. Nor does its deliberate disruption of non-party world organisations such as the peace movement, the trade unions, and organisations of women and youth by trying to force its own views on them and abusing all who disagree. Indeed, the question arises: Is there a real desire for unity, or is it a split that is wanted?

The Communist Party of China publishes and circulates widely many articles and pamphlets attacking the stand of many other Parties, including our own. It says that the majority of Communist Parties are: "revisionist" — that is, revising Marxism-Leninism in the interests of the capitalist class; "betraying the interests of the entire international proletariat and the people of the world", "departing from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism," "catering to the needs of imperialism"; "protecting the interests of monopoly capital, betraying those of the proletariat, and degenerating into social democrats"; "deliberately deceiving the peoples of the world and helping the imperialists in their policies of aggression and war"; "running hither and thither in response to the baton of certain persons abroad," and many similar insulting phrases.

These accusations are made in a general form, without any proof.

If the Chinese comrades believe their own charges, how could they desire unity with "collaborators with imperialism," "revisionists," "traitors," "social democrats"?

By putting the argument on such a basis, they prevent proper discussion. This indicates that they are working for a split, in which those calling themselves "true Marxist-Leninists" will cut themselves off from those they label "revisionists."

The Hill group has in fact foreshadowed the appearance of a "new" Party in Australia, following the Chinese Party lead:

"If the leading group in any Party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the Party will replace them and lead the people in making revolution." (Letter, June 14, 1963.)

In practice, the Communist Party of China leaders and their allies, the Albanian Party leaders, are now more or less openly working to split other Communist Parties.

E. F. Hill was removed from the leadership of the Communist Party of Australia and then expelled for continued factional activity, contempt of Party democracy, violation of the Party Constitution and refusal to obey decisions of Party conferences and leading bodies.

The Chinese comrades were informed of Hill's removal from the leadership, yet Hill was invited to China for discussions and feted by Mao Tse-tung.

On July 23, Hsinhua News Agency reported that "representatives of the Belgian Communist Party were invited to Albania." It turns out that these "representatives" were *expelled* from the Belgian Communist Party at its last Congress!

This is a strange new contribution to Marxist-Leninist teachings on the Party and on relations between Communist Parties!

A new category of Marxist-Leninists is discovered — those who place themselves *outside* the Party. Relations betwen Communist Parties are now relations with splinter groups, which have no support among the Party or the masses.

This, from the Communist Party of China, which has so often correctly said it is wrong "to interfere in internal affairs" of other Parties!

This, from the Chinese comrades, who have so often asserted the right of all Parties to decide their own policies, and who have sharply criticised what they considered attempts to impose "the programme, resolutions and line of one's own Party on other fraternal Parties" as the "common programme" of the international Communist movement.

The appearance from time to time of differences within a Communist Party and in the world movement is inevitable. This can serve to strengthen rather than weaken the movement if they are treated as differences between Communists with the same aims, the same basic class standpoint and ideological outlook. They can then be discussed and resolved by concrete analysis and investigation, in which all learn; if there are some issues which cannot be settled immediately, experience in practice will resolve them.

■ ■ ■

On the Ideological Position of the Communist Party of China

(Reprinted from *Political Affairs* of October, 1963. No. 10)

The ideological dispute within the world Communist movement has now erupted into open conflict. The Communist Party of China has unreservedly placed itself in direct, basic opposition to the ideological line adhered to by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and by virtually every other Marxist-Leninist party throughout the world.

With the appearance of the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. and the subsequent reply of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., the debate was brought into full public view. Prior to this, the Chinese party had directed sharp public attacks against a number of other parties, among them the Communist Party of the United States. But since the publication of the two letters and the breakdown of the Moscow discussions, the C.P.C. has brought increasingly into the open its thorough-going hostility to the ideological position of the rest of the world Communist movement. Its attacks have become progressively harsher and more undisguised, their language increasingly abusive and acrimonious, and their scope ever wider. And with the publication of the *Jenminjihpao* article of September 6, launching a venomous assault on the theses of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., the full import of the Chinese position has come to light. The conflict, it is clear, has now gone far beyond ideological

---

On January 9 of this year the Communist Party of the United States issued a statement on the Caribbean crisis of last October ("The Cuban Crisis and the Struggle for World Peace", *The Worker*, January 13, 1963), in which sharp criticism was directed at the position taken by the Communist Party of China on the crisis. To this, the C.P.C. responded with an editorial entitled "A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.", appearing in *Jenminjihpao* of March 8. In a brief public statement, the C.P.U.S.A. branded the editorial as a complete misrepresentation and distortion of its views, but added that in the light of the pending Moscow meetings between the Chinese and Soviet parties and its feeling that public polemics should meawhile be discontinued, no reply would be made at that time.

In view of the drastic changes in the picture since then, however, it is felt that a detailed reply is imperative. This editorial deals with the main ideological questions raised in the Chinese editorial and with a number of related questions.

dispute between Communist parties, and has taken on the character of all-out warfare by the Communist Party of China against the fundamental views and policies of the rest of the international Communist movement.

The Test-Ban Treaty

How far the Chinese party has gone in its opposition is most glaringly manifested in its violent, vituperative attack on the recently-concluded partial nuclear test-ban treaty. The signing of this pact, whatever its limitations, has been enthusiastically greeted by hundreds of millions of people in all parts of the world as a most welcome initial step in the direction of peaceful coexistence. Everywhere there is profound relief that the poisoning of the atmosphere by radio-active fallout will be ended. And everywhere there is eager anticipation of the next steps toward world peace for which it has paved the way. More than one hundred states have signed the treaty, including even reactionary regimes which simply did not dare to go counter to these sentiments of the people.

But not so the Chinese leaders. In their eyes the treaty is nothing but a "fraud" designed to "lull and deceive ... the peoples of the world". They label it a "betrayal" and a "fake peace". They slanderously accuse the Soviet government of having "sold out the interests of the Soviet people, the interests of the socialist camp including the Chinese people and the interests of the peace-loving people throughout the world", and of engaging in "diplomacy of capitulation". And so on; the stream of invective is endless.

There are, of course, others who oppose the pact. In this country its most vociferous enemies are the Goldwaters, the Birchites and their ilk. It is Goldwater who leads the fight against its ratification, attacking it as a "political ambush" and as offering only an "illusion of peace". And it is Goldwater who condemns the very idea of peaceful coexistence. Abroad the pact is opposed by such people as de Gaulle and the extremist elements surrounding him. It is in this unsavory company that the Communist Party of China finds itself in its shameful attack on the treaty — the company of the most rabid warmongering elements in the capitalist world.

How is this to be explained? How is it that the Communist Party of a great socialist country finds itself so completely at odds with the rest of the socialist countries and with the masses of peace-loving people throughout the world, and at the side of the worst enemies of peace?

The roots of this shocking state of affairs go deep. They lie ultimately, for one thing, in the rejection of the basic line of the world Communist movement as expressed in the Twelve-Party Declaration of 1957 and the 81-Party Statement of 1960. To be sure, the Chinese leaders ceaselessly protest their complete adherence to the line of these documents and just as ceaselessly accuse other parties of aban-

doning them. But in truth it is they who have rejected *in fact*, though professing to accept in words, the assessment these documents present of the new relationship of world forces and the conclusions flowing from it, and in particular the possibility of achieving peaceful coexistence.

The 81-Party Statement declares:

"Today it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism, for a socialist transformation of society, that determine the main content, main trend and main features of the historical development of society."

On this basis it concludes:

"The time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed. World war can be prevented by the joint efforts of the world socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement, all the countries opposing war and all the peace-loving forces."

And further, given the continued advance of the forces of peace and socialism, and the achievement of their absolute superiority:

"In these conditions a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world."

It is the recognition of this new balance of world forces which forms the basis of the policies of Communist parties in the present period. It is this which motivates the policies of our Party. The main resolution of our Seventeenth National Convention, held in December, 1959, opens with these words:

"As we approach the decade of the sixties, mankind stands at the threshold of a new era. For the first time in human history the possibility now exists for the elimination of the scourge of war and the release of the full productive potential of the human race for the solution of the age-old problems of poverty, disease and ignorance. These new possibilities have been created by the profound and irreversible changes in favor of the camp of peace, freedom and social progress."

This is the theme also of our resolution on peaceful coexistence of August, 1960:

"Peaceful coexistence is the only policy which is in accordance with the state of the world today. The basic shift in world relations, which has proceeded since the end of World War II, cannot be reversed. The main historic trend continues: in favor of socialism, of independence from imperialism, of the forces of democracy and progress. Ours is the epoch of the disintegration of imperialism. It is the epoch of the rise, consolidation and final victory of world socialism. In such an epoch, the strength of the world forces arrayed against imperialism must continue to grow, and with it the realistic possibility of averting war between capitalist and socialist states and of establishing peaceful coexistence as a long-range policy. In such an epoch, war is not

inevitable, and world peace and disarmament can be fought for as realizable goals."

The Chinese party, however, thinks otherwise. In its article of September 6 it states that in setting forth such a policy, at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. "under the ... pretext that 'radical changes' had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchov ... questioned the continued validity of Lenin's teachings on imperialism and on war and peace, and in fact tampered with Lenin's teachings." In short, therefore, the Chinese leaders do not accept the position of the 81-Party Declaration on war and peace, however profusely they may proclaim their adherence to it.

Those who regard world peace and disarmament as realizable goals can only welcome every restriction on the proliferation of nuclear weapons, however limited. It is because the Chinese leaders repudiate this approach, because they in fact consider war as inevitable, that they see salvation only in the spread of nuclear arms to other countries, and especially in their own acquisition of a nuclear arsenal, and decry all efforts to prevent such proliferation as a monstrous plot designed to perpetuate a nuclear monopoly. And this is why they find themselves in the company of those who, like Goldwater, regard peaceful coexistence as a myth and therefore oppose every move toward disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons. But such an approach can hardly be called fighting for peace. On the contrary, it serves to sharpen the danger of war.

To be sure, the Chinese leaders offer an alternative. They call melodramatically for a world agreement for the complete outlawing and destruction of all nuclear weapons. This proposal is not at all new. It has been made repeatedly by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and has been supported by advocates of peace everywhere. We consider it a realistic goal.

The Chinese leaders, however, offer it at this moment as something to be achieved at one fell swoop, and *in opposition* to the very kind of partial steps essential to its realization. Indeed, the merit of the partial test-ban lies largely in its paving of the way for further steps. In this context, and in the face of their persistent ridicule of disarmament as an illusion and as having no merit beyond that of a mere propaganda slogan, the Chinese Party's advocacy of the total outlawing of nuclear weapons can be viewed only as a device to cover up the real nature of their opposition to the test-ban treaty.

Marxism-Leninism versus Nationalism

The roots of the Chinese leaders' position lie also in their departure from the Marxist-Leninist ideology of proletarian internationalism in the direction of nationalism. In the words of Gus Hall (*The Only Choice: Peaceful Coexistence,* New Century Publishers, 1963): "It seems that after certain Marxist parties became leaders of nations, the influences of narrow nationalism tended to weaken proletarian internationalism.

These parties tended to see the rest of the world, including the socialist world, through the eyes of narrow nationalism." In the writings and utterances of the C.P.C., this finds frequent and varied expression.

In the view of the Chinese Party, it is not the socialist world which is today decisive in the struggle against imperialism but the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. It is not the contradiction between socialism and capitalism which is central, but that between these peoples and imperialism. It is Asia, Africa and Latin America which are the "focus of world contradictions". The June 14 letter states:

"The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centers of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism."

And further:

"In a sense, therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of these areas, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the world's population."

Of course, no one can deny the tremendous upsurge which has taken place in the national-liberation movement in recent years and the great significance which this possesses for the whole struggle against imperialism. But to fail to see the dependence of this on the growth and consolidation of the socialist world, to fail to recognize the international class struggle as basic and decisive for these developments, is to fall prey to nationalism.

"The East wind," say the Chinese leaders, "prevails over the West wind." And with this they move toward the position that the basic conflict in the world today is one between the colored peoples and the white peoples, with all the racist overtones implicit in it.

It is such an outlook which leads the Chinese Party to construe the Soviet efforts to limit the development and spread of nuclear weapons as "big-power chauvinism", and as designed primarily to prevent China from obtaining such weapons. Thus, the Chinese leaders think solely in terms of their own possession of nuclear arms — in terms of their own narrow national interests and not in terms of the interests of the whole socialist world, the international working class, the oppressed peoples and the forces of peace generally. Clearly, such an approach tends only to isolate the national-liberation movement from the fight for socialism, and to split the unity of the socialist countries and the world forces of peace and progress on national and racial lines.

But the Chinese leaders go further. They view the entire world conflict essentially as one in which all the rest of the world is arrayed against U.S. imperialism. They state (*More on the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us,* Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1963):

"... U.S. imperialism is trying to build a huge empire in the capitalist world, such as has never been known before. This huge empire which U.S. imperialism is seeking to build would involve the direct enslavement not only of such vanquished nations as West Germany, Italy and Japan, and of their former colonies and spheres of influence, but also of its own wartime allies, Britain, France, Belgium, etc., and their existing and former colonies and spheres of influence.

"That is to say, in its quest for this unprecedentedly large empire, U.S. imperialism concentrated its efforts primarily on the seizure of the immense intermediate zone between the United States and the socialist countries. At the same time, it is using every means to conduct subversion, sabotage and aggression against the socialist countries."

It is correct, of course, to recognize U.S. imperialism as the citadel of world reaction and the drive for world domination as the cornerstone of Wall Street's cold-war program. But the concept of an "immense intermediate zone" embracing all the remaining imperialist powers is a nationalistic distortion of the picture, for it regards the essence of the world conflict today as a struggle of the rest of the world for national independence from U.S. imperialism. It leads to directing the attack not against imperialism as a whole but solely against U.S. imperialism (and it is significant that this tendency is prominent in all the Chinese documents). It overlooks the role of British imperialism, the threat of aggression and war emanating from West German and French imperialism, and the imperialist, anti-socialist character of the Common Market. Rather, it leads to the development of opportunist ties with other imperialist powers in the name of fighting U.S. imperialism. For the world anti-imperialist forces, and above all for these forces in the United States, this struggle is central. But the position of the C.P.C. will weaken not strengthen it. And it must be said that the opposition to the test-ban treaty, as well as the growing anti-Sovietism displayed by the Chinese leaders is consistent with such a pattern.

Such is the end result of the nationalism of the Chinese Communist Party. It gives rise to opportunistic capitulation to imperialism, covered over by revolutionary phrasemongering and a dogmatic, sectarian line. Thus are nationalism on the one hand and dogmatism and sectarianism on the other interrelated — they are the two sides of one coin.

The Chinese Party's false estimate of present-day world relationships and its consequent dogmatic insistence on conclusions supposedly arising out of the relationships of a past period, as well as its corroding nationalism, color its position on all questions. They have led the C.P.C., moreover, not only to present a grossly distorted picture of conditions in other countries but also to falsify and misrepresent the positions of other parties. This, in fact, is the central feature of the editorial "A Comment on the Statement of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.", to whose contents we now turn.

The editorial devotes itself in considerable part to a defense of the Chinese stand on the Caribbean crisis, which we had opposed in our statement of January 9. It states:

"We support the five just demands of the Cuban Revolutionary Government, we were against putting any faith in Kennedy's sham 'guarantee', and we were against imposing 'international inspection' on Cuba. From the outset we directed the spearhead of our struggle against U.S. imperialism, which was committing aggression against Cuba. We neither advocated the sending of missiles to Cuba, nor obstructed the withdrawal of so-called offensive weapons. *We opposed adventurism, and we also opposed capitulationism.* We would like to ask: What was wrong with this correct position of ours? How can it be described as 'a policy leading to nuclear war?' What was there about it that 'dovetails' with the line of U.S. imperialism? (Emphasis added.)"

And further:

"Since you describe the Chinese comrades, who resolutely oppose U.S. imperialism, as being 'pseudo-Left', we would like to ask: What do you consider to be the genuine Left? *Can it be that those using the sovereignty of another country as a counter for political bargaining with U.S. imperialism are to be considered the genuine Left?* To act in that way is indeed to be through-and-through pseudo-Left, or rather, genuinely Right. (Emphasis added.)"

The position of the C.P.U.S.A. is amply set forth in the January 9 statement, in the pamphlet *The Only Choice: Peaceful Coexistence* by Gus Hall, and more recently in the editorial articles "The Ideological Struggle in the American Left" in *Political Affairs* of August, 1963, as well as in numerous other writings. It is not necessary to repeat all this; here we wish only to emphasize certain points:

The above quotations are no more than a reiteration of the original Chinese position, including the portions emphasized, which are an essential part of the basis of our criticism. And this position is simply reasserted, without proof, as one which is self-evidently "correct". But is it?

For what is being reasserted here is that the Soviet Union was guilty of adventurism in placing the missiles and of capitulationism in removing them, and in the course of this, of abusing the sovereignty of Cuba in order to compromise with imperialism. In the light of recent developments, however, these contentions stand up today even less than when they were first made.

Is it not indeed a strange "capitulation" which results not in the destruction of Cuba's sovereignty but in the prevention of threatened invasion and the protection of her continued existence as a sovereign state? And is it not a strange "capitulation" which is not regarded as such by its supposed victims, who on the contrary hail the Soviet

actions as a shining example of selfless assistance, of true international solidarity? Is it not strange that Fidel Castro should respond to "using the sovereignty" of his country "as a counter for political bargaining" by saying, as he did in his television broadcast of June 4, 1963: "This solidarity was displayed in its entire scope due to which the Soviet Union was running a great risk. The Soviet people agreed to make a great sacrifice. Without wavering, they subjected themselves to this risk for the sake of our country"?

It has become unquestionably clear that the freedom of Cuba *was* effectively defended and that the Kennedy Administration *was* compelled to retreat from its invasion plans. But the Chinese have persisted in picturing this outcome as having been somehow achieved by the Cuban people *despite* the Soviet Union. An article by Shoa Tieh-Chen, "Revolutionary Dialectics and How to Appraise Imperialism", appearing in the *Peking Review,* January 11, 1963, presents it as follows: "Two months ago, U.S. imperialism stirred up tension in the Caribbean in an attempt to strangle the Cuban revolution. But with support from the people all over the world the heroic Cuban people waged a resolute struggle, hit back hard at the war provocations of U.S. imperialism and thus defended their sovereignty and their revolution."

But this is not a true picture, for it omits the decisive element. The people of Guatemala, when U.S. imperialism launched its intrigues to overthrow their democratic government, also had the support of people all over the world, but this did not stop imperialism from carrying out its plot. What *did* stop them in the case of Cuba was the shocking realization, thanks to the Soviet actions taken in agreement with the Cuban government, that if they persisted in their course they would have to contend not only with Cuba but also with the Soviet Union, and that they would subject themselves to the threat of retaliatory blows on their own territory. It was this realization which exercised a sobering effect on a section of the Kennedy Administration and impelled Kennedy to retreat and compromise. And it is this realization which makes the promise not to invade Cuba something more than a "sham".

To fail to recognize this, and to continue to attack the role of the Soviet Union, *does* dovetail with the line of U.S. imperialism. To charge the Soviet Union with "capitulationism" *does* give encouragement to the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital in its contention that the outcome was a vindication of the "get tough" policy of brinkmanship and that this policy should therefore be further pursued and stepped up.

Further, if the placing of the missiles was "adventurism" and their removal "capitulationism", what alternative course should have been followed? Either the missiles should never have been put there and preparations to meet the threatened invasion should have been confined to arming the Cuban people to carry on the fight themselves with only the moral support of the rest of the world, and as we have already indicated, it is obvious what the outcome of such an uneven contest

would be. Or, once having been put there, they should not have been removed and the aggressive acts of U.S. imperialism should have been met head-on. The outcome of this course of action is equally obvious, as our January 9, statement quite correctly points out, saying: "The editorials of the *Peking Review,* which emphasize that the alternative policy that should have been followed is one of 'blow-for-blow', and which charge 'surrender' and 'Munich', have only one meaning in the actual circumstances of the time: that the quarantine and threat of bombing should have been met head-on — in short a policy leading to nuclear war." And no amount of mere verbal insistence that one's line is "correct" can alter this. Furthermore, the effect of placing the onus for the crisis on the Soviet Union is to absolve its actual fomenter — U.S. imperialism — of *its* responsibility.

The C.P.U.S.A. and the Kennedy Administration

The main body of the editorial is devoted to an all-out attack on what it purports to be the position of the C.P.U.S.A. with regard to the Kennedy Administration. It states: "For a considerable period. certain leaders of the C.P.U.S.A., in their reports and statements, have been doing their utmost to prettify U.S. imperialism, to prettify Kennedy, the U.S. imperialist chieftain, and to affirm their loyalty to the U.S. ruling class."

What is actually presented, however, is a complete misrepresentation of that position. The misrepresentation, moreover, can only be deliberate, since it is accomplished by stringing together isolated sentences, fragments of sentences and even single words, torn entirely out of context, in such a way as to present a meaning quite different from that of the original. And in many instances the source of these fragmented quotations is not given. The following examples demonstrate the nature and significance of this deliberate distortion.

1. The editorial states:

"They spoke highly of Kennedy's idea of the 'New Frontier', which extends U.S. spheres of inluence over all six continents, saying that 'to speak of a New Frontier, as Kennedy does, is good'."

This fragment is extracted from the following paragraph in a report by Gus Hall ("The United States in Today's World", *Political Affairs,* February, 1961):

"To speak of a New Frontier, as Kennedy does, is good. But there can be no new frontiers along the cold-war path. If the new Administration is to find them, it will have to chart a new course. On the basis of our own study and knowledge of world developments, we are firmly convinced that new frontiers for the United States do exist, but they can be successfully sought only if the direction of our course is towards the ending of the cold war policies and the initiation of policies looking toward peacefull coexistence, the ending of colonialism, disarmament and peace."

Clearly, this is a far cry from "speaking highly" of Kennedy's idea. On the contrary, it is an obvious rejection of it.

2. The editorial states:

"They praised Kennedy's Inaugural Speech, which called on the people of the United States to make sacrifices to promote the cause of U.S. imperialism, saying that it was 'a possible opening on the road to peace'."

The quoted phrase is part of the following paragraph in an article by Daniel Mason in *The Worker* of January 29, 1961:

"Kennedy's inaugural address was welcomed by most of the nations of the world as a possible opening on the road to peace. In the Soviet Union, the address received the widest radio and press coverage."

This is plainly not the same as the editorial's version, for it simply reports a positive world reaction. But the question at issue goes beyond this: Was such a reaction warranted?

Further examination discloses that the positive response was not to the address as a whole, but centered on one particular point in it, summarized in the following words: "So let us begin anew — remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The question is how should one respond to such a statement, particularly in addressing oneself to the American people. One might simply dismiss it out of hand as nothing more than a demagogic utterance, contradicted by other utterances and actions and designed only to conceal the aggressive designs of American imperialism. Or one might take into consideration the mass pressures and other factors which impelled Kennedy to make it and produced the favorable reaction noted above, and on this basis join in the fight to step up these pressures and to demand implementation of the expressed position.

The first approach would lead only to sectarian isolation from the peace movement; the second would associate the Communists with the peace movement of the masses of people and with the utilization of every opening, however small, to advance the cause of peace. The Chinese party, apparently, prefers the former approach. We, on the other hand, have no hesitation in choosing the latter path and in associating ourselves with those who welcome every opening for peace.

3. The editorial states:

"They held that the Kennedy Administration's 'main mass support' is 'the working class, the Negro people and the peace forces', and they wished for 'a shift in policy . . . in the direction of peace and democracy' on the part of the Kennedy government."

The first part is not a statement of policy but a statement of fact, easily verifiable from the results of the 1960 elections and from numerous developments since then. But the policy statement from which it is taken ("The Ultra-Right, Kennedy, and the Role of the Progressives", *The Worker*, July 16, 1961) places it in the following context:

"The Kennedy Administration pursues a contradictory course which flows from the instability of the U.S. imperialist position, from the new relationship of world forces (the growing strength of the socialist, anti-imperialist, and peace forces) which it recognizes but does not fully and properly assess. Its wavering course results also from pressures of the masses of people in our own country, particularly from the working class, the Negro people, the peace forces which have been its main mass support and which elected it."

This is simply an assessment of the position of the Administration, based on an examination of its statements and actions, and of the reasons for them. It is on such assessments that our own policies and tactics must be based, not on mere abstract generalities about the nature and role of U.S. imperialism.

The second part of the editorial's characterization falsifies what the policy statement actually says, as the full context plainly shows:

"The Kennedy Administration pursues this course (i. e., 'a cold-war, interventionist, and generally anti-democratic course') because it is dominated by the big monopolies and financiers whose interests it serves. This must be kept firmly in mind. Yet, while recognizing that it has taken measures which further curtail democratic rights, it would be a serious mistake to consider the Kennedy Administration as embarked at present on the fascist road.

"To make the proper differentiation between Kennedy and the ultra-Right is the central tactical problem faced by the entire Left and all progressives. It is not simple. Kennedy is not a Roosevelt. Since his election, he has been moving in a reactionary direction. But it is not inevitable that he will continue along this path, giving ever wider openings to the ultra-Right.

"If the tactical problem is solved correctly, it will be possible to slam the door on the ultra-Right, defeat it, and force a shift in policy upon the Administration itself in the direction of peace and democracy."

This is a far cry from "wishing for" such a change; it is a call for mass action to *force* a change. It is based on the estimate (as of mid-1962) that 1. there exists a fascist ultra-Right, supported by sections of monopoly capital and Right-wing elements in Congress, which must be taken seriously as a threat to peace and democracy; 2. the Kennedy Administration is not a part of this, and while it is presently veering to the right, its position contains elements of ambivalence and vacillation growing out of the factors enumerated above; and 3. mass pressure on the Administration, coupled with an attack centered on the ultra-Right, can be effective in compelling the Administration to change its course.

To differentiate thus between sections of monopoly capital as a basis for determining the proper tactics for mass struggle is not new; the utilization of such differences is an integral part of the very concept of the united front. To do so is not in itself to "prettify" anyone. The only proper basis of estimate is whether the assessment is right or wrong, and this the editorial does not even trouble to discuss.

The events of the past year, moreover, prove that our assessment was correct. The Kennedy Administration *has* been compelled to alter its course in certain important respects. It has had to abandon, at least for the present, any plans for a Cuban invasion. And this change of course has been followed by other steps in the direction of peaceful coexistence. Chief among these are the new attitudes expressed in Kennedy's June 10 speech, and above all the recently-concluded test-ban treaty. Likewise, there has been a change of course with respect to the Negro rights struggle, with the Administration compelled to retreat somewhat from its original attitude and, in the form of the proposed civil rights legislation, to commit the federal government to a greater degree of responsibility in defending the Constitutional rights of the Negro people. These are developments whose objective consequences are of no small importance to the American people.

4. The editorial states:

"From Kennedy's 1962 State of the Union message, in which he announced the stepping up of armaments to realize the U.S. goal of world domination, they drew the conclusion that the Kennedy Administration 'can be compelled to yield to the pressures from the people'."

This is extracted from an article which is throughout strongly critical of the message (Arnold Johnson, "The Kennedy Program", *Political Affairs,* February, 1962). The immediate context reads as follows:

"Naturally, the President seeks to cover American imperialist designs with fine-sounding phrases such as 'alliance for progress' and 'the challenge of freedom' or 'the new frontier'. The demagogy is clear. Still, this Administration can be compelled to yield to the pressures from the people. *Only the building up of such mass pressure and a struggle against any illusions of simply 'leaving it to the President' can effect a real change in U.S. policy."*

Again, by the selection of an isolated phrase, a call for mass action to compel the Administration to retreat from its cold-war policies is distorted into an implied policy of reliance on the Administration.

5. The editorial states:

"Commenting on Kennedy's 1963 State of the Union message in which he expressed the intention of using nuclear blackmail to establish 'a world of order' led by the United States, they played up his statement that 'we seek not the world-wide victory of one nation or system but a world-wide victory of man' and described this deceitful rubbish as Kennedy's 'recognition of world realities', which 'most people were happy to hear' and which inspired 'hopefulness'."

Here again, an entirely false picture is painted. The source, an article by Daniel Mason in *The Worker* of January 20, 1963, headlined "JFK Hikes War Budget, Shuns Social Aims", criticizes the message at length, characterizing it in such terms as these:

"The President made a sideswiping threat against the AFL-CIO for seeking a 35-hour week to ameliorate unemployment. For the vast ma-

jority of the people, he proposed cuts in the budget that will of necessity reduce Federal social services.

"But for the armaments tycoons, he proposed billions of dollars more in arms expenditures. He tipped his hat politely to peace, but offered no proposals that would ease the way to it."

It is in *this* context that the article states:

"Most people were happy to hear the President declare:

" 'For we seek not the world-wide victory of one nation or system, but a world-wide victory of man. The modern globe is too small, its weapons too destructive, and its disorders too contagious to permit any other kind of victory.' "

"But the hopefulness inspired by such a recognition of world realities was shattered by the qualifying remarks about the need of building up U.S. armaments to achieve it."

Once more, the difference is painfully evident. Added comment is hardly necessary.

Why the Distortions?

We have dwelt at some length on these misrepresentations of our position (and there are many more) in order to show that they are not occasional and unintentional but consistent and deliberate, designed to create a picture of the leaders of the C.P.U.S.A. as "willing apologists for U.S. imperialism". Why has the Chinese Party labored so hard to twist the facts in order to portray us in this false light? We believe it arises from their own erroneous estimate of postwar developments in the United States.

The editorial calls attention to the characterization of U.S. imperialism in the Twelve-Party Declaration and the 81-Party Statement, and in line with these describes it as "the greatest international exploiter, the center of world reaction, the chief bulwark of modern colonialism, the international gendarme, the main force of aggression and war, and the enemy of the people of the world." All this is unquestionably true. But what is one to conclude from it, particularly in waging the struggle against U.S. imperialism within its own citadel in which, moreover, the vast majority of the people do not yet see this and do not accept such an assessment?

One could, as the Chinese leaders evidently propose, apply this characterization mechanically and dogmatically, and conclude that since these things are true of U.S. imperialism as a whole, then every section of monopoly capital and every spokesman for it must be branded as equally reactionary. Hence one cannot differentiate among them in any significant way but must direct one's attack at all equally. More, one must conclude that the most dangerous sections of monopoly capital are those which are at the time in control of the federal government, and hence the attack must be centered on these.

Such sectarian approach grows out of a gross overestimation of the power and extent of imperialist reaction in the United States, and this

is evident in the assessment made by the Chinese Party. Thus, the article by Shao Tieh-Chien cited above states: "After the war, U.S. imperialism became more and more reactionary and rotten politically. *It began to institute a fascist rule at home and gradually discarded even the shadow of democracy and freedom*, arousing more and more opposition from the American people." (Emphasis added.) This is simply not so. Not even when McCarthyism was at its worst could it be said that democracy and freedom had been obliterated. Indeed, anti-McCarthy sentiment proved powerful enough, and among other things was sufficiently prevalent within the ruling class itself, to relegate McCarthy to obscurity and end his witch-hunting career.

The article similarly exaggerates the extent and intensity of the opposition to U.S. imperialism. It says: "The irreconcilable contradictions facing U.S. imperialism at home and abroad were like volcanoes which threatened it every minute and could erupt into revolutions at any moment." This is a totally fanciful picture. Neither now nor at any other time since World War II could it be said with the remotest justification that within the United States there existed a volcano ready to erupt into outright revolution against U.S. imperialism at any moment.

The Chinese leaders' failure to grasp correctly the relationship of forces in this country is but part of their failure to assess properly the shift in the balance of forces which has taken place on a world scale and their insistence on appraising the present picture in terms of the past. They do not give sufficient consideration to the fact that the very process of the decline of capitalism and the growth of socialism, inherent features of the era of imperialism, must give rise to changes in the relationship of forces with profound consequences, in this country as well as elsewhere.

If one were to proceed from the dogmatic approach outlined above, one would have to reject, as being based on illusions, those mass movements of the people which do not come forward in the name of anti-imperialism, lest one sink into reformism and abandon the revolutionary content of Marxism-Leninism. And this is precisely the position which the Chinese party has taken, carrying it to the point of demanding that the world peace movement explicitly express itself as anti-imperialist as a condition for participating in it.

Such an approach we must resolutely reject. To pursue such a course would be to isolate oneself from the struggles of the masses for peace, for jobs, for democratic rights, which they pursue in terms of their present understanding of these problems. It would be to refuse to participate in their struggles and instead to form narrow, sectarian organizations and movements attracting only the small minority already in the Left. It would be to sit on the sidelines and engage in sterile exhortation — in attempts to convince people that they are wasting their time. It would be to remove the conscious element from within these mass struggles and to abandon these masses to the influence of imperialist

ideology. In the end it would be to do nothing — to "sit it out" and wait for the "backward" masses to awaken.

On the other hand, one could take the path of becoming part of these mass movements and projecting within them a course of action which leads in the desired direction and which, step by step, leads to the growth of the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist consciousness of the masses. One could strive, in the course of participating in their struggles for peace, to help people see the role of U.S. imperialism in Cuba, in Vietnam and elsewhere. One could work for the successful accomplishment of every action which, regardless of the degree of awareness of those involved, is objectively a blow against U.S. imperialism and its cold-war policies.

It is this which imperialist reaction fears, not the mouthing of abstract generalities and revolutionary phrases. The winning of the right to vote by the Negro people in the South poses a far greater threat to the power of the Dixiecrats and their reactionary cohorts in the North than does any amount of radical language and pious exhortation to the Negro people that "they must be anti-imperialist". It is in the building of ties with such movements and not in the mere hurling of curses at imperialism that the development of revolutionary content in the work of a Marxist-Leninist Party is to be sought.

To work in such a manner requires the concrete assessment and utilization at all times of differences and conflicts within the camp of monopoly capital itself. Such differences and conflicts are not peripheral or of minor consequence in relation to mass movements and struggles. On the contrary, they are a vital factor in all united front struggles.

This was evident during the thirties in the differences between those sections of monopoly, for whom Roosevelt spoke, who looked to concessions to the workers as the best means of saving capitalism, and those, centered in the Liberty League, who looked to fascism. It war evident during World War II in the differences between those who looked to alliance with the Soviet Union as best serving to preserve American imperialism, and those who opposed it, maintaining that we were fighting "the wrong war".

It is evident today in the differences between those who oppose blockade or immediate invasion of Cuba and those who advocate these measures, between those who support the nuclear test-ban and those who are against it, or between the position of a President Kennedy on civil rights and that of a Governor Wallace.

The source of these differences lies in divergent interests and tactical differences of special sections of monopoly capital. They are accentuated by the growing difficulties of the ruling class — by the mounting strength of the world anti-imperialist forces and the ever greater gap between the aims of imperialism and its ability to attain them. And they are accentuated all the more by the rising tide of mass struggles — of the peace movement, the Negro freedom movement, and the economic struggles of the working class.

It is such considerations that underlie the contradictions in the Administration's statements and actions. However demagogic the President's utterances in behalf of peace, disarmament or other progressive aims may be on a given occasion, they *are* a response to both the difficulties of monopoly capital and growing mass pressures. The task of the mass movement is to seize on the openings they afford and utilize them to advance the struggle.

It is on this approach that the policies and tactics of the C.P.U.S.A. are founded. It is this approach which the Chinese leaders evidently repudiate. This is why, apparently, the editorial strives to picture it as "prettifying Kennedy" and as "serving as willing apologists for U.S. imperialism". And this is why, to make our position fit the Procrustean bed of its preconceived, dogmatic concepts, the editorial falsifies it.

The Negro Freedom Struggles

The distorted picture of the American scene which the Chinese Party presents is especially glaring in relation to the Negro freedom struggles. The perpetrators of the terror against the Negro people in the South are in the first place the Wallaces, the Barnetts, the Eastlands and the rest of the Dixiecrat racist elements, supported chiefly by the extreme Right in other parts of the country. In its failure to move against these elements and to take resolute action to crush the terror, the Kennedy Administration shares in the guilt, and the Negro people are fully aware of this. But the Chinese Party makes every effort to place the *main* responsibility for the oppression of the Negro people on the Kennedy Administration.

At a mass meeting held in Peking on August 12, the Chinese trade union leader Liu Ning-I spoke of "fascist atrocities committed by the Kennedy Administration in suppressing the struggle of the Negroes". (*Peking Review,* August 16, 1963.) A cablegram sent from the meeting to the N.A.A.C.P. and other organizations in this country, ostensibly in support of the August 28 demonstration in Washington, refers to the Kennedy Administration as the "chief culprit for the ruthless persecution of Negroes, champion of racial discrimination and main source of policy of national oppression and aggression throughout the world". It says further: "Since inauguration of Kennedy Administration shocking crimes of brutal suppression against American Negroes have been constantly increasing." (*New York Times,* August 23, 1963.) And the statement issued by Mao Tse-tung on August 8 (*Peking Review,* August 16, 1963) asserts that the Kennedy Administration "is proposing to Congress the so-called 'civil rights legislation' " as part of "an attempt to lull the fighting will of the Negro people and deceive the masses troughout the country".

Without question, the Kennedy Administration is subject to severe criticism and has much to answer for with respect to its failures on this score. It has sought to placate the Negro people with token concessions in order to maintain the support of the racist Dixiecrats. It has persitent-

ly and stubbornly refused to use the full weight of the federal authority and military power in the South, even in the face of the shocking murder of innocent children in Birmingham. And its civil rights legislation leaves much to be desired, as does its readiness to wage the kind of fight which is needed for its passage.

Nevertheless, to make of the Administration the "chief culprit" and the main perpetrator of "fascist atrocities" is sheer perversion of the facts. The August 28 demonstration, a moving, awe-inspiring outpouring of humanity such as has never before been witnessed in Washington or any other American city, was not directed primarily against the Administration, but was called in *support of* what Mao terms the "so-called civil rights legislation". Moreover, it will be followed by an all-out fight to smash the anticipated Dixiecrat filibuster *against it.*

To offer support to the Washington demonstration or to the Negro freedom struggle generally in terms of a fight centered against the Kennedy Administration as a fascist regime is not a help but a disservice to the cause of the Negro people. To do so would lead only to sectarian isolation, to splitting the Negro people's movement from its natural allies among the white masses instead of striving to strengthen these bonds, and to condemning it to impotence. By its position the Chinese Communist Party aligns itself with those ultra-Leftist elements in this country who belittle the Washington demonstration, who accuse its leaders of "selling out" to the Administration, and who come forward with provocative demands for resolving the struggle for Negro freedom through armed conflict.

At the Side of Reaction

In the course of the debate, the Chinese Party has repeatedly hurled at other parties the false slander that they are "following the baton" of the C.P.S.U., that is, that they speak and act as it directs. Such a manner of argument is in general unworthy of any Communist Party. But when it is directed against a Party such as ours, which is defending its very existence against the McCarran Act with its false accusation of "foreign agent", and whose leaders and members are threatened with astronomical prison terms and fines, it is doubly so. The Chinese leaders loudly protest their support of our Party in this struggle; indeed, their editorial complains that their statement of support was not given proper publicity here. However, in the face of the repeated canard that we are guilty of "following the baton" of a foreign party, such protestations become meaningless, for with it they give aid to the enemies of our Party and stab us in the back. For what can such a slander mean other than that we are in fact "foreign agents" who slavishly carry out the behest of the C.P.S.U. in this country — precisely what the McCarran Act asserts?

Nor is the Chinese leaders' assault on our Party confined to this. The editorial states that "there are not a small number of genuine Com-

munists, both inside and outside the Communist Party of the United States, who firmly adhere to Marxism-Leninism and oppose revisionism and dogmatism". It expresses the highest hopes for these "revolutionary Marxists-Leninists of the United States". And who are these "genuine Communists"? Obviously, those individuals who oppose the ideological position and policies of our Party and support those of the C.P.C. And what is this prononuncement if not encouragement to such elements "both inside and outside" the Party to work to undermine and destroy it? In fact, it is no secret that the Chinese party gives support and encouragement to anti-Party splinter groups, led mainly by individuals who have been expelled from the Communist Party, to carry on such activities. Thus, to the deliberate falsification of our position, and to slanders about following the Soviet baton, the C.P.C. adds its direct support of anti-Party elements working to disrupt and wreck the Party.

We have noted above that the opposition of the Chinese leaders to the test-ban treaty has landed them in strange company. But this outcome is by no means confined to their position on this particular question. On the contrary, it is characteristic that on one question after another, while they start out with a highly "revolutionary" position and freely accuse other parties of "revisionism" and "betrayal", they emerge with a policy which places them side by side with reaction.

This is true of their rejection of peaceful coexistence. It is true of their stand on Cuba, which plays into the hands of those in this country who call for its invasion. It is true of their policy of centering the attack on the Kennedy Administration, which serves to strengthen the hand of the most reactionary, ultra-Right elements. It is true of their "follow the baton" slanders, which aid reaction in its efforts to destroy the Communist Party. And it is true of their growing attacks on the Soviet Union and the anti-Sovietism which has already grown to alarming proportions within China. Their abusive accusations of chauvinism, alliance with imperialism and similar crimes are grist to the mill of all enemies of the Soviet Union. In short, the Chinese Party has ended with a virtual vendetta against the first land of socialism and the leading force in the fight against imperialism, for peace and socialism, in the world today.

Again the question arises: how is this to be explained? We ask the Chinese leaders themselves, how do *they* explain the fact that on one issue after another they find themselves in a position which aids the enemies of peace, of national liberation, of socialism, of the Soviet Union? It is a question well worth pondering.

Increasingly, the line and tactics of the C.P.C. bear a disturbing resemblance to those of world Trotskyism, which carries to an extreme the support of imperialist reaction under the cloak of revolutionary phrasemongering. It is also characteristic of Trotskyism that it advances totally unrealistic, radical-sounding proposals as a basis for opposing immediate practical steps. To this, too, the Chinese leadership's proposal for an immediate total ban on nuclear weapons in opposition to the

partial test-ban treaty is disturbingly similar. It is small wonder that the Chinese Party's line has been enthusiastically embraced by Trotskyites everywhere. Certainly, this should give the Chinese leaders pause.

For a Policy of Peaceful Coexistence

Our Party, the Communist Party of the United States, has at all times placed the struggle for peace as its foremost task. And it has at all times based itself firmly on a policy of peaceful coexistence.

In *The Only Choice: Peaceful Coexistence,* Gus Hall writes: "The world Marxists, including ourselves, hold that the policy of peaceful coexistence is compatible with and facilitates the class struggle, the end of colonialism and the emergence of world socialism. We firmly believe that this is not only correct, but that any other policy in the context of the realities of this epoch can lead only to defeats and setbacks."

Life has borne out the correctness of this policy, and not least in the form of the test-ban treaty. We are certain that life will continue to bear it out, and we can justifiably take pride that this policy has been ours and that we have unswervingly fought for it.

This policy has now been challenged by the Communist Party of China. Through its action the Chinese Party has precipitated a serious split in the socialist camp and the international Marxist movement, and has created disunity among the anti-imperialist forces on a world scale. The situation is a grave one, and it is not possible to foretell its exact outcome. It is to be hoped that ultimately the common desire for the world victory of socialism and communism will prevail and unity will be restored.

We have always admired and applauded the glorious achievements of the Communist Party of China in past years. We have greeted as an example for all to follow its great tactical flexibility and wisdom under the most difficult conditions. At the same time, we have always been deeply appreciative of our own obligation to fight unyieldingly every attack of U.S. imperialism against the People's Republic of China. We have consistently demanded that U.S. imperialism get out of Taiwan, and we have fought for the admission of People's China into the United Nations. And these things we shall at all times continue to do. We earnestly hope that the Chinese leaders will on their part seek the path of united struggle against a common enemy.

At present, the situation calls for a firm defense of the ideological position of the world Communist movement and our own Party. Above all, the fight for peaceful coexistence must be carried on with redoubled energy. On this, there must be no compromise, no wavering. It is the one correct path to a world of peace and socialism.

■ ■ ■

Workers of all lands, unite!

FILE COPY

Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Articles and Speeches

INFORMATION BULLETIN

6

PEACE AND SOCIALISM
PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE 1964

CONTENTS

Statement by the C.C., South African C.P.

Resolution of the C.C., C.P. of Martinique

Statement of the National Executive, C.P. of Canada

Joint Statement of the Communist Parties of France and Spain

Speech by Alvaro Kunhal

Communique of the C.C., Portuguese C.P.

Perspectives of the West-European Working-Class Movement

Against Factionists and Splitters (from documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties)

Strive for World Communist Unity

A Statement by the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party

1. Unity is Our Direct Concern

For some time our Party has been gravely perturbed at the differences within the world Communist movement. The points in dispute have been multiplied and sharpened, and the methods of discussion have become intolerably acrimonious and uncomradely. In some fraternal parties factions and breakaway groupings have resulted from differences in the world movement. Differences about Marxist theory have not been confined to the Communist parties, but have spread into international organizations and gatherings of peace, labour, national liberation and other progressive movements embracing both Communists and non-Communists. Even state relations between socialist countries were affected, with serious effects on their economic development and endangering the solidarity of the socialist camp.

We cannot take a detached view of this problem. Our Party is taking part in a grim struggle against the fascist apartheid regime, known, hated and despised by the whole world. Our people have embarked on the path of armed resistance rather than submit to the tyranny and degradation of continued White minority domination; foremost leaders of the South African people are being arbitrarily arrested, tortured and murdered by the Verwoerd-Vorster dictatorship.

Our struggle against apartheid is not only of local, but also of crucial international importance. The fight against the special form of colonialism existing in South Africa is an integral part of the struggle for the liberation of the whole African continent from colonialism in all its forms: the continuing African Revolution for freedom, unity and rapid social progress. The fascist South African regime with its powerful military machine, built up with the aid of the imperialists, poses an urgent threat to African independence and security and to world peace. Solidarity with the struggle against apartheid, the international isolation of the Verwoerd regime, and the severing of its links with imperialism which sustain it and enable it to continue its rule of oppression—these questions have become a focus of international attention, discussion and activity: a rallying point of the forces of peace, national liberation and socialism everywhere. Unity of the progressive forces of the world will hasten the liberation of our people. Disunity prolongs the agony of South Africa.

Reprinted from *International Bulletin*, No. 5, December 1963.

The heart and soul of the unity of the anti-imperialist forces, both on an international scale and within each country, is the Communist movement. Fruitless and protracted disputes among ourselves both distract us from our great common aims and retard the achievement of unity of all anti-imperialist forces. For that reason in particular we South African Communists are vitally concerned with the world unity of our movement. International Communist unity is a correct slogan, an essential for the security and progress of the socialist camp, the defence of peace and the advance of national liberation everywhere. For us South African Communists it is also an urgent practical necessity affecting our work in many different ways.

2. Some of the Problems under Discussion

In considering some of the specific problems under discussion, we are guided by our own independent judgement; by our understanding of Marxism-Leninism and our experience of forty-two years of struggle of our Party in extremely complicated and difficult conditions. Throughout the history of our Party we have been accused by the capitalists and others of being blind followers or agents of "Moscow". These were baseless and unworthy slanders. Communists in all countries have faced prison and death because they have the ability to think for themselves and the courage to say what they think. We supported the main lines of policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union because we considered they were correct, in the interests of the Soviet people, of the workers and oppressed people of our own country and of the whole world. We did not allow slander or persecution to deter us from expressing our views. In the same spirit we defended anti-imperialist struggles in all parts of the world, including the heroic Chinese revolution. History has vindicated the correctness of our understanding and judgement, on which we continue to rely today in considering various matters of international debate.

It is being suggested today that the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has abandoned revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in favour of revisionism, and that the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems involves capitulation to imperialism and the abandonment of wars of national liberation. We do not believe these suggestions are in any way justified.

We considered, and still do, that the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Programme it adopted for the building of Communism, were outstanding contributions to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. These conclusions are embodied in our own Programme, *The Road to South African Freedom*, which was adopted at our Fifth National Conference in 1962 after the fullest discussion among all of our members.

The policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social

systems, as the basic line of foreign policy of the socialist countries is not something new, that has been advanced in the past two or three years. It was put forward by Lenin, and it has been elaborated since the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. in present day conditions. This concept was approved in the clearest terms by the meetings of fraternal parties in 1957 and 1960. Our own Party participated in, approved and endorsed these decisions, and carried them out in its practical work. In our view the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis and the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty on atomic tests are positive results of this concept and proof of its validity; they were events which lowered international tension and helped to prevent the imperialists from plunging the world into the ultimate horror and disaster of a general thermonuclear war.

We regard the Moscow Treaty as a positive achievement of the progressive forces all over the world, including South Africa, which have long been campaigning for the ending of nuclear tests. The treaty puts a stop to the dangerous contamination of the air and the oceans. It helps, and is a step forward in our continuing struggle for the abandonment and destruction of all nuclear weapons, and for eventual general, complete and controlled disarmament. We vigorously condemn the French government which intends to go on with nuclear tests on the soil of our continent and elsewhere, poisoning the air we breathe. And we regret very much that the Chinese comrades, by belittling and attacking the Moscow Treaty, weaken the international exposure and isolation of French imperialism on this matter.

We South Africans, like all fighters for African freedom, are keenly conscious of the solidarity, the support both moral and practical, rendered to our struggle by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. We remember Suez; we remember Algeria; we remember the innumerable occasions when our cause has been championed by the socialist countries; we know of their unqualified backing for African freedom today. No sincere African patriot will ever forget these things. The plain facts of present-day history disprove any suggestion that the Soviet Union, or the policy of peaceful coexistence, or the demand for disarmement hamper or retard the national liberation of colonial or formerly colonial peoples.

As stated in our Programme, universal disarmament would not only free our generation from the nightmare of a catastrophic nuclear war; it would also "greatly assist the cause of national liberation by striking the arms from the hands of the imperialists". It is not the African patriots, fighting an armed struggle with inferior weapons, who are adversely affected by our campaign for disarmament; it is the powerfully-armed enemies against whom they fight. It is the imperialists and the armament-manufacturers, in particular it is the Verwoerds, the Salazars, the Chiang Kai-sheks and their like, who profit from international tension and the cold war. International tension and the cold

war facilitate the continuing support of these condemned regimes by imperialism, on the grounds that they are "bastions of the West, of anti-communism". Already a certain lessening of tension has brought about a situation where an international arms embargo on South Africa could be passed by the United Nations, and a further relaxation of cold war pressures could enable this embargo to be enforced. Ending the cold war would help towards the liquidation of the remaining islands of colonialism and fascism both through mass political struggle and armed revolution.

The national-liberation movements of countries which are fighting colonialism and neo-colonialism and the heritage of colonialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America are not alone in their struggles. They share common aims and aspirations with the working people of the socialist countries and the developed capitalist countries. They have a common enemy: international imperialism. There is a profoundly necessary and healthy trend for all the progressive movements of all countries to merge in a mighty stream for peace and the liberation of all mankind. Our Party is vigorously opposed to any tendency to isolate our national-liberation movement from their allies and brothers in the socialist countries, and from the militant labour and progressive anti-imperialist movements in the capitalist countries. Such tendencies are fraught with the gravest dangers.

We in South Africa have striven ceaselessly to preserve and uphold the character of our people's struggle for freedom as a united movement both of the oppressed non-whites and the progressive whites. It is not the Communists, not the national-liberation leaders, but Verwoerd and his kind, enemies of mankind, who try to divide people on lines of "colour". They try to present a picture of an inevitable conflict, in South Africa and all over the world: not a conflict between workers and capitalists, between oppressor and oppressed, but solely one between the so-called "white" and "non-white" races. It is the duty of all Communists and other anti-fascists, everywhere, to fight uncompromisingly against any such utterly false, dangerous and anti-human ideas.

3. Divisions Can and Must Be Healed

We believe strongly that the principles and interests which the world Communist movement and the socialist countries have in common are far more fundamental, permanent and binding than any temporary differences on day-to-day policy which have arisen or may again arise. We are sure that time will prove this view to be correct, and that these long-term and fundamental factors will reassert themselves. We are vigorously opposed to any "theory" that a split, an organizational cleavage in our movement is inevitable, necessary or "healthy". The only ones who would welcome such a theory are the imperialists,

and those confused elements, unprincipled careerists and adventurers, Trotskyists and others who are always ready to profit by differences between serious revolutionaries in order to establish a platform for themselves.

Honest anti-imperialist fighters outside the ranks of the Communist movement, trade unionists, peace workers and others are dismayed by the sharp differences that have arisen in our movement and by the unseemly methods used to express them. They do not wish to be drawn into our dispute, and they demand urgently that we settle our problems among ourselves and get on with the innumerable practical tasks they and we have in common.

In the past, our great Communist movement has known many attempts to split it and to divert it from the path of Marxism-Leninism. Such attempts, for example, were made by elements like the anarchists and the Trotskyites. For some time they gained a certain amount of support among sections of the "ultra-Left" middle-class intellectuals who always attach themselves to the revolutionary movement, and whose character was so brilliantly analyzed by Lenin in his masterly essay: *"Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder*. Again, on many occasions, oportunist, Right-wing tendencies developed in the working class movement, especially in the imperialist countries, based on the sharing of a portion of the imperialists' superprofits with the "aristocracy of labour" as the price for their support. But all these erroneous concepts and theories have been tested and proved false by the unfolding of history, they have been rejected by the revolutionary working class and the anti-imperialist masses. Marxism-Leninism has been proved by history to be the only correct revolutionary theory, and communism the only alternative to capitalism with its poverty, exploitation and oppression; its crises, chaos and wars.

Moreover, we Communists, coming from all over the world, and with widely differing conditions of life and work, have reached, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, an extraordinary degree of unanimity. We have agreed on the new problems with which life has faced us, on the characterization of our new epoch and on the most pressing and urgent problems of the world we live in today. The only differences which remain among us are those relating to the detailed interpretation of agreements we have already reached.

There is thus no basis, in theory or in fact, in differences of class or national interest or outlook, for any split within our ranks. It would be idle to pretend that sericus divergencies have not already taken place, and serious damage caused, by disagreements among us Communists, and by uncomradely methods of debate. But the damage is not irreparable. Our pressing need for unity must override all our differences. The immediate problem is: what is the way out of this situation? How can we Communists heal the breaches and restore unity, comradeship and confidence among all of us?

We think the first step is to bring to an end the unseemly type of unrestrained "all-in" controversy we have been witnessing in which all methods have been regarded as permissible for "victory". In reality such controversy can lead to no "victory"; all the Communists stand to lose by it. There can be no possibility of calm and rational debate. Issues are multiplied out of reason; the air is filled with recriminations and angry insults; state relations between socialist countries deteriorate to the point where economic development and even security are adversely affected; our friends are repelled; destructive factional struggles spread inside every Party; only the enemy rejoices.

We do not think any useful purpose will be served by discussing who was to blame for this deplorable state of affairs, or who started it. What is important is to make a new start, a new drive for unity. And we are sure that the first essential step is to bring to an immediate end the period of debate of our differences outside the ranks of the Communist movement itself.

By this we do not mean, of course, that we should not discuss our differences; without discussion and interchange of views there can be no agreement. But we do mean that the discussion should be brought under control; that before further discussions we should have agreement on exactly what subjects are to be discussed, and by whom, and in what manner.

We are of the opinion, in general, that detailed discussions should be limited to those directly concerned. In particular we think that the detailed interpretation of questions of Marxist-Leninist theory should never be submitted for debate or arbitration to non-Communists.

We think that all of us should scrupulously observe certain rules of comradely discussion. It is impermissible to ascribe views to others which they have not expressed, or which are derived by inferences and out-of-context quotations. Nor is it permissible to ascribe improper and un-Communists motives to comrades with whom one disagrees.

We think that questions regarding the internal policy of any Party should not as a rule be generally debated by fraternal parties. If one Party has criticism to make of the internal policy of another it should be made in a private and comradely manner.

We would urge, with all due modesty, that on the basis of some such preliminary understanding, and on the basis of ending the public controversy, discussions should be held between the leaderships of the socialist countries as a means of preparing the way for a general discussion of the whole Communist movement. Without an understanding and discussions of this kind we do not think any useful purpose would be served by a big meeting of all the parties at the present time.

For our part, we shall do all we can to strive for unity in the world Communist movement. We shall discuss every issue on its merits, regardles of who puts forward any viewpoint. And we shall contest vi-

gorously any viewpoint which disunites, diverts or confuses the Communist and working-class movement, the anti-Colonialist African Revolution and the great struggle for South African freedom.

We call upon all South African Communists to defend the unity of our Party, based on our Marxist-Leninist Programme, and to fight ruthlessly against any sort of factionalism, which in present-day conditions of illegality and repression endanger the very existence of our Party and the lives of all our members.

In the name of our great world movement, as well as of our noble fight for South African freedom, the cause of all progressive humanity, we appeal to all the leaders and members of our fraternal parties to strive for a new beginning, an overwhelming campaign for unity.

Long live communism! Long live the unity of the world Communist movement!

■ ■ ■

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Martinique on the Situation in the International Communist Movement

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Martinique has thoroughly examined the ideological differences in the international Communist movement.

It notes that there are serious differences of opinion between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of Communist parties, on the one hand, and the Chinese Communist Party and some other parties, on the other hand, on a number of basic issues.

The Central Committee dwelt mainly on the principal issues with a direct bearing on the tasks of our Party and the struggle of the people of Martinique, namely:

— the problem of peace and peaceful coexistence;

— the question of the personality cult;

— the problem of transition from capitalism to socialism;

— the connection between the struggle of the international working class and the national-liberation movement.

Peaceful Coexistence Is the Correct Way

The Communist Party of Martinique reaffirms its full agreement with the general line of the world revolutionary movement as outlined in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960.

On the question of war and peace, which is the most pressing problem of our time, the Communist Party reaffirms its agreement with the thesis of the 81-Party Statement that "world war can be prevented" and that "a real possibility will have arisen to exclude world war from the life of society even before socialism achieves complete victory on earth, with capitalism still existing in a part of the world."

This assessment is based on an objective analysis of the content of our time which is characterized by the decisive strength of the combined forces of the socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement and the other democratic and peace-loving forces. A new world balance favouring the forces of peace and

---

Justice, No. 49, November 21, 1963.

progress has come into being, and with it the possibility of compelling imperialism to accept peaceful coexistence.

In a situation when the world is divided into two systems the only correct and rational principle of international relations is peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems.

The choice is between peaceful coexistence and thermonuclear war.

The Central Committee notes that recent international events, such as the Caribbean crisis and the limited test-ban treaty, have demonstrated the correctness of the policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the U.S.S.R. and the erroneousness of the stand taken by the Chinese comrades.

During the Caribbean crisis it was the Soviet Union's levelheadedness and high sense of responsibility that preserved world peace and at the same time made it possible to save the Cuban socialist revolution and safeguard the very existence of the Cuban people.

As for the limited test-ban treaty, it is a solemn commitment to end nuclear explosions causing the greatest damage to people's health, and to prevent the dangerous proliferation of nuclear weapons which would make it increasingly difficult to avert a new war; it is a step forward which all peoples should support with a view to winning a complete ban on the testing, manufacture and use of nuclear weapons and to achieiving general controlled disarmament. The opposition of the Chinese Communist Party to peaceful coexistence being recognized as the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries runs counter to the 81-Party Statement.

The Communist Party of Martinique condemns the attacks made by the Chinese comrades against the Soviet government, which they accuse of "betrayal of the peoples and socialism" during the Caribbean crisis and in connection with the signing of the Moscow treaty. The Communist Party of Martinique holds that the Soviet Union served well the cause of the peoples and of socialism.

The assertions of the Chinese comrades that the peaceful coexistence advocated by the C.P.S.U. and other Communist parties means "class collaboration between the exploiters and the exploited", or "collaboration between the oppressed nations and the oppressor countries", are completely groundless. The facts show that peaceful coexistence creates the most favourable conditions for the victory of the national-liberation movement and the disintegration of the colonial system, that it favours the class struggle in the countries under imperialist rule. Peaceful coexistence is a form of class struggle between capitalism and socialism on a world scale.

For us socialism means peace. There is no doubt that world war would signify the complete annihilation of many peoples, including the numerically small people of Martinique, which a single nuclear bomb could wipe off the face of the earth.

The policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the socialist camp, exerting an influence on the French, British and U.S. imperialists,

ensured the victory of the Cuban revolution and facilitated the achievement of independence or autonomy by most of the Caribbean countries as well as the anti-imperialist struggle in Latin America. It greatly facilitates the liberation struggle of the people of Martinique while impeding the intrigues of U.S. imperialism against our country.

Against the Personality Cult

In the matter of the personality cult, the Chinese comrades, while posing as "opponents of exaggerating the role of individuals", now come out against the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and criticize those who raised the question of "combating the personality cult", especially the comrades from the C.P.S.U. who exposed the Stalin cult.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Martinique is convinced that there was a personality cult in Stalin's time and that it was necessary to expose this cult, which paralyzed the creative initiative of the masses and could only act as a brake on the development of the socialist society.

The Communist Party of Martinique knows from its own experience, and especially from the events of 1956, that the personality cult presents a threat also to the Communist parties of countries which have not freed themselves from capitalism, that it can cause serious harm to the working class, and that it must be energetically combated.

Forms of Transition to Socialism

As regards the ways in which the socialist world system develops, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Martinique agrees, as hitherto, with the thesis of the 81-Party Statement concerning the possibility of peaceful ways to socialism becoming available to the peoples under certain conditions.

Peaceful transition to socialism, the possibility of which Lenin conceded in theory, appeared to be a very remote likelihood in his time. But for all that Lenin foresaw that the international role of the great commonwealth of socialist nations and its influence on the march of world events would rapidly grow.

Today, when the world balance has changed in favour of the forces of progress, when the socialist world system has become the *decisive factor* of social development, transition to socialism by peaceful means is becoming increasingly possible, a fact which the Communist parties naturally cannot ignore. By redoubling its efforts in order to leave the United States behind in peaceful competition, the Soviet Union is setting an example for the peoples and thereby facilitating their struggle for socialism.

This, however, has never been understood to mean that the working class should renounce the non-peaceful way. "... The degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or other stage of the struggle for socialism. The actual possibility of the one or the other way of transition to socialism in each individual country depends on the concrete historical conditions." The working class should be prepared for the "most rapid and sudden shifts from one form of struggle to the other".

The International Working-Class Movement Is the Mainstay of the National-Liberation Movement

Serious differences have arisen also as regards the role of the national-liberation movement in the world revolutionary process.

On this question the Communist Party of Martinique reaffirms its support of the theses contained in the 81-Party Statement, namely, that the socialist world system is the decisive factor in the evolution of human society and that, even if the national-liberation movement in Africa, Asia and Latin America represents a very substantial force in the world revolutionary movement, the basic contradiction of our time is, nevertheless, the contradiction between capitalism and socialism.

The Communist Party of Martinique condemns the accusations levelled by the Communist Party of China against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that the C.P.S.U. allegedly "scorns the liberation struggle of the oppressed nations". Proceeding from this false premise, the Chinese comrades have sought to exclude the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries from some international conferences dealing with the problems of Asia and Africa. Such a concept can only lead to isolating the national-liberation movement from the international working-class movement, depriving it of its main support. In reality the Soviet Union is rendering the most effective aid in many forms both to peoples fighting for their liberation (including those waging an armed struggle) and to newly-emerged states working to consolidate their political and economic independence, as can be seen from the example of Cuba, the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Angola, Guinea and many other countries.

In reality, the revolutionary cause of the peoples depends wholly on the merging of all the revolutionary forces of our time in a single stream. In this alliance the decisive role belongs to the international working class and its creation — the socialist world system.

The international Communist movement must devote the utmost attention and render maximum support to the national-liberation struggle.

Unity Must Be Preserved

The Communist Party of Martinique considers the unity of the international Communist movement to be a prime factor making for the rapid advance of the world revolutionary movement.

It is deeply distressed by the present differences which are fraught with the danger of a split and impede the progress of the cause of the proletariat and the peoples' liberation struggle. In its opinion, those who are seeking to provoke a split are taking a grave responsibility upon themselves. To overcome the differences, all parties must respect the agreed decisions jointly adopted at international conferences of the Communist parties.

The Communist Party of Martinique therefore declares for the convocation of a conference of all Communist parties to confirm once again the general line of the international Communist movement.

The Communists of Martinique are convinced that the international Communist movement will be able to overcome the differences and to preserve its unity.

The Central Committee calls upon all Communists of Martinique to rally in solid unity under the banner of proletarian internationalism and, guided by Marxism Leninism, to adhere to the line charted by the international Communist movement in order sucessfully to carry the liberation struggle to completion.

Adopted unanimously, November 3, 1963.

■ ■ ■

On the International Movement

Statement of the National Executive Committee,
Communist Party of Canada

This National Committee meeting re-affirms once again its support for the general line of the international Communist movement as expressed in the Declaration and Statement of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Conferences of Communist and Worker's parties with which our Party Program fully corresponds.

Events since then have fully demonstrated their validity and power.

Our Party has at various occasions (National Convention, National Committee meetings and through a Party delegation to the C.P.S.U. and C.P. of China) expressed its views on the ideological differences in the world Communist movement which in the recent period have become much more acute.

The general line of the world movement has been attacked by the leadership of the C.P. of China under cover of pseudo revolutionary phrases with the aim of imposing its own line, its own policy on the world Communist movement, in the course of which it has undertaken a slanderous campaign directed to discrediting the Soviet Union, the C.P.S.U. and other Communist and Workers parties.

By its actions the C.P. of China has done serious harm to the unity of the world Communist movement. Under the guise of combating revisionism the C.P. of China has undertaken to split the world Communist movement, assumed the right to interfere in the internal affairs of fraternal parties, striven to separate and isolate the national liberation movement from the socialist system of states and from the working class in the capitalist countries, separated itself from the socialist system of states with respect to the fight for peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament and with regard to those policies of economic cooperation between socialist states which would enable them to compete most sucessfully with capitalism in the economic field and thereby most effectively to demonstrate to the working class of the capitalist countries the superiority of the socialist economy.

By labelling U.S. imperialism and its A- and H-Bombs as "paper tigers" and declaring that the struggle for life and against nuclear war is cowardly the C.P. of China shows that it fails to understand the nature of world nuclear war and minimizes the possibility of rallying the majority of mankind to fight against nuclear war in order to preserve life.

Reprinted from *Discussion*, December 1963.

By incorrectly posing the issue as being world revolution as against peaceful coexistence, on the pretext that peaceful coexistence bans revolutionary struggle and impedes it, the C.P. of China in effect denies the decisive character of the struggle for peace, for disarmament and for peaceful coexistence in the present epoch. It plays down the struggles of the people for that aim and its revolutionary potential. It mechanically separates two aspects of one process in the sense that the struggle for peace in today's conditions offers the most favorable opportunities to curb imperialism and advance the cause of socialism, facilitating the struggle for national liberation as well as stimulating the struggles of the working-class and democratic forces against monopoly in the capitalist world, thereby widening the social base of struggle for the advance to socialism. In today's conditions with thermonuclear weapons now available which can inflict wholesale destruction on mankind, the struggle for peace becomes the main world force against imperialism and for socialism. It is this new possibility which the C.P. of China rejects.

By the statement that a world without wars is only possible after the destruction of imperialism everywhere and that the chiefs of staff of the imperialist countries decide the issue of peace or war, the C.P. of China comes out in opposition to the 1957 and 1960 World Conferences on the non-inevitability of war and denies in effect that a world war can be averted arising from the new anti-war, anti-imperialist forces which have emerged on the world arena and which, if united are able to impose peace on the warmakers.

On the one hand the C.P. of China declares that the main areas of revolutionary storms have shifted to Asia, Africa and Latin America from where imperialism will be destroyed and emancipation will come to the working people in the capitalist world, in effect denying the historic role of the working class and the socialist system of states in the defeat of imperialism. On the other hand the C.P. of China accuses our Party and other Communist and Workers parties in the capitalist countries of being reformist and cowardly and looks on the struggle for democratic aims, for the immediate economic needs of the working people, and above all, the struggle for peace, as unimportant matters, or at best tactical slogans. The C.P. of China counterposes the struggle for socialism to the struggle for peace, declaring that the struggle for peace diverts the masses from socialist revolution. Such an approach closes the door to a truly effective struggle against imperialism, which as Lenin said "is nothing except monopoly capitalism", isolates the working class from its allies and our Party from the working class. It is another example of sheer pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering which our Party completely rejects.

On all questions of peace and war and the struggle for peaceful coexistence as well as with respect to the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, which the C.P. of China proposes to replace by

policies of advocacy of export of revolution, the C.P. of China takes positions opposed to that of our Party and its Program.

What is involved here is not only a matter of interpretation of the 1957 and 1960 world documents but the advancement of another line based on entirely different estimates and different conclusions from present-day phenomena. These differences have already found their concrete expression with respect to the Caribbean crisis, the solution of border conflicts, and the partial test-ban treaty and follow logically from the erroneous policies pursued by the C.P. of China. They constitute a form of sabotage of efforts at the settlement of differences through negotiations and mutual compromise as they constitute a form of sabotage of the concrete forms of the struggle for peace and disarmament. They weaken the world front of peace and thereby aid imperialism.

In sum total the policies advanced by the C.P. of China represents a nationalist line, a dogmatic line, an adventurist line and were it to become the basis of the policies of the world Communist movement, could do incalculable harm to the cause of peace, the national-liberation movement, the working-class struggle in the capitalist world and the cause of world socialism. At the bottom it is a line of defeatism and retreat covered up by pseudo-revolutionary phrases which ignore the new possibilities appearing in our epoch due to the decisive shifts in the relationship of forces on a world scale.

For our Party as for all Communist and Workers parties in the capitalist world the policies advanced by the C.P. of China would close the door to the masses of working people without whom there can be no effective struggle for peace, democracy, independence or for socialism.

This National Committee meeting affirms again its principled and unalterable opposition to the erroneous non-Marxist and anti-Leninist positions of the leadership of the C.P. of China. It endorses the N.E.C. statement of October 3, 1963 which called upon the Party as a whole to strengthen and extend our work to enlighten and clarify all democratic people concerning the confusion and the encouragement to disruption inherent in the propaganda of the C.P. of China and which called for a world conference of Communist and Workers parties to rally behind the principles of Marxism-Leninism as embodied in the documents of 1957 and 1960 so as to defeat the dogmatic trend which has appeared in the world movement. We urge that agreement be reached to end public polemices so that a proper atmosphere can be created for the convening of such a World Conference.

The enemies of communism, of peace and socialism rejoice too soon and consider that the differences in the world Communist movement are irreconcilable, cannot be resolved and that a split is inevitable. This is furthest from the truth. The differences which have arisen in the world movement are not rooted in the socialist system but arise

from subjectivist, one-sided and therefore erroneous views on the part of the C.P. of China with regard to world phenomena. Precisely because they are subjective in character, they can and will be resolved on the basis of the solid foundations of Marxism-Leninism as embodied in the 1957 and 1960 documents of the world Communist movement.

The National Committee declares that our Party, like the majority of Communist and Workers parties, will patiently persevere in all efforts at restoring and consolidating unity on a firm principled basis.

■ ■ ■

Joint Statement of the Communist Parties of France and Spain

The following statement issued jointly by the French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain was published in *l'Humanité* on January 7, 1964:

Delegations of the French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain met in December 1963 for an extensive exchange of information and views which took place in an atmosphere of fraternity. The discussion revealed complete identity of views on both the international situation and the political atmosphere and perspectives in France and Spain.

The two delegations reaffirm their allegiance to the thesis contained in the Statement of the 81-Parthy meeting that *"the democratic and peace forces today have no task more pressing than that of safeguarding humanity against a global thermonuclear disaster"*.

They also stress the significance of the Moscow partial test-ban treaty signed by over a hundred states and hail it as an important step towards averting this disaster. The Moscow treaty opens to the peoples new perspectives of progress, the road to fresh success for the peace-loving forces. It is the result of the peace-loving policy of the U.S.S.R. and the socialist camp as a whole, the outcome of the struggle waged by the peoples for peace.

Further efforts in the struggle for peace will make it possible to secure the ending of all nuclear tests—including underground tests—general and controlled disarmament, and negotiated settlement of all outstanding issues, in particular those of Germany and West Berlin. Nuclear war must be made impossible by waging a vigorous and incessant struggle for the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons, for disarmament, for a world without arms and without armies.

The struggle for world peace, for general and controlled disarmament is in the best interests of humanity as a whole; this struggle fully corresponds to the interests and traditions of our two peoples and our parties. The two delegations energetically reject the idea that victorious socialism can be achieved through a nuclear world war. The advance of democracy, the ultimate victory of socialism in the capitalist countries, the consolidation of socialism and the transition to communism in countries where the working class has already come to power—all this is intimately linked up with the defence of world peace and the policy of peaceful coexistence. The two delegations reaffirm that the struggle for peace, coexistence and general and con-

---

Abridged.

trolled disarmament remains the major task for all Communist and Workers' parties.

The delegations of the French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain believe that in order to ensure the security of their peoples and of the whole world it is necessary to intensify the struggle for dismantling U.S. military bases, against the installation of West-German military bases in France and in Europe as a whole, against de Gaulle's atomic "striking force" and against giving atomic weapons to the Bonn government either through the Bonn-Paris axis or by way of building "multilateral forces". The two delegations denounce the collaboration and joint military manoeuvres conducted by the governments of de Gaulle and Franco as a menace to peace and democracy, as a form of support extended by the Gaullist regime to the rotten tyranny which oppresses the people of Spain.

The two delegations have reaffirmed their solidarity with the Communists and other democrats persecuted and imprisoned in Portugal, West Germany, Greece, Iraq, Morocco and Martinique.

The two parties reaffirm their complete solidarity with the movement for national and social liberation and voice their support for the peoples still oppressed by colonialism—the peoples of Angola, Portuguese and Spanish Guinea and South Rhodesia. They salute the peoples fighting against neo-colonialism and imperialism, in particular the peoples of Venezuela, South Vietnam and Laos.

The two parties proclaim their solidarity with heroic Cuba and its struggle against the provocations of U.S. imperialism, to safeguard its independence and consolidate its socialist system. They also declare their solidarity with the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria and express their sympathy for the socialist changes being carried out in that country.

The Communist Party of Spain and the French Communist Party reaffirm their conviction that the cooperation of the newly-free countries with the countries of the socialist camp and with the working-class movement in the capitalist countries is an earnest of new successes in the struggle against imperialism, for human progress and for peace.

The changes taking place in the world and the major successes scored by the two parties go to show the correctness of the line jointly elaborated and unanimously approved by the meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960.

In the European capitalist countries, as is shown, among other things, by the experience of France and Spain, large-scale mass actions of the working class and other anti-monopoly sections have taken place in recent times, which opens the perspective of a new advance for the democratic forces, the perspective of a still more vigorous struggle to curb and, ultimately, abolish the power of the monopolies. With each passing day the ideas of socialism are striking deeper and

deeper roots among the mass of the working people, intellectuals and the youth. The forces and influence of the Communist and Workers' parties are growing.

In this evolution the success of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the power of attraction exerted by their policy of peace and their disinterested aid to other peoples play an enormous role. This evolution received particularly great impetus after the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which, overcoming the consequences of the personality cult and boldly developing the creative spirit of Marxism-Leninism, have rendered an inestimable service to the cause of communism. Each day more and more people realize the absurdity of the situation when the great scientific and technological achievements of our time are utilized, in large measure, for the manufacture of terrible and ruinous weapons of mass dectruction, while their peaceful use would make it possible to put an end to the hunger and poverty still plaguing the people in many parts of the world and to the disgraceful inequality which still exists.

The responsibility of the imperialist system for this state of affairs and the need to advance to a system of society which will place the achievement of science and technology at the service of man—and this system is socialism— are becoming increasingly obvious to all, including people who, ideologically, are still very remote from Marxism-Leninism.

In our time the people come to socialism following different roads. New perspectives of reaching mutual understanding and unity in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism are now on hand. The possibility of achieving socialism along their own, peaceful ways in a number of coutries is based precisely on the might of the socialist world system, those profound changes which have occurred in the world and on the unprecedented growth of productive forces—factors which also determine the growth of people's consciousness.

The delegations of the French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain have agreed on the need to carry on the policy of building the unity of the working class and all other democratic forces both in the struggle for democracy and in the struggle for socialism.

In view of this perspective, the two parties consider it necessary to exert every effort in order to secure unity of action with the Socialist parties in both countries and with other organizations, including Catholic organizations which adopt advanced positions on the social and political plane.

The French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain maintain that in the present historical situation it is possible to achieve in both countries effective cooperation between the Communist parties and other democratic parties not only in the present-day struggle for democracy but in the struggle for socialism as well.

The two parties express satisfaction with their close fraternal co-operation under the banner of proletarian internationalism. They consider that communism is internationalist in its very essence. Deriving from the experience of the international Communist movement the vanguard of which is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and upholding the fundamental principles of our teaching and its method of creative analysis of new phenomena, the common general line of the Communist and working-class movement, which also respects the specific features of each party and each country, is both possible and necessary.

Therefore, while voicing their agreement with practically the entire international Communist movement, the two parties are indignant at the splitting activities carried out by the leaders of the Communist Party of China both in inter-party relations and inside the fraternal parties of various countries. Both parties believe that a split can only play into the hands of the imperialists. They denounce the violent attacks launched by the Communist Party of China against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders and also against the other Communist parties which uphold the line approved by the international Communist movement. The two parties declare that the sectarian and dogmatic line advocated by the leaders of the Communist Party of China is only capable of isolating the Communists from the masses and leading to their defeat.

The French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Spain express their firm resolution to exert every necessary effort, working side by side with the C.P.S.U. and other parties of the international Communist and working-class movement and displaying the maximum of patience, to overcome the present differences with the Chinese comrades on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. The two parties express their desire to achieve this, without, however, losing sight of the considerable difficulties arising from the violent, uncomradely character which the Chinese Party imparts to the open polemics, and also from its refusal to maintain this polemic within the framework of the international Communist and working-class movement.

The two parties favour the convocation of a conference of the international Communist and working-class movement which could make an important contribution to healing the split and reinforcing unity.

Patiently conducting the discussion on a principled political and ideological foundation, the two parties will spare no effort and miss no opportunity to promote and reinforce unity which is the guarantee of the triumph of peace and socialism.

■ ■ ■

The Situation in the World Communist Movement

(From the Speech by Alvaro Cunhal at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Portugal, August 1963)

Comrade Cunhal noted that the position of the Portuguese Communist Party in the debate had been consistent throughout. In 1960, when the Communist Party of China published and circulated all over the world its pamphlet *Long Live Leninism* in which it attacked the general line adopted in 1957, the Political Committee of our Party published a document entitled "Three Problems of Today", refuting the basic theses of the Chinese comrades.

In this document, which examined the question of the different ways leading to the victory of socialism on a world scale, our Party strongly opposed the theory that war is inevitable and that this being the case, only through war can socialism defeat imperialism. To claim that capitalism can be defeated only through the medium of world war, stated the document, would be sheer Bonapartist adventurism unworthy of the followers of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Socialism will triumph throughout the world in peaceful competition between nations.

The document laid special emphasis on the fact that the roads to socialism are many and varied; it pointed out that in a number of countries the peaceful road is becoming more and more feasible and rejected the theses of the Chinese comrades on this score.

Peaceful Coexistence, a Product and a Factor of the World Revolutionary Process

The establishment by the international working class of the socialist world system embracing one-third of mankind, the collapse of the colonial system and the winning of independence by many peoples, and the successes of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries have radically changed the balance of forces in the world today. From this the international Communist movement has drawn the scientifically substantiated conclusion that imperialism can be curbed, world war averted and war ruled out of the life of the peoples even before the victory of socialism on a world scale.

Our Chinese comrades reject this thesis, maintaining that so long as imperialism exists war is inevitable. From the theory and the policy

---

Abridged.

of the Chinese comrades it follows that world war is essential for the triumph of socialism. Hence their criticism of the policy of peaceful coexistence, their objection to negotiations and agreements aimed at easing international tension, and their disparagement of any effort toward disarmament.

The international Communist movement stands foursquare for peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence, which is the general line of foreign policy pursued by the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, has the full support of the world Communist movement. It is the only policy that serves the interests of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

The general trend of world development today confirms the correctness of this policy. The Caribbean crisis perhaps more than anything else demonstrated the soundness and the effectiveness of the policy of peaceful coexistence unswervingly pursued by the Soviet Union. And since the Chinese comrades seized upon the Caribbean crisis as the most eloquent confirmation of the "correctness" of their own position in opposing the policy of peaceful coexistence, permit me, comrades, to say a few words on this question.

On October 28, 1962 the Central Committee of our Party published and widely circulated in our own country a manifesto exposing the plans to attack Cuba and supporting the firm and admirable policy of the Soviet Union and the heroic Cuban people as "an example of courage for all peoples", and appealing to all Portuguese to protest against the threatened invasion of Cuba and to step up the struggle against the policy of the Salazar government and in defence of peace. After the Caribbean crisis had been settled, our Party, in its leading underground organ *Avante*, and also in a number of documents, made a detailed analysis of the situation. The manifesto published in November by the Party leadership in the province of do Sul, for example, pointed out that "thanks to the courage and resolution of the Cuban people and the consistent peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union, Cuba's sovereignty had been preserved, the Cuban revolution defended and the peace safeguarded."

Like our Party, the majority of the fraternal parties took the right stand during those crucial days when the fate of world peace hung in the balance.

Not so the Chinese comrades. They accused the Soviet Union of having indulged in an "adventurist" policy by placing its rockets in Cuba, and charged that the withdrawal of the rockets was an act of political "surrender". They called the agreement with the United States a "new Munich". Yes, comrades, those were the very words they used. They maintained that the Soviet Union had exposed Cuba to imperialist intervention. "No compromises!" they shouted. "Imperialism is a paper tiger!"

The Chinese comrades have repeatedly asserted that the enemy must be taken seriously on a tactical plane and treated with contempt on a strategical plane. This means, they explain, that in the long run, prospectively, the enemy is bound to be defeated, i.e., he should be regarded as a "paper tiger", but at the given moment, in each concrete instance of conflict he is still capable of offering serious resistance to the revolutionary forces and should hence be regarded as a real tiger (see Liu Shao-tsi's speech at the Meeting of the 81 parties in 1960). More, our Chinese comrades emphasize that those who do not have the courage to scorn the enemy on the strategic plane are committing Right-wing opportunist mistakes; while those who scorn the enemy not only strategically but tactically are guilty of Leftist and adventurist blunders.

Let us for a moment accept these formulas and examine the behaviour of the Chinese comrades during the Caribbean crisis from this standpoint. At the very height of the crisis, when an immediate threat of nuclear war hung over the world, they loosed a barrage in the press, the radio and at public meetings, shouting "No compromise!" "No surrender!" "American imperialism is a paper tiger." It is quite clear that the Caribbean crisis was an instance of "a concrete conflict" with imperialism, and not a "prospective" one, of defining one's position on a tactical and not a strategic plane. In this particular "concrete clash", however, the Chinese comrades "scorned the enemy on a tactical plane", which in their own words is a Leftist, adventurist line. Hence they stand condemned by their own thesis. Their own formula leaves no room for doubt as to their Leftist, adventurist policy, which in practice gambles with the fate of humanity.

The opposition of the Communist Party of China to the policy of peaceful coexistence recently found its most outrageous expression in their reaction to the treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, space and under water signed on July 25, 1963.

The Chinese position with regard to this agreement is a clear expression of their line and policy on the question of war and peace, their attitude to the unity of the socialist camp, revealing the lengths to which they have gone in their anti-Soviet sentiments and their anti-Soviet propaganda.

The position adopted by the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party in this question is a striking demonstration not only of their narrow nationalist approach, but also of their lack of faith in the possibility of preserving peace, which is equivalent to the assertion that the road to victory over imperialism must inevitably pass through the nuclear war.

Peaceful coexistence is a factor of the entire world revolutionary process, inasmuch as in the conditions of peaceful coexistence the victorious advance to communism and socialism continues; each passing day witnesses the growing strength and influence of the

socialist camp—product and bulwark of the world working-class movement; with each passing day the balance of forces in the world is changing increasingly in favour of socialism, and the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries against reaction and against fascism, for democracy and socialism is gaining ground; with each passing day the struggle for independence waged by peoples still under colonial rule is spreading. Peaceful coexistence offers the shortest and easiest way to the triumph of communism throughout the world.

Alliance with the Socialist Camp and the Working-Class Movement, an Earnest of Victory for the National-Liberation Movement

The rapid development of the national-liberation movement cannot be seen in isolation from the situation in the modern world. That development has become possible thanks to the historic victories of the international working class, thanks to the October Revolution, the victory of the U.S.S.R. in the Second World War, the victory of the Chinese revolution and the revolutions in other countries of Europe and Asia, the establishment of the socialist world system, the strength and influence of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the direct and indirect assistance rendered by the U.S.S.R., the other socialist countries and the international working class. Some nations won their freedom by waging armed struggle, others without recourse to arms. In either case a decisive factor was the moral, material, political and diplomatic support rendered by the U.S.S.R., the socialist camp, the world proletariat.

Peaceful coexistence creates the most favourable conditions for the struggle for national liberation. On the one hand, because an important role in strengthening the independence of the emergent countries is played by the economic and technical assistance of the socialist camp, which in turn is closely linked with the achievements of the socialist camp in the economic contest with capitalism in conditions of peaceful coexistence. On the other hand, peaceful coexistence makes it harder for the imperialists to conduct hostilities and maintain armed forces in the newly-liberated or emergent countries. In some cases peaceful coexistence enables the peoples to win national independence without waging wars of liberation, and when such wars prove to be unavoidable, it facilitates their victory. The policy of peaceful coexistence and the fight for peace do not preclude national-liberation movements, but on the contrary, contribute to the success of such movements. Peaceful coexistence and the struggle for peace creates the soil for cooperation and alliance between the movements for national liberation, on the one hand, and the socialist camp and the world working class, on the other.

In the interests of the world revolutionary process, in the interests of the national-liberation movement it is essential to strengthen that alliance. Everything that tends to disrupt or weaken it benefits imperialism alone and hampers and delays the liberation of many nations and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, however, take a different view. Their policy and their propaganda are aimed at isolating the national-liberation movement from the socialist camp and the international working-class movement. They accuse the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries of allegedly abandoning to the mercy of fate the newly-liberated peoples and those still fighting for liberation, of adopting a scornful attitude toward them and of seeking to hold back their struggle; of being reluctant to fight against imperialism, of sacrificing the liberation revolutions to their fear of war, of, allegedly, advocating disarmament solely in order to disarm the peoples fighting for their independence. The Chinese comrades seek to debar the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries from participation in Afro-Asian conferences. They are attempting to set up international organizations without the participation of the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries. They are stirring up racist feeling against the working class of the economically advanced countries. At the same time they pose as the only true friends of the national-liberation movements.

Thus, they substitute for the Marxist class concept the concept of geographical and racial zones, in which they include states with different social systems undergoing different stages of social development and, moreover, belonging to different "zones" of the world revolutionary process. The Chinese comrades forget that liberation from colonialism does not in itself mean deliverance from exploitation, that if isolated from the socialist camp the newly-independent states are liable to fall victim to neo-colonialism or to take the capitalist path of development in alliance with imperialism. They reject or minimize the role of the proletarian revolution in history, and also the fact that world politics are pivoted on the international working class and the socialist camp.

If the policy of the Chinese comrades aimed at weakening the ties between the national-liberation movement and the socialist camp is harmful and erroneous, no less so is the policy which seeks to sow among the peoples battling for independence suspicion and distrust of the working class in the imperialist conutries, and especially those with colonial possessions.

This policy is wrong because the working class in these countries and its vanguard, the Communist parties, are honourably fulfilling their international duty despite the difficulties of carrying on the struggle within the very citadel of imperialism.

The Portuguese Communist Party has always supported and will

continue to support the just struggle waged by the peoples of the Portuguese colonies for their national independence. Our Party is conducting a consistent campaign against the colonial policy of the government, and is leading our people in the struggle against that policy, organizing a resistance movement, group desertion from the army and mutinies against the war in Angola and Guinea, and rendering every possible assistance to the liberation movements in the Portuguese colonies. When Portuguese troops in Goa, Damao and Diu, in defiance of Salazar's orders to resist to the last bullet and the last soldier, refused to fight in defence of the colonialists, this was not only a striking manifestation of the sentiments of the Portuguese people toward the peoples of the colonies; it was also evidence of the political activity of our Party. The steadfast internationalism of members of our Party has earned them the hatred of the fascist government, the charge of "high treason", torture, humiliation and long years in prison. We Portuguese Communists are no less dedicated to the cause of the liberation of the peoples suffering under Portuguese colonial yoke than to the liberation of our own people. The hearts of the Portuguese Communists are with the African peoples, with the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea, Cape Verde, Sao Tomé and Principe, with the people of Timor, and with the Chinese peoples on Macao. We have no cause to be ashamed of being Europeans, of being "whites". We Portuguese Communists consider ourselves brothers of the peoples of all continents, all races; we shall always march side by side with them until the world is purged of exploitation and oppression, until it is no longer divided into oppressed classes or oppressor-classes, oppressed countries and oppressor-countries, until freedom, equality, abundance and peace is achieved by all nations, all countries.

While it is true that the liberation movement in the colonial countries facilitates the struggle of the working class in the metropolitan countries in no small measure, it is wrong to say, as the Chinese comrades do, that "the decisive blow at the ruling classes in the capitalist metropolitan countries" will be delivered by the national-liberation movement, and not by the working class of these countries. The working class and its product, the socialist camp, continues to be the principal force in the world revolutionary process. The basic contradiction in the modern world is that between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, which in turn is an expression of the contradiction between labour and capital.

The Variety of Roads to Socialism

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that one cannot bypass the essential stages of the revolution, that when there is no revolutionary situation the conquest of power by the proletariat cannot be effected merely by order. The revolution is a complex process which does not fit into

ready-made formulas and patterns. In every individual case the Communist parties must be able to determine the principal political objectives at the given stage, and to choose the forms of revolutionary action accordingly.

Our Chinese comrades accuse the world Communist movement of having abandoned the revolution, they accuse the fraternal parties of being "unwilling to raise the question of power", of "refusing to take over the power", of "rejecting the dictatorship of the proletariat", and of "being afraid of making the necessary sacrifices". These charges are made because some parties are of the opinion that a revolutionary situation has not ripened in their particular countries, that the basic tactic is to make use of constitutional and legal opportunities, in a word, parties which in the existing conditions are seeking to advance to socialism without recourse to armed uprising or civil war.

Marx, Engels and Lenin stressed that in certain social and political conditions the transition to socialism could be peaceful. In 1917, in the period between February and July, the Russian Bolsheviks under Lenin's leadership fought for the peaceful development of the revolution. And if at the beginning of the century possibilities for the peaceful way were few, today, with the balance of forces changing in favour of socialism, they are far greater.

It must also be noted that although the world Communist movement envisages such possibilities it considers that under certain conditions the non-peaceful path is essential. But to listen to the Chinese comrades it would appear that any Party which considers the non-peaceful way of achieving democracy and socialism most suited to the conditions in its particular country stands the risk of being condemned by the entire world Communist movement as "heretic" and of forfeiting the friendship of the C.P.S.U.

The Portuguese Communist Party is in a particularly favourable position to judge of these assertions of the Chinese comrades. A study of the situation in Portugal with its centralized and profoundly military fascist state, the total absence of all freedom, and the ruthless suppression of even the most modest demands of the people has led our Party to conclude that the only way left for us to establish a democratic system is the non-peaceful way, the way of popular uprising.

Does this course of action conflict with the general line of the world Communist movement? Does it contradict the theses adopted by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.? Certainly not. In the first place transition from a fascist dictatorship to a bourgeois democracy and transition from capitalism to socialism in the bourgeois democratic countries are two entirely different things. Our Party, while raising the question of the need to resort to violence to overthrow the fascist dictatorship, at the same time holds that after a democratic system is established and certain conditions created it may be possible to pass over peacefully to socialism.

Secondly, in speaking of the ways of transition to socialism the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. stressed that in countries where the bourgeois state is still strong a "sharp revolutionary struggle" will be essential, while the 1960 Statement also emphasizes that "in the event that the exploiting classes resort to violence against the people, the possibility of the non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind".

Why in that case do the Chinese comrades misrepresent the line of the international Communist movement by declaring that it recognizes the peaceful path only as "the general recipe".

Perhaps our Party is being pressured by the C.P.S.U. or some other party to induce it to depart from its own line and accept the "recipe of the peaceful way"? No, comrades, no one is exerting any pressure of any kind on our Party. Our Party, as a sovereign and independent party, has studied the situation in Portugal and defined its own political and tactical line. And this line in no way conflicts with the general line of the world Communist movement.

Has any Party tried to interfere in the affairs of our Party, has any Party tried to remove the leaders of our Party for maintaining that the non-peaceful road is the best way to overthrow fascism? Have we been "excommunicated"? Have our relations with the C.P.S.U. and the other members of the great family of Communists become less friendly? No, comrades, never have our relations with the C.P.S.U. and the world Communist movement been as warm and fraternal as they are today.

The case of our Party is an excellent example of how groundless are the charges made by the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The Necessity for International Communist Discipline

We stand for the equality of the Communist and Workers' parties, for the independence of each Party, and we are opposed to interference by any Party in the internal life of fraternal parties. No Party receives "orders and instructions" from any other Party. Each Party enjoys the sovereign right to define its own line of activity.

How in these circumstances can the unity of the world Communist movement, which is the decisive factor for the victory of communism, be assured?

This unity can be assured by joint elaboration of the general line of the world Communist movement and by observance of this general line by all the parties. This signifies that the independence and sovereignty of the Communist parties does not preclude, but rather presupposes the need for discipline obligatory for all parties.

This is not a discipline imposed on all the parties by some leading centre, for since the dissolution of the Communist International in

1943 there has been no international centre of leadership for the Communist movement as a whole. Neither is it a discipline imposed on all the parties by any one leading party, for in the Communist movement there are no dominant and subordinate parties, all the parties are independent and equal. It is a discipline observed by all the parties with regard to the jointly elaborated and freely adopted general line.

The present general line of the Communist Party, as you know, was adopted by the 81 Communist and Workers' parties at the Meeting of their representatives held in Moscow in 1960. Our Party was represented at that Meeting. On that occasion we submitted our opinion and participated in the work of the Meeting. We signed the Statement issued by the Meeting and, like the other fraternal parties, we regard this Statement as the general line common to and binding upon all the parties.

Our Chinese comrades do not agree with the views held by the majority in the world working-class movement. And since the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties do not agree with the concepts of the Chinese comrades, the latter accuse that majority of wishing to impose its will on the minority. By what right, one might ask, does the Communist Party of China seek to impose *its* will on the entire Communist movement? Our Chinese comrades have a most peculiar theory on this score. They say: the majority cannot in itself be right simply because it is a majority. And the minority is not necessarily in the wrong simply because it happens to be the minority. In their opinion, both these considerations prove their point. Hence in the present situation, they say, there exists only a "temporary majority" and a "temporary minority". On the basis of this "theory" the Chinese comrades demand (and in what terms!) that the entire international Communist movement accept their point of view, and they are helping the disruptive "minority" in the other parties to fight against their own parties.

We understand the unity and discipline of the international Communist movement differently. We cannot agree to any Party coming out in opposition to the overwhelming majority of the parties, not only holding different views but working against them in all its practical activity. We cannot agree to any one Party trying to impose its views on the others, and, when it does not succeed in doing so, crudely charging them with betrayal of the revolution and Marxism-Leninism, engaging in insidious factional and splitting activities within other parties, thereby disorganizing the great political army of the world proletariat whose historic victories depend in large measure on its unity, and discipline built up on the principles of Leninism. If one or another Party of the international Communist movement does not agree with the general line, that Party should not come out against the majority of the fraternal parties in its basic activities but, on the contrary, should march side by side with them.

Splitting Activity Must Cease Without Delay

Our Chinese comrades do not limit themselves to taking issue with the world Communist movement as a whole. They do not confine themselves to advancing proposals. They do not confine themselves to the propaganda on a world scale of their erroneous views which contradict the general line of the international Communist movement. They do not stop at causing a split in international democratic organizations. They go much farther than that. In fact they are going too far. Our Chinese comrades, regarding themselves to be the sole standardbearers of the truth, take the liberty of conducting a virulent campaign against the fraternal parties, beginning with the C.P.S.U., and engaging in disruptive and factional activities within the international Communist movement. They not only interfere in the activity of such international democratic organizations as the peace movement, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Democratic Youth Federation, the International Students' Union, the Women's International Democratic Federation and the movement for Afro-Asian solidarity, but are openly and directly interfering in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties, seeking to discredit their leaders by levelling outrageous charges against them and widely circulating this propaganda among the membership of these parties (France, Italy, the United States). They have gone so far as to establish contact with elements that have been expelled from the fraternal parties, aiding and abetting the factional and disruptive activities of these elements.

For a time this factional activity was carried on surreptitiously. Now, however, the Chinese comrades are doing this openly on the plea that they have the right to do so. "Who can prevent us from rendering assistance to genuine revolutionaries, true Marxists-Leninists"? they declare.

What could be a grosser violation of the standards of relations between the parties than reprinting of anti-Party materials put out by renegades and splitters; maintaining contacts with elements expelled from fraternal parties; instigating them to fight against these parties; holding official receptions for the leaders of these factions, negotiating with them and issuing communiques on these talks, as is done in the case of negotiations between parties. Take, for example, the official reception and the talks conducted in Tirana with Grippa and other factionists who were expelled from the Belgian Communist Party. Or the reception in Peking given for Hill who was expelled from the Communist Party of Australia. Or the "hospitality" which Comrade Prestes tells us the Chinese Communist Party press extends to materials issued by the Amazonas group of splitters in Brazil.

Our Chinese comrades not only have no respect for the discipline in the world Communist movement as a whole, they are doing their level best to undermine the discipline and unity in each individual Party.

Their activity has already done grave harm and is creating difficulties for some parties which are carrying on the struggle under exceptionally arduous conditions, and also for the Communist movement as a whole. How far do the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party intend to go?

Let us assume for a moment that members of the Chinese Communist Party would voice their disapproval of the dogmatic and sectarian line pursued by the leaders of the C.P.C. and give support to the general line of the international Communist movement. In our view these comrades would be fully justified in doing so, and if the principles of democratic centralism were observed, would have the right to defend their views in their own Party.

We say "would have the right", for we do not know whether in fact they enjoy that right. We have our doubts on this score, judging by the zeal with which the Chinese Communist Party leaders defend the Stalin cult and by their attacks on the historical decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. which restored socialist legality and the Leninist standards of Party life in the C.P.S.U. and opened the way to eradicating the disastrous consequences of the personality cult, and which were of inestimable value in ensuring the observance of the principles of democratic centralism throughout the international Communist movement. Is it not legitimate to assume that those who oppose criticism of the Stalin cult believe in the deification and infallibility of leaders, in blind acceptance of their opinions, their exemption from criticism, the authoritarian imposition of personal views in defiance of the collective view; countenance the absence of democracy in Party life, administrative and military methods in settling differences and in the cadre policy of the Party. How can observance of the principles of democratic centralism be ensured in a party whose leaders in practice seek to cover up and defend the tyranny and crimes committed in the guise of the Stalin cult? That is why we say that we do not know whether members of the Chinese Communist Party who disagree with the dogmatic and sectarian line of their leaders enjoy the right to defend their point of view in their own Party.

If, however, these comrades (who, in our opinion, would be in the right) were to be expelled from the Chinese Communist Party and if they were to attempt to establish contact with our party, if they were to send us articles attacking the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, would we publish these materials in our press? Would we establish relations with them, receive them, help them to fight the Central Committee of their Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung? Certainly not.

Unfortunately, our Chinese comrades do not observe this discipline. Instead they interfere in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties, demonstratively aiding and abetting the renegades and splitters who are fighting against these parties. We, for our part, severely condemn such splitting activities. Since each individual Communist Party is in-

dependent and sovereign, no other fraternal Party has the right to interfere in its internal affairs, no Party has the right to carry on propaganda against the policy of the Communist parties in the different countries and maintain ties with members of these parties over the heads of the leading bodies. We cannot accept any other rules of behaviour in the relations between Communist parties.

Dogmatism, the Chief Danger at the Present Time

At its meeting in January this year, the Central Committee of our Party, having studied the situation in the world Communist movement, came to the conclusion that "although in some parties Right opportunism may continue to be the main danger, in the world Communist movement as a whole the chief danger at the present time is dogmatism.

"...The 1960 Statement notes that "revisionism remains the main danger" and that "dogmatism and sectarianism... can also become the main danger at some stage in the development of individual parties."

In 1960, as at the present time, the struggle went on on two fronts: on the one hand, against Right opportunism and against revisionism, and, on the other, against dogmatism and sectarianism. But since 1960 the situation has changed. In 1960 the 81 Communist and Workers' parties were united, and the Chinese Communist Party, which already then represented a dogmatic, sectarian and Leftist trend in the world movement, signed the Statement of the Meeting which laid down the general line of the world Communist movement. If the leaders of the Communist Party of China followed the general line set forth in the Statement which bears their signature there would be no need to change anything with regard to the "main danger".

Consequently, how can we consider the situation unchanged if today the greatest difficulties experienced by the world Communist movement spring from the propaganda of the dogmatic and sectarian views and actions? Unless we blind ourselves to the truth we cannot fail to see that dogmatism and sectarianism represent the gravest danger to the world Communist movement at the present moment.

Such is the opinion of our Party.

The curious thing is that the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party talk a great deal about the need to combat dogmatism, declaring that they too are combating it. But what do they call dogmatism? Dogmatism, according to them, is the mechanical application of the experience of one Party to the activities of other parties. This indeed is one of the aspects of dogmatism, but only one of many. What is the purpose of the Chinese Communist Party leaders in posing the question thus? They are out to prove that the fact that the international Communist movement draws on the rich experience gained by the Communist Party

of the Soviet Union, that it has endorsed the resolutions adopted by the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the C.P.S.U., and that the fraternal parties recognize the Programme of the C.P.S.U. as the most important document of our time is above all an instance of such application of experience. In their view, the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties around the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and recognition of the Party of Lenin as the vanguard of the international Communist movement is dogmatism.

According to them, the C.P.S.U. is guilty of both these sins, the sin of revisionism and the sin of dogmatism. The leaders of the Communist Party of China, on the other hand, are innocent of all sin. They represent Marxism-Leninism in its purest form.

The fact of the matter is, comrades, that basically the struggle against dogmatism, sectarianism and leftism is precisely a struggle against the concepts and concrete political activities of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, which we have mentioned above, and against their influence in the world Communist movement and the national-liberation movement. This is where the main danger lies today.

If dogmatism, sectarianism and Leftism are the main danger, does that mean that Right-wing opportunism no longer presents any danger? Of course not. Insofar as the line and activities of some parties are concerned, it may well constitute the main danger. More, the Right opportunistic mistakes of parties which take the correct stand with regard to the cardinal issues of our time, hinder the implementation of the general line of the Communist movement and are used by dogmatists to attack that line.

In our view, any weakening of the struggle on the one front (against Right-wing opportunism) hinders the struggle on the other front (against dogmatism and Leftism). The danger of revisionism is sometimes seen to emanate only from the Yugoslavs, while Right-wing opportunism in general, which today too is no less harmful, is forgotten. Therefore we believe that the battle against Right-wing opportunism should not only be continued but should be intensified.

If dogmatism, sectarianism and Leftism are the main danger does this imply that the struggle against the revisionist conceptions of the Yugoslav Communists should be abandoned? Of course not. Despite the fact that these concepts have ceased to have any palpable effect on the world movement, the struggle against them is continuing. At the same time we cannot but take into account the new factors that have arisen since 1960: Firstly the defeat of Yugoslav revisionism in the ideological sphere, and secondly, the positive evolution of some aspects of the policy of the Yugoslav League of Communists, e.g. the strengthening of the leading role of the Party, improvements in economic planning, the foreign policy orientation, the rapprochement and cooperation between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries, and the rapprochement between the League of Yugoslav Communists and

the fraternal parties. This favourable evolution should be encouraged, without relaxing the ideological debate against revisionism; but the Yugoslav Communists should not be treated as enemies, on the contrary, they should be given fraternal assistance.

We believe that a still closer rapprochement between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries and between the Yugoslav Communists and the world Communist movement is both possible and desirable. Such an attitude on the part of the Communist parties, if accompanied by a firm ideological position toward revisionism, will not foster Yugoslav revisionism but will rather serve to rectify it. We would then be happy to welcome the return of the Yugoslav Communists to the ranks of the world Communist movement. Our Party has no relations at present with the League of Yugoslav Communists, but we have no objections to establishing friendly contacts with them in order to gain a better understanding of Yugoslav realities and the position of the Yugoslav comrades.

The struggle against Right-wing opportunism, against revisionism, should, therefore, be continued. But "the main danger" is so great that it is already undermining the unity of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement. That danger is the dogmatism, sectarianism and Leftism which emanates from the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party.

Shoulder to Shoulder with the Party of Lenin

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the Party of that great and glorious country which by virtue of its might and internationalism has become the shield protecting the entire socialist camp, a friend always ready to come to the assistance of the national-liberation movements, a guarantee of the victorious advance of the international working class to the ultimate triumph of communism on a world scale. Hence the world Communist movement rightly regards the Party, founded by Lenin, as its vanguard.

Does this mean, however, that the principles of independence, equality and sovereignty in the relations between the fraternal parties are not applied in relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties? No, comrades. Slanderous allegations about "the hand of Moscow" and "orders from Moscow" can emanate only from the cesspools of reactionary and fascist propaganda. In the international Communist movement all parties, the C.P.S.U. included, are independent, equal and sovereign. The fraternal parties consider the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be their vanguard not because the C.P.S.U. enjoys any special rights, not because it occupies some leading position in the international Communist movement. There are no "leading" or "subordinate" parties in that movement, all the fraternal parties are equal. The Communist Party of

the Soviet Union is considered the vanguard of the international Communist movement not by virtue of any special rights but by virtue of the contribution it has made and is still making to that movement

It goes without saying that in elaborating the present general line of the international Communist movement the C.P.S.U. played a prominent role. All the fraternal parties welcomed the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the C.P.S.U. as a decisive contribution in defining the line of the Communist movement. The Programme of the C.P.S.U., adopted by the Twenty-Second Congress, has justly been called the Communist Manifesto of our time because it analyzes the international situation with remarkable clarity from the standpoint of the principles set forth in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties of 1957 and 1960; because it generalizes the vast experience accumulated not only by the C.P.S.U. but by the entire world Communist movement and draws from this experience fundamental theoretical conclusions; because it enriches ideologically each and every Communist Party and helps them independently to define their own political and tactical line.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China do not agree with such recognition by the international Communist movement of the contribution made by the C.P.S.U., its authority and prestige. Their propaganda is levelled mainly against the Party of Lenin. And they do not only limit themselves to arguing and disagreeing. All the fraternal parties have the right to argue and disagree. No, comrades. The leaders of the C.P.C. do not stop at that. They brandish their fists, they distort the facts and engage in slander.

Yes, comrades, it is hard to believe that such accusations could be hurled at the Party of Lenin by Communists, accusations of "betrayal", "of rejection of the struggle against imperialism", "fear of imperialism and war", "capitulation to North American imperialism"; charges that the Party of Lenin "does not hate the class enemy and is opposed to class struggle", that it "is against just wars", "is trying to defend the domination of the imperialists", that it is "afraid of revolution", "is opposed to revolution" and "forbids others to carry out or give support to revolutions"; that it "is ready to act in such a way as to help to restore capitalism" in the U.S.S.R.! It is hard to believe that such words as these could emanate from the lips or the pen of Communists: "The policy pursued by the Soviet government is a policy of alliance with the forces of war for struggle against the forces of peace, a policy of alliance with imperialism for struggle against socialism, a policy of alliance with the United States for struggle against China, an alliance with reaction of various countries for struggle against the peoples of the whole world." These words are taken not from some newspaper article written by some irresponsible journalist. These words, irresponsible though they are, are contained in the Statement of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic of July 31, 1963.

This is what the leaders of the Communist Party of China write about a socialist country, about the Party which is the most powerful friend and champion of socialist China, of the whole socialist camp, of the working class, the peoples fighting for independence, the champion of peace throughout the world. It would be more fitting for these things, printed in the columns of their newspapers, to have been concocted by fascists!

The leaders of the Communist Party of China do not ask themselves: "Why is it that the imperialist and reactionary press of all countries, not to speak of the fascist press, reprints our accusations and statements and gives them such prominence? Does this not suggest that imperialism and reaction knows better than we do who their chief enemies are?" But they do not ask themselves such questions. On the contrary, they appear to be delighted at the publicity they are given by the anti-Communist press of all countries.

Neither do the leaders of the Communist Party of China ask themselves this question: "Why is it that the majority of the Communists of the world, leaders of the working class who have dedicated their lives to the cause of communism, tried and tested Marxists-Leninists in all corners of the globe, disagree with us? Does this not suggest that we ought to pay more heed to their arguments and give more thought to our views?" No, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party do not ask themselves such questions. They prefer to explain the position of the international Communist movement by repeating the fabrications of reactionary propaganda that the leaders of fraternal parties are following the "hand of Moscow" and obeying "orders from Moscow", and by claiming that the leaders of the fraternal parties uphold the general line of the Communist movement not out of principle or conviction, but because they obey "the conductor's baton", because "they have a gift for parrot-like repetition", because between the C.P.S.U. and the other parties "there exist abnormal patriarchal relations typical of feudal times". Incredibly enough, this is said by Communists, by leaders of a great fraternal Party.

We, for our part, want to say this: precisely because we are waging an indefatigable struggle against imperialism and fascism for democracy, national independence and socialism, just because we stand for the independence, equality and sovereignty of the fraternal parties, we are marching side by side with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the great family of Communist and Workers' parties. If, as the leaders of the C.P.C. claim, to date three great battles were fought in the working-class movement (the battle fought by Lenin against the II International and reformism, by Stalin against the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, etc., and today, by themselves against revisionism), then it is clear that they believe that the Communist Party of China stands in the van of the world Communist movement and that they no longer

regard the other Communist parties as fraternal parties. Clearly, they are not lacking in arrogance and ambition.

We have great respect for Comrade Mao Tse-tung, as an outstanding revolutionary, the leader of the great Communist Party of China. But if the President of the Academy of Science of the Chinese People's Republic says that "the ideas of Mao Tse-tung constitute today the highest stage of Marxism-Leninism" (speech published in *Jenminjihpao* on March 26, 1963), if the Chinese newspapers claim that the "ideas of Mao Tse-tung represent Marxism-Leninism of the epoch of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism", and if this thought is repeated in every key by the press and other propaganda media, then our Chinese comrades should not take offence if the fraternal parties do not quite see eye to eye with them. With the leaders of the Communist Party of China advancing such concepts (which we define as dogmatic and sectarian and which we consider to be a departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism) it is quite obvious that we cannot possibly agree with our Chinese comrades on this score either.

Unity Must Be Preserved at All Costs

In the foregoing we have set forth our position. We wish to make it clear that we do not close our ears to everything the Chinese comrades are saying simply because it emanates from them.

Without discounting the difficulties confronting us or ignoring the seriousness of the disagreements and the complexity of the situation, we believe that everything should be done to restore the unity of the international Communist movement.

All the bridges have not yet been burned. We must do all in our power to prevent them from being burned.

As before, however, we consider wholly undesirable and harmful the public debate which the Chinese comrades have been conducting in an hysterical, acrimonious and disrespectful manner, expressing themselves not in fraternal but more often in unfriendly and hostile terms.

The differences are so profound that it will take much time before ideological unity can be restored in the Communist movement. Until then, if we wish to avoid a split which would do incalculable damage to the international Communist movement, we must find a way of preventing the relations between the fraternal parties from deteriorating still further.

The differences in the international Communist movement are serious indeed. They cannot be overcome in a short time, but overcome they will be. Unity will be restored on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. In the socialist camp, as well as in the capitalist countries, the Communist parties will score new successes and win new victories. Nothing can prevent the victory of communism throughout the world.

■ ■ ■

Communique of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party

Concerning the Situation in the World Communist Movement

"1. At its August 1963 plenary meeting, the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party heard and approved the report of Comrade Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the Party, on the situation in the world Communist movement.

"2. The situation in the world Communist movement has taken an unfavourable turn. Unity is not complete and there is a real danger of a split. The crux of the matter is that the Communist Party of China is not in agreement with the general line of the world Communist movement, which was unanimously adopted by the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings . . .

"8. The Chinese leaders not only indulge in discussions and actions that are a breach of discipline in the world Communist movement. They go so far as to contact renegades and other elements who have been expelled from the fraternal parties, support and instigate them against the respective parties. The Portuguese Communist Party emphatically condemns all splitting and factional activity for it undermines unity and discipline in the Communist and Workers' parties, weakens or depreciates their prestige and influence.

"9. The Portuguese Communist Party considers dogmatism to be the main danger in the world Communist movement today. The fight against dogmatism, sectarianism and leftism is, essentially, a fight against the concepts and policy of the C.P.C. leaders and against their influence in the Communist and national-liberation movements.

"The fight against dogmatism, the main danger, does not mean that the fight against revisionism and Right opportunism should be discontinued."

The communique then goes on to speak of the vanguard role of the C.P.S.U. in the world Communist movement, how its experience and example help the Marxist parties in their activities. It notes the great significance for the world Communist movement of the decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the C.P.S.U. and of the C.P.S.U. Programme rightly called the "Communist Manifesto" of our era, and censures the hostile propaganda conducted by the Communist Party of China against the party of Lenin, and the slanderous nature of this propaganda. The Central Committee of the Portuguese

---

Abridged.

Party stresses the services rendered by the C.P.S.U. and the U.S.S.R. in the fight against imperialism and for peace, and refers to the C.P.S.U. as the most faithful guardian of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The Portuguese Party also recognizes the services rendered by the glorious Communist Party of China and states that everything must be done to prevent the split which the C.P.C. leaders seem to want, and which would only benefit the common enemy of communism.

The Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party therefore proposes in its communique:

"Since the situation continues to grow dangerously worse, the P.C.P. thinks that it would be advisable to hold as soon as possible a meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties at which, besides discussion of ideological issues, procedures regulating relations between the fraternal parties would be duly established.

"The P.C.P. believes that even if the meeting should fail to settle ideological differences, it will have achieved fruitful results if common agreement is reached to cease all open polemics, to prohibit the parties from engaging in unilateral criticism of one another, from interfering in each other's internal affairs, and from establishing political contact with Communists of another country other than through the leadership of the Party, or with its consent.

"The P.C.P. also thinks that it would be advisable to set up a commission of representatives of several Communist and Workers' parties to study the practical questions relevant to the holding of such a meeting."

Central Committee,
Portuguese Communist Party

August 1963.

Perspectives of the West-European Working-Class Movement

BY FRANZ MAREK

Can we speak of any specific perspectives of the West-European working-class movement as a whole? After all, the conditions in the various countries differ greatly. On the other hand, can the struggles of the West-European working class be examined apart from the struggle for peace and socialism waged in the socialist and newly-emerged countries? Would not the separate examination of problems facing the working-class movement in this part of Europe tend to weaken international solidarity?

Needless to say, the conditions in which the working-class movement finds itself in the various West European countries vary greatly, if only due to the differences between the alignments of forces within this movement. The situation in the Scandinavian countries differs from that in Italy and France, and the conditions in Spain are quite unlike those in Britain. Working-class struggle in Western Europe is of course inseparably connected with the development of the socialist world and the powerful national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. But for all that the problems arising in this part of Europe require a specific approach and the perspectives are of a specific nature, all of which justifies independent examination.

Basically we are concerned here with the developed capitalist countries where the working-class movement has deep-seated traditions, though, owing to the existence of both Communist and Socialist parties, the internal alignments differ by countries. In some democratic unity is impossible without the support of Catholic groupings; however, anti-fascist traditions and sentiment are a big factor in these countries. Solidarity with the Spanish anti-fascists, for example, has time and again brought diverse groups and people adhering to different views together.

The role and place of the West-European working-class movement has also been discussed in the course of the debate under way in the international Communist movement. The opinion that the national-liberation struggle in Asia, Africa and Latin America has made these continents the storm centre of world revolution not only stems from an underestimation of the part played by the countries where capitalism has already been overthrown and an oversimplified idealization of the highly contradictory and complex colonial revolutions; it also echoes the feeling encountered even in the West-European working-

---

Abridged from *Weg und Ziel*, No. 1, 1964.

class movement that no progress is being made in the countries of Western Europe, that their workers live too well and hence have lost all sense of the future. Many newspaper writers follow in the wake of those embittered and frustrated elements who feel that not much hope can be placed in the "well-fed" worker and that the colonial revolutions alone are projected into the future. In desperation they wait for this liberation struggle to inundate the world and hope to find an ark which will land them on some Ararat. But is this solidarity with the colonial peoples?

And how can these theorists ignore the fact that even if the colonial revolutions unquestionably weaken imperialism there is no force in the world that can assume the task of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries to abolish capitalism? If a higher living standard leads, as is alleged, to the loss of perspective, would this not imply that some decades from now, when the newly-emerged countries will have reached a certain level of development, there will no longer be any striving for progress anywhere in the world?

It would be wrong to claim that Western Europe has shown no progress in recent years. Not to speak of the powerful sweep of trade union struggles, we cannot forget such facts as the rebuff which the Italian workers gave in 1960 to the attempts to set up a reactionary regime with fascist support; the splendid struggle for democratic freedoms conducted in Spain; the struggle waged by the French Communists against the dirty war in Vietnam, and, above all, the efforts of the West-European workers to safeguard peace which played no small part in preventing the use of nuclear bombs in Korea and Vietnam. During the Suez adventure the invaders were unquestionably halted primarily thanks to the resolute stand taken by the Soviet government, with the position of the British trade union membership also playing its role. Only those who counterpose the fight for peace to the fight for socialism can minimize the contribution of the European working-class movement to the cause of peace.

True, the cold war deepened the split in the working-class and democratic movement, helped to isolate the Communists and gave the leaders of many Socialist parties an opportunity to abandon class principles and the socialist perspective. It is true, too, that under the influence of the cold war and what is called the personality cult, the Communist parties were slow in assessing the changed balance of forces in the spirit of creative Marxism, drawing on the ideological legacy of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International (1935). Major success in Western Europe is possible only if the Communists and Socialists agree on concrete tasks and the overall perspective.

Strategy and Tactics

One of the specific features of the West-European working-class movement is that all the Communist parties of Western Europe—most

of them before the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.—declared for the peaceful road to socialism, for the conquest of power by the workers without civil war. This line stemmed not from any illusions as to the possibility of morally metamorphosing big business, but from the specific conditions of Western Europe which differ fundamentally from the conditions in Asia, Africa and Latin America (though it is interesting to note that the big Brazilian and Indonesian parties likewise orient on peaceful transition to socialism). The basic premise for the West-European Communists is that they are working in developed capitalist countries with deep-seated parliamentary and democratic traditions, whereas hitherto in all cases except one capitalism was overthrown in backward countries ruled by reactionary or openly fascist dictatorships.

In discussing the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism *Marx* and *Engels* are usually cited, in particular what Marx said about the possibility of peaceful advance to socialism in the U.S.A., Britain and Holland, countries which in his time still had no highly developed state machinery. Marx harboured no illusions that the exploiting classes would calmly watch things take this course; as Engels said in his preface to *Capital,* Marx hardly expected the "English ruling classes to submit, without a 'pro-slavery rebellion', to this peaceful and legal revolution". It is noteworthy that in his critique of the Erfurt Programme (1891) Engels said that peaceful advance to socialism could be envisaged also in France even though the state machine in that country was the most highly developed.

In discussing the peaceful way to socialism it is also pointed out that Lenin called it an extremely rare though important possibility. He considered this possibility not only before the summer of 1917 but also a few weeks before the October Revolution. These opinions of our classics are valuable primarily because they bring it home to us that the socialist revolution need not necessarily take the form of armed insurrection. But they do not cover all the problems of our time.

The argument advanced in this discussion that peaceful development has never led to socialism is clearly incorrect. This did happen, in the specific conditions following the Second World War, in Czechoslovakia, for instance. The Cuban revolution began as an anti-imperialist national-democratic revolution and only later developed to a point when socialist aims were set and Marxist assessments made. This should be borne in mind in order to refute the vulgarized view that the October Revolution must be repeated in all countries launching out on the socialist road.

We must remember that in orientating the revolutionary mass movement in Western Europe on the peaceful road to socialism we are doing so in conditions which did not exist hitherto in the develop-

ed capitalist countries. The new opportunities and conditions necessitated the adoption of a new strategy which had not been tested in practice, just as the theory concerning the three stages of the Chinese revolution elaborated by the Chinese Communists in 1940 was not backed up by previous experience.

In connection with the Moscow Meeting of 1957 the Chinese Communists drew up a memorandum concerning the peaceful way to socialism which they published a few weeks ago as an appendix to the pamphlet *The Origin and Development of Our Differences with the Leadership of the C.P.S.U.* Here we read, among other things, the following:

"In the situation now prevailing in the international Communist movement, it is advantageous from the standpoint of *tactical* considerations to mention that we would prefer peaceful transition. But it would be incorrect to place too much emphasis on the possibility of such transition."

As we pose the problem, it is by no means a question of tactics but of a new strategy. Engels once said that Marxism undergoes change with each new scientific discovery. Should, then, Marxist strategy remain immutable? Lenin posed before the Communist parties the task of constantly working out new approaches to the socialist revolution in accordance with the changing conditions. The Communist parties in Western Europe are seeking to do this in accordance with the new possibilities and new conditions.

We should like to dwell here on why it is *necessary* to orientate on the peaceful road to socialism. The situation has changed and we are fighting an enemy who has changed his methods and forms of struggle, more, has had to change them, for the world itself has changed, primarily thanks to the Communists. Today, capitalism has to engage in competition with the socialist system.

In this situation it is imperative to combat the danger of Americanization threatening the working-class movement, the danger of concentrating on trade union struggle alone, renouncing independent working-class action and the socialist perspective. To convince the masses of the necessity of socialism is by no means an easy task in these conditions. The idea of a headlong attack with arms in hand does not fit in with the conditions or the consciousness of the masses of workers, and hence advocacy of this idea would turn the small Communist parties into ludicrous sects and the large parties into bands of adventurers.

The struggle for socialism in Western Europe also bears the imprint of the fact that it is waged in countries with deep-rooted parliamentary and democratic traditions and where the masses, especially after the lessons taught by fascism, attach much importance to democratic gains. Indeed, it is not fortuitous that the masses of workers

in Western Europe were particularly sensitive to the violations of socialist legality in the socialist countries, violations which clashed with their democratic sentiments. The socialist revolution, which abolishes the pernicious and corrupting rule of capital, is unquestionably the most democratic revolution in all history; but to the broad masses in Western Europe it can prove attractive only if it extends democracy in all spheres, only if it adds new democratic freedoms to the existing ones.

The perspective, therefore, is this: posing, by stages, democratic aims which curtail the power of the big capitalists, give more weight to the working people and open for them the way to leadership of society; elaboration of constructive plans designed to deepen democracy, primarily through ensuring and extending the right of the working people to share in deciding all issues in all areas; isolation of the reactionaries and the pursuance, on the basis of the existing democratic institutions and the multi-party system, of a broad policy of working-class unity and federation which would exert an influence all the way up to the state apparatus—all this would offer the best conditions for overcoming the resistance of the exploiting classes in the event that these classes risk resorting to violence to prevent the socialist revolution.

Orientation on the peaceful path of socialism has thus become possible and necessary. In no way is it based on the assumption, as the Chinese Communists' "25 points" sarcastically put it, that "the imperialists and reactionaries are prepared to accept peaceful change". The imperialists will never do so. This is an orientation which implies a long and arduous struggle, including extra-parliamentary clashes, but for all that we believe that it is the only possible orientation in Western-Europe. The argument that this is too long-range a prospect does not hold water; the right way is always the shortest. Orientation on the immediate achievement of the goal is not an alternative, but merely an instance of shortsightedness, in effect, a way of evading the issue.

Structural Reforms

Orientation on the peaceful road to socialism, on the stage-by-stage deepening and regeneration of democracy, presupposes primarily two things: firstly, curtailing the power of big capital by limiting its sphere of operation, defending and extending the nationalized sector, planned coordination within this sector as envisaged to some extent in Pitterman's latest proposals, and extending nationalization to the economic commanding heights still held by big private capital, and, secondly, winning and extending the right of the working people to share in decidig issues at the enterprises, on the scale of the various

industries and in the sphere of economic policy generally; moreover, the present-day level of technology opens specific ways for the realization of that alliance of the working class and the intellectuals which Marx envisaged already in his early writings—an alliance of sufferers who think and thinkers who suffer.

This sum-total of transitional political and economic aims which diminish the power of the big capitalists and the bureaucratic machinery, increase the weight of the working class and democratize social life and the political institutions through growing public control over the state and the economy are aptly described as structural reforms. Today it is quite clear that if these reforms are not to be reduced to nought the working people must have a say in deciding things and exercise effective control over investments, prices and planning of production at the enterprises, on the scale of the various industries and of the economy as a whole. What is needed is real participation in all these things and not mere lip-service to such participation.

When it comes to structural reforms we are often accused of adopting a *reformist* position. But it seems to us that the difference between the reformist position and ours is patent: the reformists advocate petty reforms instead of revolution, whereas we, though we do not disdain minor reforms, set our sights on major all-embracing reforms facilitating advance to the socialist revolution. The reformists declared through Bernstein that the movement was everything, the aim nothing; for us the touchstone of the movement is the extent to which it hastens the achievement of the goal. The reformists were satisfied with winning one or another concession through negotiation and sought to reconcile the working class to capitalism; we, on the contrary, see that the struggle for structural reforms will be futile unless the masses are rallied for extraparliamentary action as well in an unrelenting struggle against big capital. The peaceful road to socialism does not imply an absence of struggle, nor is it only a matter of gradual evolution but also of political crises and leaps in political development.

In this connection another objection has been raised: is it possible to carry out such far reaching reforms in the conditions of the present *class state*? Are we not forgetting the class nature of the state?

All the gains the working-class movement has won have been wrested by force from the state, its class nature notwithstanding. In the Inaugural Address of the First International, the centenary of which we shall mark in September, Marx, leading up to his definition of the conquest of political power as a great duty of the working class, assessed the winning of the 10-hour working day in England as a great success inasmuch as "it told indeed upon the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled

by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class".

If it were not convinced of the possibility of wresting concessions and reforms from the capitalist state, the working-class movement would have remained a mere propaganda sect. In the conditions of developed capitalism this possibility has acquired a new quality. The role of state intervention and state investment has greatly increased and with it also the need to influence investment plans, production and other structures, coordination and planning in the nationalized sector, to win progressive measures at the expense of the big capitalists and in spite of their opposition even before big capital has been completely abolished.

Lenin in his *The State and Revolution* criticized the nihilistic viewpoint that such major and far-reaching reforms as the granting of the right to self-determination to the peoples cannot be achieved before the final victory of the proletariat. In this connection he gave a generalized definition of the relation between democracy and socialism which can be recommended as a guide when discussing structural reforms.

"To develop democracy *to the utmost,* to seek out the *forms* for this development, to test it by *practice,* and so forth—all this is one of the constituent tasks of the struggle for the social revolution," he said. "Taken separately, no kind of democracy will bring socialism. But in actual life democracy will never be 'taken separately'; it will be 'taken together' with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life, will simulate *its* transformation; and in its turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on. Such are the dialectics of living history."

Working-Class and Democratic Unity

The new strategy raises the policy of united action and democratic unity to a new plane not only because orientation on the peaceful way to socialism eliminates a controversial issue of long standing in the working-class movement but also because clear-cut recognition by the Communists of the multi-party system (even during the transition to socialism) removes a barrier of distrust.

A decisive role here is played by the relations between the Communist and Socialist parties. The Chinese Communists advocate a general line which would make it incumbent on the Communist parties to draw a "sharp demarcation line" between themselves and the Socialist parties. The same view is held by the anti-communists in the Socialist parties. If we were to accept this thesis we would be repudiating ourselves and denying that the working-class movement has any future.

The correct thing to do is to ascertain points of contact between

the two parties and, without glossing over the differences or abstaining from criticism, to foster a sense of responsibility to the working-class movement as a whole. This sense of responsibility is displayed by the Italian Communists when they show concern for unity in the Italian Socialist Party and are doing their utmost to prevent a split in it; by the Belgian Communists when they try again and again to dissuade the Left trade union functionaries from setting up a new Left Socialist Party; by the French Communists, who at the last elections helped elect Socialist candidates; by all of us who are looking forward to a Labour victory in the next general election in Britain; by those Socialist comrades who dissociate themselves from the malicious, petty gloating over the difficulties encountered by the socialist countries and who now, as a result of experience gained in struggle, are coming to realize that the Communist parties, even the smaller ones, are an indispensable force in combating efforts to rob the labour movement of its working-class ideology in the struggle for the socialist perspective.

Some specific problems are encountered in the struggle for working-class unity as a result of the participation of Socialist parties in coalition governments and the fact that some governments are headed by Socialist Prime Ministers. The Communists' attitude towards the Socialist Party depends not on whether Socialists hold ministerial portfolios or not, but on the policy pursued by these Socialist Ministers, on what the Socialist Party does or fails to do in the government—whether its participation or leadership in the government remains a mere Social Democratic interlude, as happened so often before and after the Second World War, or whether it makes social progress possible, strengthens the peace forces and makes for democratic unity. Generally speaking, Socialist governments or the participation of Socialist Ministers in coalition governments can promote the shaping of a democratic alternative only when their policy does not jeopardize independent working-class action and does not run counter to the socialist perspective.

Agreement between the Socialists and the Communists is a prerequisite for the creation of that front against reaction and fascism, and for the regeneration of democracy which in some West-European countries is impossible of realization without the participation of certain Catholic forces, without taking into account the significant processes under way in the Catholic camp which have found reflection even in the Ecumenical Council in Rome. It is noteworthy that the Left Catholics, some of whom actually come out in support of socialism, are taking an increasingly courageous stand.

These circles have also advanced the idea that in view of the difficulties encountered within, and also between, some working-class parties, the trade unions should not limit themselves to the defence of the economic and socio-political interests of the workers alone

but should be the champions of democratic concepts. This attitude may play a significant role in the West-European working class movement, especially since the trade unions have in recent years more and more frequently shown themselves to be a factor making for unity within their own countries and, on the international plane, in relations between the socialist and capitalist countries.

Peaceful Coexistence

After the assassination of Kennedy a greater responsibility than ever for the preservation of peace devolved on the working-class movement and all peace-loving forces in Western Europe. More than ever before they must be on guard against attempts to utilize the new situation to subvert peace. Indeed, the general reaction to the murder of the U.S. President once again showed now deep the idea of peaceful coexistence has struck root: the most diverse groups, publications and press writers on both sides of the Atlantic this time acted in unison to nip in the bud the dangerous lie, reminiscent of the Reichstag fire, which was in the making.

The perspectives of the West-European working-class movement are closely linked with the struggle for peaceful coexistence.

1. Successful implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence facilitates independent working-class struggle in the capitalist countries by hindering direct intervention by foreign reaction. Periods of rising tension on the world political scene tend to unite the leaders of the imperialist states in spite of their contradictions; periods of détente, on the contrary, accentuate these contradictions, make it more difficult to build up imperialist fronts, and increase the chances of autonomous peaceful advance towards socialism in Western Europe.

2. Successful implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence moderates the climate within democratic groups, deters the anti-communist witch-hunters, and facilitates contact and agreement among Socialists, Communists and other democratic groups. And this in turn promotes peaceful coexistence. We have seen often enough in recent years that mounting tensions make for disunity, worsen relations between the Socialists and the Communists and lead to the break-up of existing democratic fronts. In periods of diminishing tension the contradictions within reactionary groupings grow sharper, whereas periods of tension aggravate differences within the democratic groups and play into the hands of those who would isolate the Communists. Orientation on the peaceful way to socialism implies maximum understanding among the Socialists, Communists and other progressives, and therefore it is indissolubly linked with the policy of peaceful coexistence.

3. The view that nuclear war cannot be justified by any controversial issues of world policy logically leads to a striving towards *peaceful*

competition between the two systems; the peoples should be given an opportunity to choose the system they want on the basis of their own experience. The Chinese Communists' "25 points" warn against exaggerating the significance of peaceful competition; but as far as the working-class movement in Western Europe is concerned, the importance of peaceful competition can hardly be overestimated. Needless to say, peaceful competition is not a substitute for the struggle for socialism, but the fact remains that the outcome of this struggle depends on socialism proving its superiority in all spheres.

All parties, groups and individuals who advocate socialist aims recognize this. And this recognition offers a wide range of opportunities for all shades of criticism and restraint; solidarity with the socialist countries under no circumstances implies obligatory identification with every measure they implement and every statement they make. Peaceful competition is an essential component of the peaceful way to socialism, and therefore violent anti-communism which admits of nothing but condemnation of the socialist states is incompatible with genuine struggle for peace and socialism.

That the fight for peace is closely linked with the fight for socialism was pointed out by Marx in the Inaugural Address of the First International, which declares that the task is "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rule paramount to the intercourse of nations. The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes".

This was written a hundred years ago, but there is nothing we need add to it.

★

It is imperative for Western Europe to steer a course towards socialism. As for the West-European working-class movement, it cannot accept any verdict that it is incapable of achieving this aim or unworthy of it.

A great responsibility rests on this movement. Western Europe is the cradle of the modern working-class movement, the cradle of scientific socialism; the concepts "socialism" and "communism" were born here. It is one of the centres of modern technology and civilization inhabited by millions of workers. What a vast force they would represent if close unity were established between the Socialists and the Communists and the working people fully appreciated their responsibility for the destinies of their own country, their responsibility for world peace, and their responsibility to their class comrades who have already abolished capitalism and to the peoples who have broken their colonial fetters and are fighting to break the grip of neo-colonialism. Solidarity in the interests of peace and socialism is that great idea which we should bring home above all to the youth. In this

connection too the warning sounded in the Inaugural Address remains as timely as ever: "Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts."

■ ■ ■

The Struggle of the Communist and Workers' Parties for the Unity of Their Ranks, against Factionists and Splitters

(From documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties)

The experience of the international Communist movement shows that resolute defence by the Communist and Workers' parties of the Marxist-Leninist unity of their ranks and the banning of factions and groups sapping unity guarantee the successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the establishment of socialism and communism. *(Declaration of the Moscow Meeting of 1957.)*

Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as a law of their activity strictly to observe the Leninist standards of Party life in keeping with the principle of democratic centralism, and to cherish Party unity like the apple of their eye. They strictly adhere to the principle of Party democracy and collective leadership, for they attach, in keeping with the organizational principles of Leninism, great importance to the role of the leading party bodies in the life of the Party. They work indefatigably for the strengthening of their bonds with the Party membership and with the broad masses of the working people... *(Statement of the Moscow Meeting of 1960.)*

AUSTRALIA

In August 1963, E. Hill, a former member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia, and F. Russel were expelled from the Party for factional and splitting activities, violation of the Party rules and refusal to carry out Party decisions.

After his expulsion Hill began openly to recruit followers for struggle against the leadership of the Party. In September be sent a letter to the vice-chairman of the Party in which he accused the leadership of

betrayal of the cause of Marxism-Leninism and tried to refute the charges on which he had been expelled from the Central Committee and membership of the Party. In September 1963 he called a meeting of his supporters in Melbourne.

On September 25, 1963, the *Jenminjihpao* published a detailed report of the Melbourne meeting under the title "Hold High the Banner of Marxism-Leninism in the Struggle against Revisionism".

At the end of November 1963, the Hill group published a "Declaration of Australian Marxists-Leninists" (reprinted in *Jenminjihpao* on November 28, 1963) directed mainly against the July 14, 1963 Open Letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The declaration was filled with slanderous allegations against the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and the Communist Party of Australia and sought to justify the splitting activities of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the Hill group. E. Hill is now busy trying to set up a new "Marxist-Leninist" party.

> This new "party" will be composed of Hill and a small group of renegades from the Communist Party who failed miserably to impose their sectarian and splitting line on the Party... The Communist Party of China has seriously blotted its great reputation by its open interference in the internal affairs of the Communist Party of Australia by giving encouragement and support to Hill and by publishing many of his concoctions in the journal *Peking Review*. Communist parties, whatever their differences, should have their dealings with other Communist parties, not with disruptive factions. *(Statement by the Political Committee of the Communist Party of Australia, January 22, 1964.)*

The group's mouthpiece is the *Australian Communist*.

AUSTRIA

A drive to split the Communist Party of Austria was initiated by two former members of the Party, F. Strobl and H. Parkas (the latter now works in the Albanian mission in Vienna).

Strobl and Parkas circulated among Party members leaflets addressed "To the Austrian Communists" extolling the political line of the C.P.C., in particular the 25 points set forth in the letter of the Central Com-

mittee of the C.P.C. to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. of June 14, 1963.

Subsequently they announced the establishment of a provisional leadership of the "Anti-Revisionist Communists of Austria" and began publishing the sheet *Rote Fahne.*

BELGIUM

The Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium held in Antwerp in April 1963 expelled Grippa, Delogne, Massoz and Raindorf for opposing, in particular the stand taken by the Central Committee on the Caribbean crisis.

> The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium informs the Party organizations that M. Delogne, J. Grippa, M. Massoz and R. Raindorf, who were expelled from the Party by the Fourteenth Congress, have now openly embarked on splitting the Party . . . *(Resolution of the C.C., C.P.B.)*

In June 1963 the opposition group called its own extraordinary conference of the Brussels Federation of the Communist Party which elected a bureau headed by Grippa.

> The Grippa faction "succeeded in drawing attention to itself mainly thanks to the differences between the overwhelming majority of the Communist and Workers' parties, on the one hand, and the C.P.C., on the other". *(Statement by G. Moulin, member of the Political Bureau, C.P.B.)*

The factionists are now rallying around the Brussels office of the Hsinhua Agency which helps to finance their publishing activities.

"After the Antwerp Congress the men expelled from the Party gradually stepped up their activity to a point which at first glance seemed to exceed their resources, financial resources primarily. Grippa, Massoz, Raindorf and Delogne, the principal spokesmen of the group, met with full 'understanding' in the bourgeois parties and the capitalist press, which readily gives wide publicity to their slanderous attacks against the Communist Party of Belgium. The state broadcasting corporation likewise came to their assistance . . .

"All this is not too surprising. The sad thing is that the staff members of the Brussels office of Hsinhua hastened to the assistance of the factionists who are rallying around it and clearly receiving aid from it for carrying on extensive publishing activity.

(Report in Rudé Právo, organ of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, July 30, 1963.)

The group publishes the paper *Voix du peuple.*

The splitters' methods:

In the spate of printed matter put out by the "pro-Chinese" Brussels splinter group one can hardly find even a semblance of an analysis of the situation in Belgium since a serious examination of the social scene would inevitably reveal the growth of the working-class forces and the positive role played by our Party. The polemics conducted by the group of splitters are also of an artificial nature. When this group essays to elaborate a policy acceptable to the working class of our country, it succeeds only in crudely copying the conclusions arirved at by the Central Committee and the last Party Congress.

There is not a single new idea, not a single new slogan, not a single new proposal capable of serving as a stimulus to action. The political impotence of the group and the vapidity of its propaganda are the best proof of the artificiality of the Brussels split, which stems from sources alien to the Belgian working-class movement. The splinter group has no hope of being able to initiate any broad trend in the Belgian working class; its aim is merely to cause damage to the Belgian Communists, to create additional difficulties for them, and to smear the Soviet Union. Its activities are basically aimed against the Party and the Soviet Union.

One of the areas in which it is most anxious to cause damage is that of inner-Party democracy, a sphere to which we have devoted much attention. The working masses are becoming increasingly aware that ours is a party functioning on a democratic foundation, a party in which supreme authority rests with meetings, in which decisions obligatory for all are adopted by secret vote and in which the leading bodies scrupulously observe the decisions taken.

Our Party has made a point of explaining to the public how it functions and has sought to set an example of democratic activity for all workers' organizations.

The recent Party Congress decided to launch a campaign to elucidate and popularize our Rules. We wish to make our Rules known not only to our own members but also to large numbers of active trade unionists. The anti-Party slander of the splitters should not be allowed to divert us from the work we decided to undertake in this sphere, it should not be allowed to prevent us from taking the initiative in order to defend our organizational principles and make the methods of our work known to the public.

The difficulties which the splinter group is encountering in propounding its political line—an adventuristic line divorced from reality—compel it to resort to the most unconscionable devices ever encountered in the Belgian working-class movement. Its activities basically consist of publishing fabrications, sowing

confusion, and ascribing to the Party positions which it has never held and which can only mislead the working people. We must always be vigilantly on guard against the methods and provocative actions of this group, but vigilance should not cause us to forget our basic activities. *(Report by E. Burnelle, National Chairman of the Communist Party of Belgium, at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee on September 14, 1963.)*

BRAZIL

Building the Party and implementing its policy require intensification of ideological work, which must always be aimed against dogmatic and revisionist tendencies alike. In particular it is necessary to work unremittingly to uproot sectarianism and dogmatism, which struck deep root long ago in the leadership and the ranks of the Communist Party of Brazil. To overcome dogmatism and revisionism it is necessary to conduct Marxist-Leninist ideological education in the Party, closely linking the principles of scientific socialism with Brazilian reality and the practical activities of the revolutionary movement in our country. *(Political Resolution adopted by the Fifth Congress of the Brazilian Communist Party, September 1960.)*

The Brazilian Communist Party, whose General Secretary is Comrade Luis Carlos Prestes, is the recognized vanguard of the working people of Brazil.

In February 1962, however, the Grabois—Amazonas—Pomar splinter group issued a manifesto in which it declared itself the "true Communist Party of Brazil" and began publishing the journal *A Clase Operaria.* Articles published in *A Clase Operaria* are regularly reprinted in the press of the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour. Writing about the Brazilian splitters' publication, the Albanian *Zeri i Popullit* (November 17, 1963) declared that "the appearance of this militant paper was an important event in the political life of Brazil and Latin America, a signal success for the Communists and for revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in the struggle against the oligarchy, imperialism and modern revisionism".

COLOMBIA

At the same time a persistent struggle should be waged against extremist trends and "Left" opportunism which are particularly dangerous when the conditions are maturing for a revolutionary situation. "Left" opportunism or extremism is marked by disdain for mass actions and legal activity; it takes a negative attitude to any policy of alliances and underestimates the value of patient

work among the masses and struggle for vital demands which do not at once result in spectacular success, it denies the prime importance of political work among the working class and, hence, advances adventuristic theses laying the stress on armed guerilla struggle as the only and immediate form of struggle. In the ideological respect "Left" opportunism is expressed in dogmatism and mechanical copying of the experience of other countries. *(Political Resolution adopted by the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of Colombia, June 1961.)*

There is a splinter group in Colombia headed by P. Vásquez and P. Abella.

At the 29th plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia in October 1963 this faction was fully exposed.

The Chinese leaders, pretending to adhere to Marxism-Leninism while actually distorting it and flouting its essence, are engaged in ideological, political and practical activities which have led them to establishing direct contact with diverse groups of Trotskyites, renegades and expellees from the Communist and Workers' parties. This activity, at variance with Marxism-Leninism, is aimed at splitting the world Communist and working-class movement; instead of championing and propagating the great slogan of Marx and Engels, "Workers of all lands, unite!" it is undermining this slogan.

It is essential to heighten the revolutionary vigilance of our Party in order to prevent the existing differences from providing a pretext for the growth of factionalism, which is completely at variance with the Leninist norms of organization. *(Resolution adopted unanimously at the 29th plenary meeting of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Colombia, Bogota, October 22, 1963.)*

Here is a characterization of this group of renegades given by J. Cordona Hoyos, member of the Central Committee of the Party:

The Chinese splitters find supporters only among elements which have nothing in common with the Communists . . . I should like to cite as an example a certain P. Abella, who was expelled from the Party a long time ago for gross violations of Party discipline and adventuristic sallies. For the last 14 years this individual incessantly attacked the line of our Party. Then this anarchist began getting moral support from Peking; the C.P.C. leaders picked him off the political garbage heap and are now using him for their disruptive purposes. *(Pravda, September 17, 1963.)*

PERU

> As regards the unity of the world Communist movement, the unity of every Communist and Workers' Party, we hold that this unity is the most important condition for struggle for a radiant future for all humanity, for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism. Therefore we are opposed to any attempt to undermine the unity of the international Communist movement, to revive factionalism in the Communist Party, to extend a hand to those who have been expelled from the Party and other opportunist elements, or to interfere in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties in violation of standards of proletarian internationalism clearly set forth in the Moscow Statement of 1960. *(Statement of the Peruvian Communist Party on the differences in the international Communist movement, October 1963.)*

A group of splitters headed by Romualdo Valle convened what they called a "national Communist conference" on January 18-19, 1964.

On December 24, 1963, *Unidad,* organ of the Peruvian Communist Party, carried an editorial entitled "The Peruvian Communist Party—Vanguard of the Working Class". The article points out that in the recent period enemies have endeavoured "to split it from within, to prevent it from becoming a mass organization, to divert the Party's forces and make it incapable of consistently upholding the interests of the working class and the entire people. Factionalism, which confuses some honest Party members and impels them towards anti-Party positions, has emerged in embryonic form ... In our own ranks there are elements who support these positions—the factionists who call themselves the Lima regional committee and publish the anti-Party and anti-Soviet paper *Bandera Roja.*"

Raul Acosta Salas, General Secretary of the Communist Party, declared that the group of defectors provokes the government to begin persecuting the Communists and all other democratic forces.

A conference of the Party organization in the capital held on January 29, 1964, condemned the disruptive activities and the leading factionists were expelled. A resolution was adopted pointing out that at the present time the most dangerous deviation is the Left deviation upheld in the dogmatic theses of the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

U. S. A.

Dear Comrades,

A publication called *Hammer and Steel* has been sent around the world from the U.S. This sheet is edited by one Homer Chase, who was expelled from the C.P.U.S.A. two years ago.

He is a renegade with Trots-

kyist views and now openly fighting the C.P.U.S.A., through the bourgeois press. He is receiving support from the Albanian Party of Labour, which he extols in his publication.

He also reflects the views of the C.P.C. as regards the "inevitability of war"... There is another such publication called *Progressive Labour* edited by Milt. Rosen, expelled from the C.P.U.S.A,. that is being circulated internationally. This renegade too receives support from the Albanians... *(Communication from C.P.U.S.A., to all Communist and Workers' parties.)*

..."The Party must wage a persistent struggle against deeply ingrained dogmatic-sectarian opportunist tendencies, seen in rejection and underestimation of the united front, and in narrow, limited actions running ahead of the masses and causing isolation from them, leading to frustration and apathy. Above all, the Party must conduct an uncompromising struggle to eradicate from its ranks every vestige of the destructive evil of factionalism." *(Resolution adopted by Seventeenth Convention, C.P.U.S.A., December 10-13, 1959.)*

The anti-Party splinter groups in the U.S.A. have banded together in the so-called Progressive Labour party. These groups are headed by Trotskyite adventurers like Homer Chase and Milton Rosen, both of whom were expelled from the Communist Party of the U.S.A. for disruptive factional activities.

In *Progressive Labour* and other publications the splitters advocate the establishment of a "new Marxist party" in the U.S.A. With this end in view, they have actually set up a 14-man "national coordinating committee" headed by Rosen.

Like similar factions in other countries, the leaders of the Progressive Labour party seek to cover up their departure from Marxism-Leninism by ultra-revolutionary phrasemongering and by falsely accusing the C.P.U.S.A. of echoing the policy of class collaboration pursued by the trade union leaders.

FEDERAL GERMANY

Freies Volk, organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, published in September 1963 (No. 9/249) the following item under the heading "We Expose. The Office for Protecting the Constitution finances and circulates Chinese materials":

Here are the facts:

1. A new special body set up at the Office for Protecting the

Constitution has decided to allow the entry of materials put out by the Communist Party of China and directed against the Soviet Union, against the general line of the Communist and Workers' parties, and hence also against the policy of the Communist Party of Germany, and to place at the disposal of Chinese agencies lists of addresses, primarily addresses of members and functionaries of the Communist Party of Germany.

2. The Office has issued forgeries attributed to the C.P.G., including a faked issue of the theoretical journal *Wissen und Tat* as well as leaflets, in a vain attempt to use the Albanian and Chinese "theses" to penetrate into the C.P.G. and to paralyze its militancy.

3. Röder, the Prime Minister of Saarbrücken, has placed the sum of DM 25,000 at the disposal of the anti-Communist People's League for Peace and Freedom to finance the immediate publication and circulation of the "25 theses of the C.C., C.P.C." among Communists, Social Democrats and trade unionists . . . Negotiations on this filthy deal were conducted on behalf of the League by the notorious anti-Communist provocateur and enemy of the trade unions Friedrich Fritsch.

4. The Office for Protecting the Constitution has banned the printing and publication of the Open Letter of the C.C., C.P.S.U. and the circulation of the Statement on this question by the Political Bureau of the C.P.G. (*Freies Volk*, September 1963.)

The Chinese leaders are trying to split the Communist parties and the world Communist movement, to muster all sorts of renegades and splinter groups of factionists in order to counterpose them to the Marxist-Leninist parties. They rely on all kinds of anti-Party groupings and elements in the various countries, including our country, Federal Germany.

Materials put out by the Communist Party of China are circulated among Communists, Social Democrats and other progressives in the Federal Republic in the most diverse ways. In particular this is done through a certain Jean Kantor (Basle). These materials are accompanied by a letter offering all materials of the C.P.C. in German and announcing that they may also be obtained from Sepp Frey (Freiburg in Breisgau). Frey was once expelled from our Party and is a member of the Trotskyite centre in West Germany. Chinese publications are sent out also by Brumer Information, which is run by people expelled in the late twenties from the C.P.G. for adhering to Right opportunist positions.

In Munich Theo Pirker is recruiting a delegation to go to China with a view, as he puts it, to "learning more" about that country. Pirker is a Trotskyite who has gained notoriety through

his anti-Communist pamphlets and a book with an anti-trade union slant.

Herbert Klinger (Munich) is likewise trying to build up an anti-Party group, conducting in the process a provocative discussion directed against the Soviet Union as well as the G.D.R. and the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Although he never was a member of our Party, Klinger had close connections with our comrades. About a year ago we had to warn the Party against him since there was good reason to suspect him of being a stool-pigeon for the espionage service.

We resolutely denounce these methods used to undermine the unity of our Party. *(From a report by M. Reimann, First Secretary of the C.P.G., at a plenary meeting of the C.C., C.P.G., November 1963, published in W i s s e n u n d T a t, January—February 1964, p. 30.)*

CEYLON

The struggle against the Communist Party of Ceylon is headed by Sanmuhathasan and Kumarasiri, former members of the Political Bureau of the Party who were removed from the leadership and expelled from the Party for factional, splitting activity in the Party and also in the trade unions and women's and youth organizations of Ceylon.

On November 17, 1963 the Sanmuhathasan—Kumarasiri group held a meeting (attended by 85 persons) of so-called Marxists-Leninists of the Communist Party of Ceylon at which a declaration addressed "To All Marxists-Leninists in the Communist Party of Ceylon" was adopted and signed, and an organizational committee set up to convene the Seventh Congress of the Party for the purpose, as they say, of "renewing the leadership, saving the Party and ridding it of the heavy burden of revisionism."

In January 1964 the Kumarasiri—Sanmuhathasan group held another meeting which they unlawfully called the "Seventh Congress of the Party" and which was attended mainly by those formerly expelled from the ranks of the Party for splitting activities. The "resolution" adopted by the meeting demagogically condemns the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ceylon of September 26, 1963 "for attacking the correct Marxist-Leninist views of the Chinese Communist Party".

CHILE

A pro-Chinese factionist group calling itself the "Marxist People's Vanguard" is reported to have been set up in October 1963 in Santiago. This group, which receives assistance from Peking, opposes the line pursued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Chile.

At an affair sponsored by the Chile—China Society last October to mark the anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic, the trade representative of People's China in Chile made a speech in which he levelled crude sallies at the Communist Party of Chile.

SWITZERLAND

The Renegade J. Bulard and several other members of the Swiss Party of Labour have set up a so-called "Swiss Communist Party" in the town of Vevey ostensibly "to fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism".

Early in 1964 this group began to publish a sheet entitled *Etincelle.*

The National Conference of the Swiss Party of Labour held on September 14-15, 1963, in Geneva exposed the splitters and those who are inspiring them in these words:

> In an interminable flood of speeches, statements, leaflets... they have been giving their own interpretation, reading their own meaning into the general line set forth in the Statements. They interpret it in their own way, which they consider to be correct, ignoring the actual situation in the different countries, and disregarding the opinions of the other Communist and Workers' parties. They even attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of other Communist and Workers' parties in order to impose the line of the Chinese Communist Party on them or to win supporters for that line. *(Resolution of the National Conference of the Swiss Party of Labour, September 14-15, 1963.)*

ECUADOR

The Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Ecuador exposed the factionist group in the country which has joined with persons expelled from the Communist Party. In their factional activities this group uses the younger members of the Party who stand by A. Román, the Hsinhua correspondent in Ecuador. The factionists support Franklin Pérez Castro, former member of the Communist Party of Ecuador, and circulate pamphlets and other publications attacking the leadership and the policy of the Communist Party of Ecuador.

> The Executive Committee of the Central Committee has resolved to expose before the primary Party organizations the above-mentioned group consisting of A. Román, Salazar Tamaris, Chum and Mora, who have repeatedly been called to order by various Party bodies and who are now openly and brazenly acting against the Party, seeking to fish in the muddy waters.
>
> The Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the C.P.E. calls upon all Party bodies to uphold our organizational principles and the monolithic unity of our ranks. *(Statement of the Executive Committee of the C.C. of the C.P.E., February 1964.)*

★

The emergence of factional and splinter groups in the international Communist movement has led to the resuscitation of the Trotskyites, those political corpses in the working-class movement.

Here is what the International Secretariat of the Fourth International wrote in an Open Letter to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party as far back as September 1960:

> Comrades,
>
> Many leaders and official bodies of your party have recently started a discussion on some basic questions: peaceful co-existence, the illusion of the possibility of general disarmament, idealization of the potentialities of imperialism—such are the main points in this discussion . . .
>
> The Fourth International, which from its very inception has been waging a struggle in the Communist and working-class movement against the ideas which you are today opposing, is on your side . . . The International Secretariat of the Fourth International welcomes the debate you have initiated throughout the Communist movement. It urges you to develop that debate.

At a conference in Brussels in July 1963 the Bureau of the Fourth International adopted a decision to "give unconditional support to the struggle for the 25 programme points of the C.P.C.," stressing that "the Plenum approved an epoch-making line aimed at uniting with the Chinese and at fighting for the establishment of a united front between the Fourth International and the Chinese comrades".

SPLITTERS' INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATION

In the summer of 1963 an international journal *Revolucion* was founded in France with the direct participation of the C.P.C. The journal is headed by J. Verges, a renegade from the French Communist Party.

L'Humanité, organ of the Central Committee, French Communist Party, reported on September 25, 1963, that the editorial board of *Revolucion* consist in effect of the following:

A. Cabrera, expelled from the Communist Party of Venezuela;

R. Gibson, well known U.S. Trotskyite;

N. Kiên, a Vietnamese adventurer with nothing in common with the revolutionary forces in Vietnam.

Revolucion is a rallying centre for disruptive elements.

February 28, 1964

■ ■ ■

Workers of all lands, unite!

FILE COPY

Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Articles and Speeches

INFORMATION BULLETIN

7

PEACE AND SOCIALISM
PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE 1964

CONTENTS

Statements of the Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Mexico and Central America, of the Peruvian Communist Party, of the Dominican People's Socialist Party and of the Central Committee, C.P. of Honduras

Manifesto of the Communist Party of Nicaragua

Theses of the Central Committee, C.P. of the Netherlands

Resolution of the Central Executive Committee C.P. of India

Article by R. Chandra, Member of the Central Secretariat, C.P. of India

Programme of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party of Nigeria

Statement of National Executive Committee, C.P. of Canada

Statement by Gus Hall

Statement of the Iraqi Communist Party

CONTENS

Third Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Mexico and Central America. (Resolutions) 197

Statement of the Peruvian Communist Party. On the Ideological Differences in the International Communist Movement 201

Statement of the Dominican People's Socialist Party 206

In Defence of the Unity of the International Communist Movement. Resolution the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Honduras . . 213

For a Broad National Democratic Front (Outline of basic reforms, submitted by the Nicaraguan Socialist Party, on the occasion of its 19th anniversary, as the only way out of the economic, social and political crisis experienced by Nicaragua) 220

New Ways to Unity, for Democracy and Progress. Theses for the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Netherlands 228

On Slanderous Attacks and Open Call for Disruption and Split by the Communist Party of Indonesia. (Resolution adoptet by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India, January 14, 1964) 240

Defend the Unity of Our Party, by Romesh Chandra, Member of the Central Secretariat, the Communist Party of India, Editor-in-chief of New Age 244

The Manifesto of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party of Nigeria 248

Splitting Activities of Chinese Repudiated 265

Latest Chinese Statement Discussed by Gus Hall 266

Statement of the Iraqi Communist Party 268

Third Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Mexico and Central America

(Resolutions)

OUT WITH THE YANKEES FROM PANAMA!

The Third Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Mexico and Central America closely examined the events in the Republic of Panama.

The struggle of the Panamanian people against imperialist domination over part of the territory of that country and over its economic and political life in general is steadily acquiring ever greater world-historic significance. This heroic struggle has stripped the mask off neo-colonialism and showed up U.S. imperialism in its true colours as the exploiter and oppressor of peoples. It has once again shown that the Organization of American States is nothing but the U.S. "Department of Colonies" and that the "Inter-American System" is a fraud designed to perpetuate the subjugation of the Latin American countries in the name of such spurious principles as "defence of the continent".

The Meeting declares its resolute support of the liberation demands of the Panamanian people.

The so-called Canal Zone has always been Panamanian territory. Only by force was U.S. imperialism able to occupy this part of the territory of the Republic of Panama, thereby violating its sovereignty. The treaty of 1903 is an act designed to "legalize" seizure by right of might and hence is invalid.

Our Meeting declares that, like all other nations, the people of Panama are not obliged to share their sovereignty with anyone. The problem of the canal can be solved only on the basis of the self-determination of the Panamanian people, who have already announced their decision, and we demand that this decision be respected.

The people's firm resolve to restore their rights was demonstrated by the toll of human life taken by the cowardly aggression of the U.S. Army.

The struggle waged by the people of Panama is important not only because it is a fight for liberation but also because it will inevitably lead to the evacuation of one of the biggest U.S. military bases in the Caribbean area. The liberation of the Panamanian people will be a major contribution to the efforts of all peoples to preserve and strengthen world peace.

As we know, the U.S. armed forces stationed in Panama are there for the ignominious purpose of suppressing the peoples' striving for freedom in this part of the American continent, as has been shown by the experience of several of our countries.

The Canal Zone military command is a go-between for the Pentagon and the armies of our countries, and the Zone itself has been turned into a military political school for personnel for the repressive machine working for the oligarchy and imperialism.

The people of Panama want their country to belong to the camp of peace and that the canal should serve all nations equally. This demand accords with the interests not only of the people of Panama but of all peoples of the world. Panama's cause is therefore the cause of all peoples fighting for their national liberation.

The Communist parties of Mexico and the countries of Central America, the true champions of the interests of their peoples, consider it their duty to voice their support and solidarity with this cause. The Meeting urges all peoples to render whatever aid is needed to the Panamanian people in their heroic struggle for national liberation.

Having committed military aggression, imperialism is now threatening with economic aggression. But we are confident that this aggression will be defeated by the unbending spirit of self-sacrifice and the struggle of the people of Panama, who will enjoy the active solidarity of all peoples.

The threat of military aggression is not over. But renewed aggression will not break the spirit of the sons of the Panamanian people, and it will once again be countered by the most active solidarity.

U.S. imperialist spokesmen have begun speaking about the "need" to build a canal through Nicaragua. The object is to blackmail the ruling classes of Panama and to prepare the ground in the countries which would be affected by the construction of a new canal.

The Meeting holds that the Bryan-Chamorro treaty which was imposed on the Central American peoples through the agency of the unlawful government of Nicaragua is invalid. The time is past when Central America was a "no-man's land" where the imperialists could do whatever they wished. Now a powerful national-liberation movement championing the interests of our peoples is at various stages of development in all our countries.

The Meeting firmly declares that in the present conditions neither this canal nor the Tehuantepec Canal will be built; the peoples of Mexico and Central America will not permit it. Our parties will stand together with other democratic forces in the forefront of the fight against the imperialist claims.

The Meeting expresses its deep sympathy with the Panamanian people over the loss of precious human lives caused by the aggressive actions of the U.S. Army. The self-sacrifice of the heroes who gave

their lives in this struggle as well as of the other heroes of the anti-imperialist struggle lights the way to freedom and progress for the Latin American peoples.

Mexican Communist Party, Guatemalan Party of Labour, Communist Party of Salvador, Communist Party of Honduras, Socialist Party of Nicaragua, Party of the People's Vanguard of Costa Rica.

Central America, January 13, 1964.

DEFEND SOCIALIST CUBA

The Third Meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties of Mexico and Central America notes that since the victory of the Cuban revolution in 1959 imperialism and the ultra-reactionary circles of the Latin American ruling classes have joined forces against the heroic efforts of the Cuban people, who have put an end to imperialist domination and class exploitation.

The increasingly vicious threats of aggression with which the anti-imperialist steps taken by the Cuban revolution were met from the very outset were followed in April 1961 by direct imperialist aggression camouflaged as an invasion by Cuban counter-revolutionaries. The people of Cuba, who are dedicated to their revolution and have extended it to the material and cultural spheres, duly rebuffed the counter-revolutionary and imperialist invaders and routed them.

But the counter-revolutionaries and imperialism above all did not give up their criminal intention to drown in blood the Cuban revolution which, in the course of the struggle against the invaders, declared itself a socialist revolution. Scheming to crush Cuba's inspiring example by means of aggression, hostile sallies and blockade, the imperialists and the counter-revolutionaries aggravated international tensions and brought the world to the brink of war. The Soviet Union and the socialist camp, carrying out their internationalist duty, came to the assistance of the fraternal people of Cuba.

The Soviet Union, whose policy consistently upholds the interests of all humanity, prevented the nuclear disaster which the imperialists sought to provoke and secured guarantees against the invasion of Cuba. Thanks to this policy the forces of peace and socialism won in October 1962 a momentous victory over the forces of imperialism and war, and this created more favourable conditions for the development of the Cuban revolution.

But neither the imperialists nor the counter-revolutionaries have completely given up attempts to hinder the peaceful building of socialism in Cuba. They are continuing to hatch criminal plans to achieve their barbarous ends. The blockade, the treacherous attacks and the pressure exerted on other countries to stop them from trading with

Cuba are all components of these schemes to put an end to the "bad example" of socialist Cuba, which is inspiring the peoples to fight for their liberation and the building of a new society, a society without exploiters and exploited.

The criminal aims of the imperialists and the counter-revolutionaries present a serious threat to socialist Cuba and the peaceful endeavours in which all the problems of the Cuban people are being gradually solved. Imperialism is spending millions of dollars to finance plans of aggression and the lightning raids in which the blood is spilt of working people engaged in building, with the fraternal aid of the socialist camp, a socialist society free from poverty and fear.

In view of the danger hanging over the people of Cuba, the Meeting urges all peoples, in particular the peoples of Latin America, to display unflagging vigilance, to prevent aggression and surprise raids, resolutely to expose the preparations made in the various countries to carry out criminal schemes.

The Cuban counter-revolutionaries, who, besides undertaking actions against their own people, are engaged in the various countries in sinister criminal activities, frequently hiring out as provocateurs, stool pigeons and executioners, thereby carrying out the role assigned to them by the reactionary governments and by imperialism, should be especially watched.

Defence of the Cuban revolution should include, besides exposure of the imperialist schemes, extensive popularization of Cuba's progress in the spheres of the economy, public welfare, health and culture in order to bring home to the fraternal peoples the achievements of the socialist system and its superiority over capitalism.

The Meeting sends fraternal greetings to the national leadership and members of the United Party of the Socialist Revolution of Cuba, who are loyally and resolutely serving their people; to the soldiers and milicianos who are defending the people arms in hand; to all manual and mental workers who by their selfless all-out labour are laying the groundwork for the full satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of the fraternal people of Cuba.

Long live the Cuban socialist revolution!

Stay the hand of the imperialist and counter-revolutionary killers!

Mexican Communist Party, Guatemalan Party of Labour, Communist Party of Salvador, Communist Party of Honduras, Socialist Party of Nicaragua, Party of the People's Vanguard of Costa Rica.

Central America, January 13, 1964.

■ ■ ■

Statement of the Peruvian Communist Party

On the Ideological Differences in the International Communist Movement

The ideological differences that have recently arisen between the Communist Party of China, on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and most of the Communist parties, on the other, threaten to cause a split in the international family of the Communist parties and socialist states of the whole world.

The Central Committee of the Peruvian Communist Party gathered at its eighteenth plenary meeting in order to determine its attitude to these differences which, it goes without saying, injure the activity, growth and unity of our Party. It thoroughly discussed and critically analyzed the concepts on which there are differences of views, basing itself on the inviolable scientific foundation of Marxism-Leninism. The unanimous adoption of the statement that follows is one of the most positive aspects of the meeting.

The unity of the Peruvian Communist Party, the unity of the international Communist movement, the invulnerability and reliability of the Marxist-Leninist principles on which the political line of our Party is founded were the main issues which determined the trend of the debate and the content of our statement.

The present statement on the ideological differences is based on the principles laid down by the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960 to which our Party also subscribes, and is also determined by the political line set forth by the Fourth National Congress in 1962.

1. The Fourth Congress fully subscribes to the definition of our time as "a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale".

The Congress also subscribes to the view that it is the principal feature of our time that "the socialist world system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society" and that "whatever efforts imperialism makes, it cannot stop the advance of history ... The complete triumph of socialism is inevitable". This historical truth has been borne out by the victory of the Cuban revolution—the first socialist revolution in Latin America.

2. On the question of war and peace our Fourth Congress declared that "socialism does not need the forcible conquest of other countries for its development and that although another war by imperialism

would end in the complete destruction of this system, we Communists do not want victory at such a price: we are fighting for man's happiness, not his destruction. True to this idea, we absolutely reject the statement that 'on the debris of a dead imperialism, the victorious people would create very swiftly a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future'. A thermonuclear war would take a toll of over 800 million human lives, cause untold damage to the productive forces and socialism would thus have to be built on ruins, which would signify a return to primitive communism. Among the war victims there would be hundreds of dead workers for every dead capitalist, for the atom bomb does not differentiate between the classes."

This attitude is not humane. We must win and build socialism through class struggle, not through nuclear war. The atom danger is not merely blackmail by imperialism; it is a monstrous means which imperialism can resort to in desperation, when it realizes that it has lost all its positions in the political and ideological struggle and that before long it will be losing also the economic struggle.

We Communists regard as just the wars of liberation which will be waged as long as imperialism and colonialism exist. The socialist world and especially the Soviet Union have helped and are continuing to help all countries which are fighting for their liberation or in defence of their independence, such as Egypt, Algeria and Yemen. As regards Cuba, 90 per cent of its armaments are Soviet made.

3. As regards the question of peaceful coexistence we, in the light of the Moscow 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and also in the light of the decisions of the Fourth Congress of our Party, cannot agree with the assertion that "it is wrong to make peaceful coexistence the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries". We maintain that peaceful coexistence must indeed be the general line of relations between states with different socio-political systems. We impart to this line a revolutionary content for we see in it the most concentrated expression of struggle in present-day international conditions, a struggle which is waged in the most diverse forms in the economic, political and ideological spheres and which rules out nuclear war as a form of struggle.

Peaceful coexistence creates the conditions for positive change in society, and it should by no means be identified with conciliation, appeasement or weakening of the class struggle.

The action of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet government at the time of the Caribbean crisis was of decisive significance. As Fidel Castro said in his speech at the Lenin Stadium in Moscow, it saved both mankind and socialist Cuba from a thermonuclear catastrophe. Today, a year after, we can see how correct, courageous and resolute was the stand taken by the Soviet Government at the time when the world was on the brink of a thermonuclear war. In solving the Caribbean crisis the Soviet

Union had two aims in view: to save socialist Cuba and ensure its independence, and to safeguard universal peace. And the first aim—defence of Cuba—was considered even more important than the second, although had these two aims proved incompatible, a very grave danger would have arisen. Today we clearly see two objective factors: a) socialist Cuba continues to exist and has become even stronger and more powerful than it was before the Caribbean crisis. And the Soviet government has officially warned that should the U.S. imperialists in their frenzy again attempt to attack Cuba, it will protect her by launching guided missiles from its territory; b) universal peace was saved. With it Cuba was saved above all against the danger of being scorched by atom bombs for it would have been the first target in this war. All our peoples, humanity as a whole, were saved from a nuclear catastrophe.

As regards the Moscow treaty banning nuclear tests in outer space, in the atmosphere and under water, our enlarged Political Commission and members of the Central Committee residing in Lima warmly approved it as a milestone on the way to peace and general and complete disarmament. This outstanding event confirms the soundness of the policy of peaceful coexistence steadfastly pursued by the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union. It also confirms the effectiveness of the peace struggle of all the peoples of the world and shows that this struggle, closely linked with the growing might of the socialist system, with the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the working class of the whole world, can avert the danger of thermonuclear war and ensure a just and lasting peace, conducive to the growth of the economic, political and military might of the socialist camp and the final abolition of all forms of oppression and exploitation.

4. The Moscow Statement of 1960 calls for mastering all forms of struggle, and according to the Marxist-Leninist theses on the different ways of revolution both the peaceful way, which allows for force and class struggle, and the armed struggle are equally revolutionary. It would be wrong to say that there is no historical precedent for the peaceful way of winning power by the working class. In 1917 the working class in Hungary came to power by peaceful means. Lenin attached much importance to this possibility, regarding it as a very special and valuable perspective. In April 1917 Lenin himself considered the peaceful way and abandoned the idea only when faced with the violence let loose by reaction. As socialism grows stronger and capitalism weaker, this possibility will undoubtedly occur more frequently. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the two ways are not separated by a Chinese wall, and at a certain time, as in the case of the Russian revolution, in view of the natural resistance put up by the class enemy which never relinquishes its positions voluntarily, it will be possible to pass over from the peaceful way to the armed struggle. That is why,

our Fourth Congress, expressing its complete agreement with the relevant thesis of the 81-Party Statement, stated at the same time that the more likely perspective for our revolution is the non-peaceful way.

5. The Party has on more than one occasion criticized the personality cult as a gross violation of Marxism-Leninism. This, however, does not mean denying the role of leaders who are needed inasmuch as they express the aspirations of the working class and the people generally. The personality cult is harmful, since it belittles the role of the Party and the masses. In the latter period of his life Stalin, who before that had deservedly headed the Party and the Soviet government, estranged himself from the Party and the masses, violated the Leninist standards of Party life, abolished inner-Party democracy and renounced collective leadership. All this led to his abuse of power, to the shooting and long imprisonment of thousands of devoted members of the Party. We Peruvian Communists regard the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. and its criticism of the pernicious personality cult as the restoration of the basic principle according to which a Communist Party is a truly democratic organization in which every member has the right freely to express his or her opinion without fear of repressions and in which every member must share actively in applying Marxism-Leninism to the specific conditions of his own country. That is why we oppose any artificial elevation or deification of any man, we oppose any attempt to revive the Stalin personality cult. Marx, Engels and Lenin ridiculed the personality cult, combating it as a survival of bourgeois ideology.

6. As regards the unity of the international Communist movement, the unity of each Communist and Workers' Party, we maintain that it is the most essential condition of the struggle for man's bright future, for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism. We therefore reject any attempt to undermine this unity, to encourage factionalism in the Communist parties, to extend a hand to the expellees from the parties and to the opportunists, to interfere in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties in violation of the principles of proletarian internationalism clearly formulated in the Moscow Statement of 1960.

Realizing that unity is essential to the existence and strength of the Party, to its ability to fulfil its role of a vanguard of the working class and the people, that it is only imperialism, the oligarchy and the rabid foes of the people who stand to benefit by the split, the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties have come out in defence of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, in defence of their unity, and the right of each party independently to manage its own affairs. The struggle against the above-mentioned deviations and the discussion now under way do not mean either a split in our Party or sowing the seeds of a split; on the contrary, this means preventing these seeds from striking roots, uniting the Party, warning it against a lurking danger. If we hide our heads in the sand like ostriches whilst the storm rages, this

will mean allowing and encouraging the split and break-up of the Party. We are therefore duty bound to defend its unity, which is in fact being threatened, to clarify and defend its positions. Any delay in this respect is tantamount to suicide. We have already seen that this problem is beginning to paralyze the activity of the Party, to deprive it of perspective, to disunite its leadership and make it ineffective.

We Peruvian Communists will always fight for the unity of our own ranks and of the international Communist movement. All existing differences notwithstanding, we attach much more importance to that which unites us, than what divides us. We welcome all paths that lead to unity.

We are in favour of bilateral discussion between the parties and we are also for a World Conference of all the Communist and Workers' parties for which the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have called. We are prepared to attend this meeting, take part in its work, to approve and defend democratically adopted decisions.

The Peruvian Communist Party will steadfastly continue its fight for unity, and to fulfil its role of vanguard of the workers and the people generally. We believe that building a Party which is united ideologically, politically and organizationally and which is in close contact with the masses is the best contribution we can make to the cause of unity of the international Communist movement.

Lima, October 1963.

■ ■ ■

Statement of the Dominican People's Socialist Party

1. The guerilla action launched on November 29, in six mountain regions of the country ended on December 21 with the defeat of the main guerilla forces by the army in Las Manaclas.

Within the space of three weeks the guerilla units were wiped out one by one, with a loss of 32 dead and 98 captured.

How did this happen? Why were the guerilla detachments defeated so quickly?

Some attribute it to a lack of training, others, to inadequate organization and shortage of supplies.

It is also held that the guerillas were defeated because their operations in the mountains were not followed up by an uprising in the cities.

There is no doubt that some of these factors hastened the defeat of the guerillas in the mountains. Had the detachments been better trained they might have held out longer and inflicted greater damage on the army. But the main reason for the defeat of the guerilla detachments should be sought in the absence of conditions making for the development and the victory of an armed uprising.

2. The aim of the guerilla detachments was to destroy the military machine of repression and capture the political power for the forces of revolution. Although the guerillas did not proclaim this objective clearly and unequivocally it was quite obvious that had they succeeded in defeating the putschist regime by force of arms the power would have passed into the hands of the openly anti-imperialist and anti-feudal forces.

To determine the exact moment to start an uprising it is necessary to proceed from an analysis of the concrete situation in the given country, from the alignment of the various social forces. Let us examine the alignment of class forces in the Dominican society.

The biggest revolutionary force in a country like ours is the peasantry which is only beginning to organize and has not yet been drawn into active struggle for the land. Backwardness, subordination to the reactionary clergy, and fear of the army are characteristic features of the peasantry in our country at the present time. The peasantry has not yet shaken off the torpor induced by more than thirty years of Trujillo tyranny.

The working class is destined to lead the revolution. With all its tradition of struggle against the tyranny and its higher stage of organization it is split up into four centres. Its political consciousness is still none too high, and substantial sections of it are influenced by

reactionary propaganda. The groups of workers who raise the banner of revolution are as yet few and far between. Working-class activity is centred mainly around the economic struggle.

The middle classes do not hold a homogeneous position. Some sections of the professionals, office workers, small businessmen and shopkeepers hold democratic views; others are under the influence of the Rights or moderates like the Christian Socialists. Large sections of the students in the capital and other cities take an active part in anti-imperialist struggle and cherish revolutionary sympathies.

The bourgeoisie who are dissatisfied with the present regime —nationalist elements as well as those who are ready to compromise with imperialists—are more afraid of revolution than of a despotic government. The spectre of "Castro communism" impels these elements to make political deals with circles associated with dictatorship.

The traitorous bourgeoisie and the latifundists who control the state machine and exert considerable influence in the village and on the more gullible sections of the urban population are violently opposed not only to revolution but even to the limited bourgeois freedoms which have been in operation since September 25, last year.

Thus, only a few small groups of workers and students (the vanguard) today stand for revolution. The majority of the people believe that the present crisis can be resolved by restoring political freedom and the Constitution of April 1963. The people are fighting for democracy but they do not yet regard revolution as the surest solution of their present plight.

The vanguard must not mistake their own emotions and desires for the emotions and desires of the masses. If the vanguard carries on the fight alone, there can only be one outcome—defeat.

3. No revolutionary situation existed in our country two months ago, nor does it exist today.

What are the symptoms of a revolutionary situation? Here is Lenin's classical definition:

"1) when it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule in an unchanged form; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the 'upper classes', a crisis in the policy of the ruling class which causes fissures, through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. Usually, for a revolution to break out it is not enough for the 'lower classes not to want' to live in the old way; it is necessary also that the 'upper classes should be unable' to live in the old way; 2) when the want and suffering of the oppressed classes have become more acute than usual; 3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who in time of 'peace' quietly allow themselves to be robbed, but who in turbulent times are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis and by the *'upper classes' themselves* into independent historical action.

"Without these objective changes, which are independent not only of the will of separate groups and parties but even of separate classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The sum-total of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation."

Clearly our country does not yet present such a picture. Notwithstanding the friction within the ruling camarilla, the reactionary classes have not yet exhausted all their possibilities for domination or their ability to manoeuvre; the "lower classes" have not yet rid themselves of the illusion that the solution of their problems lies within the framework of the present social and economic structure. The political crisis too has not yet reached the point where the masses would be impelled to "independent historical action". No, such a situation does not yet exist.

A revolutionary situation cannot be created artificially. Without it, neither one nor a dozen seats of rebellion will be able to cause revolutions. Revolutions are the result of a maximum aggravation of class contradictions and require the existence of objective and subjective conditions (degree of organization and consciousness of the popular masses) without which victory is impossible.

We believe that these are the reasons for the failure of the recent attempts to establish guerilla centres in the mountain areas of our country.

4. In the statements of the Central Committee of September 26, 1962 and November 23, 1963 and in other documents, our Party has insisted on the need to take all forms of struggle, peaceful and non-peaceful, into account. The development of the revolutionary movement itself, the concrete situation will determine what the predominant form of struggle should be.

It is too early to predict exactly what road will lead to the victory of the revolution in our country.

The situation at the present time and the existence of a powerful military machine of repression in the service of the ultra-reactionary ruling bloc of the bourgeoisie and latifundists seems to indicate that the principal—but not the only—form of struggle for the victory of the revolution of national liberation should be the armed struggle, a popular uprising.

In the present conditions this is the most probable form.

At the same time the other possibility cannot be entirely excluded.

We are living in a time marked by the disintegration of the colonial system, the upsurge of the national-liberation movement, the consolidation of peace forces and the steady decline of imperialism. We are living in the glorious age of transition from capitalism to socialism, when the socialist camp is emerging more and more as the decisive force of world development.

The struggle of our people is an integral part of the general struggle of all peoples against imperialism. Our struggle contributes to the

world struggle against imperialism while the latter exerts a decisive influence on the struggle of our people. That is why the new victories scored by the forces of peace and socialism, the new and crushing defeats inflicted on imperialism (which have a direct bearing on the situation in our country) and the growth and consolidation of our democratic movement can create the conditions for far-reaching changes in the socio-economic structure of our country without recourse to civil war.

Today, we repeat, the most likely path appears to be that of armed uprising. But revolutionaries must take all possibilities into account, for events may develop in such a way that some form of struggle previously regarded as of secondary importance, may come to the fore.

5. Some rather curious notions, posing as legitimate theories on the question of revolution are being circulated among us.

It is held by some that revolution is possible today, because the people have the right to take to arms in response to reactionary repressions against them.

We believe that in the conditions of capitalism the people always have the right to take revolutionary action inasmuch as they are bound to be oppressed and exploited in one way or another. The problem, however, does not consist in whether one has or has not the right to violence, but of whether the conditions for the use of violence exist or not.

Others maintain that the problem of revolution consists simply in "having the courage to carry it out", that there are peoples who are more courageous and resolute than others and hence they take the path of revolutionary struggle.

Arguments of this kind have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. The problem of revolution is first and foremost a problem of class struggle, and not "courage". All peoples possess courage and resolution, but not all have achieved the same degree of organization and consciousness. The conditions for starting a revolution do not yet exist in all countries, and the revolution will not take an identical course in all countries.

We vehemently reject these theories, just as we reject the theory that guerilla warfare is necessarily the only road to revolution in Latin America.

Every country will choose its own road in accordance with the concrete situation. In some countries this will be the road of guerilla struggle, in others, a different form of popular revolt; in still others the possibility of effecting revolutionary changes without civil war may present itself. In any event it is for the revolutionary forces in each country to decide what road to take and when to take it.

6. When will it be possible to carry out the revolution? In one, two, five or ten years' time? No one can set the exact date. Unforeseen circumstances may postpone or hasten the victory of the revolution.

We have been fighting for political power ever since our Party, the political vanguard of the working class, was founded. Nevertheless our wishes, our efforts still fall short of our objective.

It is quite obvious that the conquest of power by the revolutionaries is not yet an immediate issue in our country.

The actions which were fought yesterday and which are being fought today are part and parcel of the revolutionary process which is a dialectical process subordinated to certain laws and not dependent on the will of one or another social group, one or another political party.

To those who are becoming impatient, we say: the more vigorous the present actions for political freedom and against the tyranny, the higher the level of organization and political consciousness of the working class, and the more social forces join in the common mass movement—the more the cause of progress will be advanced and the nearer the day of the national liberation revolution.

The immediate issue in our country, that which unites the majority of the people, is the struggle for political freedom, for the restoration of democracy. Premature calls to armed uprising, sectarianism and ultra-"leftism" which continue to exert their influence in some revolutionary quarters, hinder this struggle, play into the hands of the local reactionaries, split the democratic forces and postpone rather than hasten the day of revolution.

For this reason our principal task in the sphere of ideological work consists in combating the pernicious sectarianism and "leftist" ideas. Unless this is done, the democratic and revolutionary movement in our country will be unable to make any appreciable headway.

7. The ruling triumvirate continues to encounter difficulties caused by its putschist origins and the absence of popular support. It is a despotic government composed of the reactionary minority, of forces harmful to our country.

The lack of any appreciable degree of united action on the part of the democratic forces has enabled the triumvirate to entrench itself in power. But the efforts of the triumvirate to suppress the popular protest and to cow the masses into submission have failed. Notwithstanding the repressions, the people are fighting and demanding their rights.

The working class, which frequently declares strikes in defence of economic demands despite all threats and "legal" bans and turns a deaf ear to official palaver about "peace between the worker and the employer"; the students who stage demonstrations against the dictatorship and imperialism, the professionals and intellectuals who are fighting for human rights—all these diverse actions in support of the general mass struggle against the dictatorship represent a formidable obstacle to despotism, one which causes the government to think twice before enforcing some of its more reactionary measures. The develop-

ment of this movement, the joint actions of all anti-dictatorship forces is a guarantee that the putschists will be defeated and democracy restored.

The People's Socialist Party declares once again that so long as the triumvirate remains in power there can be no democratic solution. The anti-popular and anti-national government, the product and tool of the Trujillo "gorillas", must go.

8. Our Party has repeatedly stated its opinion that guerilla warfare at the present stage is unfeasible. We set forth this view once again in our statement of November 23 last year. However, when the seats of guerilla resistance appeared, and as an expression of our solidarity with all those who are fighting in one or another way against the dictatorship, we called upon the people to rally to the assistance of the guerillas.

The speed with which the guerilla detachments were smashed prevented this assistance from taking concrete shape. However, we made it clear that we place solidarity among revolutionaries above all tactical differences.

The men of the Revolutionary Movement of June 14 who fell in battle are heroes belonging to the same historic pleiad as those who fought in June 1959. They were actuated by patriotic sentiment, by the desire to give an impetus to the revolution. Their death is a grievous loss not only for the RM-14 but for the whole Dominican revolutionary movement.

The People's Socialist Party dips its fighting banners in reverence before these gallant revolutionaries and anti-imperialist fighters.

But respect and reverence for the heroes who gave their lives in the mountains need not prevent us from making a thorough, clearheaded and objective analysis of the recent events. The struggle waged by our people for the revolution we are all striving for makes such an analysis imperative. Not in order to dim the glory of the fallen, but in order to promote the cause for which they died.

The Revolutionary Movement of June 14 is the biggest movement of the Left. It came into being during the underground struggle against the Trujillo tyranny and enjoys deserved prestige and influence among the masses. It plays an important role in our people's struggle for an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution of national liberation.

We are the first to recognize this role of the comrades from the RM-June 14. While we may differ on certain tactical questions, we fully agree on the strategic objectives of the revolution. That which unites us far outweighs whatever might divide us.

On the basis of this identity of goals we should like to maintain relations of close friendship and cooperation with the RM-June 14 and with all other revolutionary forces as well. Such relations are a necessity in the Dominican revolutionary movement.

We appeal to the comrades from the RM-June 14, to the democratic political parties and to all who oppose the dictatorship to intensify the joint struggle for the restoration of democracy.

Let us heighten the mass activity against the police tyranny, against persecution, against deportations, for political freedom and against the despotic government of the triumvirate!

Let us launch a nation-wide campaign for a general amnesty for political prisoners, deportees and all those who are persecuted for their political beliefs.

Let us demand the repeal of Law No. 99 and the whole repressive legislation adopted by the triumvirate.

Let us demand again and again full observance of the Constitution of April 1963.

All forces to the defence of the economic demands of the working class!

Fight with every means against the rising cost of living!

Organize the peasants' fight for the land!

Let us close our ranks in the fight for these objectives. The people will be able to accomplish very little without our unity. Unity in the struggle is an earnest of victory.

To all supporters of democracy, to all enemies of despotism we say:

Let us strike blows in unison even though we march in different columns!

Central Committee, Dominican People's Socialist Party

Santo Domingo,
January 30, 1964.

■ ■ ■

In Defence of the Unity of the International Communist Movement

Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Honduras

The Communist Party of Honduras, like all Communist and Workers' parties of the world, cannot but voice its concern over the differences between the Chinese comrades and the international Communist movement.

The delegates to the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties held in Moscow in 1960, while aware that by signing the 81-Party Statement we did not achieve absolute unity as such, regarded this joint document as a basic programme of unity which, if carried out in full, would result in that cohesion which, as the Statement declares, is the "supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist Party".

All the delegates to the meeting realized that the roots of the dissenting views could be traced to the leadership of the Communist Party of China, although at the outset they were voiced not by the latter but by the representatives of the Albanian Party of Labour. A few days later, in the course of the Meeting, the Chinese comrades, who until then had proceeded very cautiously, could no longer conceal their disagreement in principle with a number of theses pertaining to the struggle of the Communist parties and the characterization of our time.

In other words, the differences arose not after the jointly elaborated Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 but long before the Moscow meetings. The meetings revealed these differences as well as some of the initial methods used by the Chinese comrades to vindicate their stand.

The Chinese comrades signed the 81-Party Statement and the revolutionary press in the Chinese People's Republic declared at the time that the imperialists were deceiving themselves if they thought that the international Communist movement would present them with the spectacle of a split in its ranks.

But the restraint of the Chinese comrades did not last long. A few days later they came out with new statements on various problems expounding their old positions which had already been discussed at the meetings. These statements were circulated by the U.S. imperialist news agencies and published the world over to the satisfaction of the worst enemies of the peoples.

For some time our Party, like the C.P.S.U., believed that the moment

was not yet ripe for a new meeting to clear up the differences. But we welcomed the proposal to end the open polemic so as to allow events and the struggle of the peoples to show with the passage of time who was right and who was wrong, irrespective of the arguments advanced in support of the different positions.

In spite of the fact that the materials published by the Communist Party of China attacking the C.P.S.U. and other parties left no doubt as to the position of the C.P.C., the agreement reached on the initiative of the C.P.S.U. for a meeting in Moscow between representatives of the two parties instilled new hope in the international Communist movement. But this hope was short-lived, for even before the talks opened they were virtually broken off by the publication by the Chinese comrades on June 14 of a letter entitled "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement". This letter introduced new points of disagreement in gross violation of the documents elaborated by the parties in 1957 and 1960. The Chinese comrades offered the Communist and Workers' parties a new programme.

The polemic continued in a tone offensive and disrespectful towards all other parties.

Although the C.P.S.U. insisted on the talks being held, the fact remains that they had been terminated before they were begun. Later we learned that the Communist Party of China had broken off negotiations. The C.P.S.U. published an open letter to all Party organizations and Communists of the Soviet Union dealing with the "new line" advanced by the Chinese Communists but in no way proposing a third line for the international Communist movement or rejecting the agreed documents signed in Moscow.

In the 25 points revising the Declaration and Statement which they advanced in their June 14 letter, the Chinese comrades set forth their fundamental differences with the international Communist movement. Pretending to base themselves on the 1960 Statement, they put forward in the first of these points a "new line", just as if the Communist movement had no jointly discussed and accepted programme—witness the polemical tone struck from the outset in points 1, 2, 3 and 4. This tone of criticism and revision of the general line already adopted by the parties, a tone of intolerant denunciation, is basic to the whole June 14 letter of the Chinese comrades. At the end of Point 7, for instance, they say: "Conversely, to make no distinction between enemies, friends and ourselves and to entrust the fate of the people and of mankind to collaboration with U.S. imperialism is to lead people astray." But who has led "people" astray to the extent that they no longer distinguish enemies from friends? Who has entrusted the fate of mankind to U.S. imperialism? Not the Communist and Workers' parties of the world; and as regards people who take an erroneous attitude to friends and enemies and do not see the anti-popular essence of imperialism, it can be safely said that they have nothing to do with

revolutionary parties. The Marxists-Leninists have never gone astray as the Chinese comrades claim.

We know of no document adopted by any Communist Party which would bear out the Chinese position on this score. There are no grounds for accusing the C.P.S.U. and the Communist movement of adhering to a view which "blots out the class content of the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps", "recognizes only the contradiction between the socialist and imperialist camps, while neglecting or underestimating the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the capitalist world, between the oppressed nations and imperialism, among the imperialist countries and among the monopoly capitalist groups, and the struggles to which these contradictions give rise", and maintains "that the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can be resolved without a proletarian revolution in each country and that the contradiction between the oppressed nations and imperialism can be resolved without revolution by the oppressed nations". These and similar accusations contained in the Chinese comrades' letter are sheer invention; no such errors have been committed by the Communist parties, and least of all by the C.P.S.U., the Party of Lenin, the Party of the first socialist revolution, of the Great October Revolution, as the letter insinuates.

In other points of the letter the Chinese comrades set forth a wide range of differences with the Communist movement and give their assessment of the Declaration and Statement. They advance a "distinct line" in regard to the struggle waged by the peoples of the semi-colonial and dependent countries, the transition from capitalism to socialism, the parties and their programmes of action, the questions of war and peace, disarmament and prohibition and destruction of thermonuclear weapons, the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, criticism of the personality cult, the principles governing relations between the Communist and Workers' parties, problems of Marxist-Leninist ideology and its practical realization by the revolutionary parties of the proletariat.

In Point 12, dealing with the parties, the Chinese comrades recommend highly questionable methods. Interpreting reformism and revisionism in their own way, they pose before the Communists the following proposition: "If the leading group in any party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxists-Leninists inside and *outside the party* will replace them and lead the people in making revolution". We ask the Chinese comrades: who is to decide whether the leadership of a given party is pursuing a revolutionary or a reformist line? Who else but its members in the various Party organizations and at its congresses? The Chinese comrades sow confusion and anarchy when they claim that Marxists-Leninists outside the Party can "replace" its leadership if a situation of this kind arises. On the one hand, one can hardly visualize a Marxist-Leninist who is

not a member of the Communist Party. On the other hand, the authorization given by the Chinese comrades, evidently in the name of their own revolution which we admire, is the sort of assistance which the Communist movement never expected from the leadership of any Communist Party.

The Chinese comrades thus set out either unwittingly or deliberately to disrupt the Communist movement. They went over to direct interference in the affairs of other parties in order to split them, and where they failed in this, began setting up new Communist parties consisting of elements they call "Marxists-Leninists outside the Party". This happened in Latin America and elsewhere. The Statement issued by the Australian Communists shows that the Chinese comrades interfered in the affairs of the Australian Communist Party, and the case of the 87 Marxists-Leninists in the Chinese sense in Ceylon is highly indicative of the anti-Leninist methods which the leaders of the C.P.C. began employing already before June 14.

In their June 14 letter and in the commentaries on the Open Letter of the C.C., C.P.S.U., published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi,* the Chinese comrades solemnly undertake the defense of Stalin and the cult of his personality, completely repudiating their previous statements on this score; in December 1956 they still declared that "the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union offered an example of great determination and courage in overcoming the personality cult, in exposing the serious mistakes made by Stalin and in eradicating the consequences of these mistakes. Throughout the world Marxists-Leninists and people sympathizing with the cause of Communism have supported the efforts of the Communist Party to rectify the mistakes and wish the Soviet comrades success in these efforts".

Is there not a contradiction between what is happening today and the statements formerly made by the Chinese comrades?

The Caribbean crisis, which was caused by the blockade of Cuba by U.S. imperialism, brought us to the brink of thermonuclear war. Thanks to the restraint and wisdom of the Soviet government the danger of an atomic disaster was averted. The Cuban revolution was safeguarded and the heroic people of the Island of Freedom came to know their worst enemy still better and united to a man in defence of their great movement which gave the Cubans the blessings of freedom, sovereignty and national independence. During this crisis caused by imperialism the Cuban revolution was safeguarded by the united people resolved to make any sacrifice for its sake. The powerful support of the Soviet Union prevented the imperialists from destroying the Cuban revolution, this *unfading example* to the peoples of America.

The Chinese comrades characterized the position of the Soviet government and its leaders as one of "adventurism" and "surrender". Soon after, the Cuban and Soviet comrades gave a detailed explanation of the situation that had arisen and the need to station missiles in

order to ensure adequate defence against the U.S. aggressors. This was essential in order to prevent an invasion. Otherwise the imperialists would have tried to carry out their aggressive plans. After this negotiations took place as a result of which the blockade was lifted. Concessions were made by both sides. The revolution suffered no damage, and this was the principal aim of the military defence measures as well as of the talks. The Cuban government was in no way compelled to change its popular and revolutionary essence. Nothing was lost, and besides this the masses, who had built up their country anew, united as never before around their Party and their revolutionary government.

Besides the charges of "adventurism" and "surrender", the Chinese comrades gave an incorrect appraisal of the solution of the Caribbean crisis. We who live in close proximity to the socialist island clearly understood, together with all our people, the need to avoid war, which would have destroyed not only the socialist system but the island itself and sparked off a world war with disastrous consequences from which nothing could have saved mankind. No sane person can welcome a war which would in no way benefit the peoples but, on the contrary, would throw them back to a primitive state; moreover, among the survivors there would be millions of cripples, insane, idiots and others too maimed to be able to build the "wonderful future on the ruins of destroyed imperialism" of which the Chinese comrades so irresponsibly speak.

Recently, in connection with the signing of the limited test-ban treaty in Moscow, the Chinese comrades have launched a campaign against the Soviet Union and its leaders such as we hitherto have encountered only in the reactionary U.S. monopoly press.

The Chinese comrades attach no significance to this treaty even though the peoples of the world welcomed its conclusion and most governments adhered to it. This treaty does not abolish the danger of war, it does not even put an end to the arms drive and the manufacture of thermonuclear bombs. But no one can deny its international significance. Apart from serving to stop the pollution of the atmosphere, it paves the way to the negotiations which are bound to be conducted in the future.

The Chinese comrades describe this treaty as a "conspiracy between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. to monopolize nuclear weapons and to deny China the right to possess these weapons in order to counteract the U.S. nuclear threat".

As we can see, the stand of the Chinese comrades as regards the limited test-ban treaty is completely unjustified.

The Chinese comrades constantly criticize, or, to be more exact, repudiate the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second congresses of the C.P.S.U. In particular, they claim that the "Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. was the first step taken by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. on the road of revisionism". They completely deny the significance

of this congress notwithstanding the fact that in the past they themselves pointed to its importance and that the Communist parties of the whole world recognized it in the 1960 Statement: "The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. are not only of great importance for the C.P.S.U. and communist construction in the U.S.S.R. but have initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism".

The Communist Party of Honduras enthusiastically welcomed the Twentieth, Twenty-First and Twenty-Second congresses of the C.P.S.U. and their decisions, which are of vast importance for all the Communist parties. That the C.P.S.U. is guided by proletarian internationalism in its relations with all working-class parties can in no way be questioned; the vast contribution of the C.P.S.U. to the defence and development of the Cuban revolution, which addresses the peoples of America in Spanish, was duly noted by Comrade Fidel Castro, the Prime Minister of Cuba, when he said: "The Soviet land, which lost more human lives in the Great Patriotic War against the fascists than there are in all of Cuba in order to defend its right to existence and to the development of its tremendous wealth, did not hesitate to take the risk of a grim war in defence of our small country: *History knows no example of solidarity to match it.*

"This is internationalism!

"This is communism!"

The press of the Communist Party of Honduras welcomed the conclusion of the Moscow treaty limiting nuclear tests and banning them beyond the boundaries of the great nuclear powers.

We published excerpts from the speech of Comrade N. S. Khrushchov at the Congress for General Disarmament and Peace inasmuch as we are in full agreement with the contents of that speech.

As we see it, the Communist parties, while conducting the polemic with the Chinese comrades in spite of all the complex implications of such a debate both today and for the future, do not close their eyes to the achievements of the Chinese comrades, do not seek to discredit China's great socialist revolution. It was the Chinese comrades' differences with and attacks against the international Communist movement that led to the open discussion. Their mistakes cannot be passed over in silence, for as we know these mistakes have not remained on paper but have found the worst possible expression—interference in the activities of some parties.

Sooner or later the unity of the international Communist movement will be restored owing to the historical need to stand united against the common enemy of the peoples—world imperialism.

Aware of its responsibility to history in the face of this serious problem, the Communist Party of Honduras has arrived at the following conclusion:

1. It confirms its support of all the theses of the Declaration and Statement signed at the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960 by the representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world.

2. It rejects the "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" contained in the letter of June 14, 1963, sent by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the C.P.S.U. as a reply to the latter's letter of March 30, 1963. The proposals of the Chinese comrades revise the entire content of the Declaration and Statement of the international Communist movement and thereby damage the strategy and tactics of our Party.

3. The Communist Party of Honduras supports without reservations the correct position of the C.P.S.U. and the other Communist and Workers' parties which the Chinese comrades are slandering in an effort to win support for their inacceptable revisionist, dogmatic and sectarian interpretations of Marxism-Leninism and of the entire policy of the international Communist movement.

4. In spite of the extremes to which the leaders of the C.P.C. have gone in their controversy with the international Communist movement, the Communist Party of Honduras considers it necessary to convene a new meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties which would facilitate the discussion and clarification of issues and the restoration of the unity and cohesion of the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world.

Central Committee, Communist Party of Honduras

September 5, 1963.

■ ■ ■

For a Broad National Democratic Front

(Outline of basic reforms, submitted by the Nicaraguan Socialist Party, on the occasion of its 19th anniversary, as the only way out of the economic, social and political crisis experienced by Nicaragua)

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party, the legitimate political expression of the will of the working class in our country, deems its urgently necessary to bring to the attention of the people and the democratic movement of Nicaragua its views with regard to the serious problems facing our country at the present time.

The relative "change" of government, which was effected in accordance with the old discredited procedure, saddled the nation with a new officaldom predisposed to preserve unchanged a situation that has prevailed in Nicaragua for more than half a century.

The existing state of affairs which in former times might have signified order and social tranquillity, has today become an anachronism; it has outlived its time and can no longer satisfy the needs of modern society.

Hunger, disease and unemployment cause much suffering to the working masses, real wages are steadily declining and from day to day more and more members of the middle sections are swelling the ranks of the have-nots.

Production for the home market is in permanent state of stagnation, although the population has grown by more than 30 per cent in the past ten years. Everything the country produces goes for export, and the needs of the domestic market are completely ignored. Moreover, the sharp discrepancy between the level of agricultural development and the hopelessly backward manufacturing and handicraft industries is making itself increasingly felt.

The national debt is beginning to assume perilous dimensions. Between 1960 and 1963 it rose by 160 million cordobas.

Agriculture, manufacturing and handicrafts, transport and trade are run on the basis of incredible exploitation inspired by a blind egoism that is incapable of foreseeing the consequences. Little wonder that popular resentment is mounting all over the country.

The big feudal landowners are trying to gain possession of the small plots still owned by the peasants. Tens of thousands of peasants all over the country are resisting the attempts of the big landlords to deprive them of their meagre possessions. And inasmuch as the government has given the landlords a free hand in this matter, our countryside is liable to become the scene of bloody strife at any moment.

A mounting wave of strikes has swept the Pacific coast of Nicaragua.

Thousands of workers are downing tools in an effort to win some improvement of their wretched lot. Despite numerous government bans, the strike movement is becoming a serious political problem both by virtue of the character of the strikes and the growing numbers of workers involved. The army, which was ostensibly created to protect the national soveregnty, is being trained to protect the right to exploit, i.e., to suppress the legitimate protests of the workers.

"From bad to worse" is how the situation with regard to Nicaragua's foreign relations might be described. Living as we do in the dollar zone the prices of our exports are disastrously declining. In the course of 1962 alone the coffee revenue fell by 14 million cordobas, and since 1955 it has dropped from 400 to 238 cordobas a quintal (a quintal = 101 lbs.) which means a loss of nearly 162 cordobas on every quintal. Cotton prices too are dropping. Since 1955 they have declined by about 50 cordobas per quintal. Moreover, the present price of 25 dollars per quintal is constantly threatened by U.S. dumping which at any moment is liable to ruin this branch of our national production.

Foreign and especially North American businessmen charge Nicaragua increasingly higher prices for the goods our country buys. This applies especially to machines and spare parts, fuel and medicines. All this adds to the hardships suffered by our people and retards the development of our national economy.

The country's finances and basic natural resources are still monopolized by big U.S. capital. Over 100 million cordobas are taken out of the country annually in the shape of gold and copper extracted by the labour of Nicaraguan workers in ore mines belonging to foreign companies. The country gets nothing for this exploitation of its mineral wealth. The mining companies ignore our national laws and lord it over the country.

The main purpose of our people's labour is the payment of interest to the Wall Street bankers so that the ruling oligarchy might be able to solicit new loans, while the people continue working to pay the bankers new and still higher interest rates. This is the vicious circle in which Nicaragua has been caught for more than half a century.

Our country's foreign policy is subordinated to the U.S. State Department. The Liberal-Conservative groups of the oligarchy which have succeeded one another in government for the past fifty-four years have never risen to the defence of the nation's freedom. They have shackled the country with debts and have given away her territory bit by bit, violating all laws and making a mockery of the national dignity and sovereignty. The oligarchy and its spokesmen submissively accept the domination of the State Department as something eternal and unchangeable, a fatal inevitability which must be borne with resignation.

Such in general outline is the picture presented by Nicaragua today. Against this background two irreconcilable social trends stand out—on the one hand, those who defend and uphold the status quo since it

serves them as a screen for their own enrichment; on the other, those who strive for change, seeking not to replace the present rulers and officials, but to change the *system* itself on the basis of plans which provide for decent conditions for all Nicaraguans who desire their country's progress.

An objective appraisal of the national problem and an examination of the immediate perspectives, brings us to the conclusion that our country is heading for disaster. Until now the combined anti-national and reactionary forces have presented a more powerful front than the progressive and patriotic forces. The new anti-oligarchic movements are dissipating their forces owing to their disunity and the lack of a common programme of demands inspired by the national interest. The danger of our national progress being retarded by violence from above, by the further penetration of foreign capital or a traditionalist-type coup is increasing from day to day. The organization of a progressive and patriotic front which would unite all the forces of our national democracy has become the most urgent task for all Nicaraguans who oppose the traitorous oligarchy.

The Essence of the Problem

The problems facing us are basically economic: problems of production and distribution, credits and foreign trade. The evils of the present system of economy engender an unhealthy political situation, social conflicts, a cultural crisis, a sense of frustration, etc.

The character of the economic relations between the propertied classes and the working masses, aggravation of class antagonisms owing to the unbridled exploitation of the workers and peasants—this is the canker that is eating away at the foundations of social and economic life in Nicaragua. Financial and trade relations with the powerful United States which has placed Nicaragua in the position of an exploited nation is another reason why our country is lagging behind in all spheres, and especially in the sphere of political institutions.

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party considers itself in duty bound once again to draw the attention of political and economic groups striving for progressive changes to our proposal for a programme of basic reforms which could help to bring about substantial changes in Nicaragua's present system of socio-economic relations, both domestic and foreign.

Permanent Action Essential

We feel that the serious nature of the problems confronting the nation calls for permanent action on the part of the groups standing for progressive and patriotic changes. After elections have taken place it is necessary to retain our fighting positions, and without deviating

from our immediate goal, to rally the people for the battles of today and tomorrow. We believe that the traditional parties which function at present only during election campaigns must alter the character of their activities if they do not want to be left behind by other parties or coalitions of permanently functioning parties. The old electoral system, under which the parties function only at the time of elections, has completely discredited itself in our country. The politician who appears on the scene only when the so-called "free elections" give him the opportunity of occupying a political post, is now being condemned by our people as a careerist pure and simple. Groups which on the eve of elections suddenly declare themselves parties and raise a loud commotion around some individual or another do our country more harm than good.

Nicaragua cannot wait for four years (and perhaps longer) to seek a way out of the chaos reigning in the country. Progressive opposition parties and other kindred organizations must take steps to establish a broad progressive and patriotic front without delay.

Today Nicaragua stands in danger of losing one of the principal sources of her income. As we noted above, the price of coffee on the U.S. market has dropped 162 cordobas a quintal and there is no indication that this decline will cease. Coffee brings Nicaragua an income of 130 million cordobas annually; the drop in the production of this crop would be an economic disaster for Nicaragua. Another vital branch of our country's economy is cotton. The steady decline in the price of cotton on the capitalist market has resulted in a loss of about 500 million cordobas since 1955, and the instability of cotton prices creates a constant threat to this branch of our national production.

Foreign credits, the mines, timber exports, indeed all our economic relations with other countries, are different aspects of one and the same problem, a problem of vital importance for Nicaragua.

Inside the country the relations between the working class, on the one hand, and the capitalists and feudal landowners, on the other, are near breaking point. Hunger and disease kill off large numbers of working people in town and village while the millionaires and the demagogues who seized the political power 30 years ago look on unmoved.

We believe that the new or revived parties can neither ignore nor reconcile themselves to these grave national problems. If the rule of the feudal gentry with their blind egoism was feasible in the conditions of the past, today when mankind has made such great advances in all spheres of life, the out-dated system of one-man leadership must give way to a system of political organization which would operate *permanently*, with the object of leading the people toward the satisfaction of their vital needs.

On the other hand, we believe that no political party in Nicaragua today can cope on its own with the problems confronting the nation.

Still less can this be done by any one individual, whatever a genius he might be. Hence the urgent need to overcome the pernicious cult of the leader or group and to put an end to dissension between the parties, the need to let all our thinking and actions be guided exclusively by the welfare of our native land.

The movement for national progress should lose no time in taking up the question of basic reforms. The main idea is to submit to the nation a plan for the maximum utilization of the natural and human resources of the country for the benefit primarily of the Nicaraguans themselves. Nicaragua will not be able to make any substantial progress unless her best sons proceed at once to tackle the vexing problem of unemployment and the parasitism which is encouraged by the suicidal policy of the present regime.

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party urges all opposition groups to come out at once in defence of the prices of our agricultural exports, above all coffee and cotton, and at the same time to voice their protest against the rising cost of the commodities which we buy abroad. We urge the Conservatives and their leaders, the Left forces, the bourgeois-democrats and also persons of no party affiliation, to state their position publicly with regard to the vital problem of national trade which within the capitalist orbit is bound to develop unfavourably for our nation.

We alert all opposition forces to the necessity of utilizing all the uncultivated lands and giving work to the hundreds of thousands of peasants whom the present regime has doomed to hunger, poverty, disease and ignorance. We hold that building palaces and laying out public parks is not a sign of progress when one-half of the population of Nicaragua lives in appalling squalor.

We appeal to the patriotism of Nicaraguans. Nicaragua is not a free country. Have we the right to call ourselves Nicaraguans? For half a century our country has been under the political and economic domination of the United States. Ours is a rich country but, because it is exploited and plundered by foreigners, three-quarters of its inhabitants are forced to suffer all manner of privation. We Nicaraguans are a nation with our own history, our own language, our own national laws and customs, with political and geographical boundaries separating us from other countries. Yet the North Americans station their soldiers on our territory; they have shackled us with their credits, and for half a century have been trampling on our national sovereignty and independence. The traitors of Nicaragua have done a good service to the North American interventionists by cooperating with them, and this path is leading our country into ever greater decline. Can we call ourselves Nicaraguans if we give any support to politicians who collaborate with foreign interventionists? We, for our part, maintain that Nicaragua is faced with the great historic task of removing from

political power the caste of traitors and winning our independence a second time, this time independence from U.S. tutelage.

The masks donned by the interventionists and their local lackeys cannot deceive anyone. The Monroe Doctrine, the "Big Stick" policy, "good neighbours", anti-communism, or the Alliance for Progress—all amount to one and the same thing. The Alliance for Progress has been in operation for three years but our country is still heading for economic bankruptcy and the loss of all its existing institutions. It was said, and it still is said, that the Alliance for Progress will bring us the credits we need to fight hunger. But it is already clear that the miserly credits granted with so many reservations by the Alliance will not change anything, and for one simple reason: imperialism, far from having ceased to sap our country's strength, has, on the contrary, been intensively flooding our small countries with its finance capital, ruining our industry, lowering prices for the raw materials we export and constantly inflating prices for the goods we have to buy. Thus, the dollars which we receive from the Alliance are paid for twice over and, under such conditions the Alliance, instead of "fighting hunger" as was promised, will aggravate our plight.

We draw the attention of all Nicaraguans opposed to the present regime to the question of the state administration. It is obvious to all that dishonesty and corruption in high places is the rule today. The typical government official is concerned mainly with lining his own pocket, through frauds, smuggling or abuse of privilege, and government decisions are marked by incompetence and stupidity. The principal occupation of the Nicaraguan government in the sphere of economy is the arbitrary drafting of the annual budget of state expenditure (which is mounting from year to year) and the collection of taxes, which are used to ensure a life of luxury for the top bureaucracy.

Moreover the present system of government constitutes a grave danger to personal liberty. President Schick is caught in a web of contradictions. The military, the reactionary oligarchy, the career politicians and, above all, the disastrous economic crisis which strikes at the working masses in town and village all add up to a picture that is anything but reassuring for the Schick government. And hanging over all is the constant threat of a coup d'etat engineered from the outside.

The President, evidently aware of his precarious position, is doing his utmost to cling to the power, but has taken a suicidal and anti-national course. President Schick defends his policy which, under the pretext of anti-communism, is directed against the popular masses, against the trade unions and the movement of the landless peasants. There is every indication that the President is mortally afraid of social progress and is closely linked with the forces at home and abroad which are placing obstacles on the way of the country's progress. The

path chosen by the President bids fair to win him the title of "anti-communist No. 1" which is vied for by so many elements from the oligarchy notorious for their unpopularity in our country. We believe that the Senor President is making a big mistake: no president can remain in power in Nicaragua by following this path (the path followed in Guatemala by the deposed president General Ydigoras Fuentes). On the contrary, he who today demands from the working class of Nicaragua unconditional surrender is taking the road leading to political debacle.

All this makes it urgently necessary to reach mutual understanding between all the social forces of Nicaragua that are dissatisfied with the present regime. This will enable them to advance together toward the common goal. The present differences among the various groups only play into the hands of the enemy. The task of pulling the country out of the swamp into which it has been led by the corrupt rulers should take precedence over all sectarian claims.

The situation in our country points up the need to carry out a programme of reforms, but not the superficial reforms which the present government professes to stand for and which do not change the structure of the system and the nature of social and international relations one iota. The reforms our country needs must reach down to the very foundations of the economic, social and political life of Nicaragua. Basically they are the following:

1. Full employment for the peasants through a genuine agrarian reform based on the abolition of the latifundia whose lands lie uncultivated.

2. Establishment of definite standards of international, diplomatic, trade and financial relations with all countries on the basis of mutual advantage.

3. Elimination of the industrial lag by means of a protectionist policy with regard to the national industry, and especially by utilization of the financial and natural resources of the country.

4. Rational planning of the economy with a view to putting an end to the present anarchy.

5. In the sphere of politics, the programme of basic reforms provides for the following: a) removal of the moribund oligarchy from political power; b) reorganization of the army from top to bottom; c) participation in government of all political parties that are opposed to the oligarchy and which stand for national independence; d) on the international plane—to pursue a policy of peace as a means of putting an end to differences among nations; e) establishment of a genuine democratic government of the people and for the people.

6. Economic relations between labour and capital should be radically changed on pain of severe punishment for all who violate the accepted standards. The state must guarantee freedom of organization for all wage earners of town and village, and also respect for the inde-

pendence of the trade unions, their right to issue directives and instructions at their own discretion. The function of the government in the event of conflicts between the workers and the employers should be limited to ensuring the observance of the new social laws and examining lawsuits without delay and within the time limits prescribed by law.

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party believes that the above outline of basic reforms offers a solution of the immediate problems confronting Nicaraguans today. We believe that only by carrying out these reforms without delay can the country be extricated from the morass into which it has been led by the oligarchy.

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party believes that while the moment is not yet ripe for socialism, the era of domination by the oligarchy, the liberals or the conservatives is gone. We maintain that now is the time when the Nicaraguan people must regroup their forces, not in the manner of the traditionalists, but exclusively with a view to social progress and national emancipation. We believe, and we repeat once again, that the future belongs to a democratic national front, a broad and powerful alliance supported by the popular masses of all political trends.

The Nicaraguan Socialist Party calls upon all political forces to work toward the establishment of such a front in order to achieve radical changes in all our national institutions. There is no time to lose.

LONG LIVE A FREE AND PROGRESSIVE NICARAGUA!

On behalf of the Nicaraguan Socialist Party,
Manuel Perez Estrada,
General Secretary, Central Committee

Managua, July 3, 1963

■ ■ ■

New Ways to Unity, for Democracy and Progress

Theses for the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Netherlands

Since the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.N., held in May 1961, profound changes have taken place in the world.

As a result of the successes in the struggle for peaceful coexistence and relaxation of tension, and the growing recognition of the peace-loving policy of the socialist system, the cold-war policy with its rabid anti-communism lost ground. The partial test-ban treaty was an initial achievement for the peace forces, creating favourable conditions for further agreements.

During the same period the anti-colonialist forces won a historic victory when the last remnants of Dutch colonial rule in Indonesia were abolished.

Workers' resistance to the exploitation by the monopolies and the Marijnen government assumed mass forms and workers' unity increased in this struggle. Our Party's policy in the trade unions bore its first fruits.

At the same time the capitalist forces are fighting tooth and nail to maintain and strengthen their positions. Continuous attacks are being made on world peace; in the U.S.A. the warmongers have become increasingly active since the murder of President Kennedy, trying to create new crises over Cuba, Berlin and other focal points; in Europe the Western-German revanchists and the French Gaullists have formed the Bonn—Paris axis, where the reactionaries of the different countries find support. The imperialists are trying to continue the exploitation of the newly-liberated countries by new, neo-colonialist methods. Democratic rights and parliamentary democracy are being undermined and emasculated.

These actions of the reactionary forces encounter increasing resistance on the part of all anti-imperialist groups.

The general course of world developments and the great perspectives thus opened, call for militant and courageous action in order to utilize fully the new possibilities and to lead the Dutch workers to further success.

In these circumstances the Twenty-First Congress will have to elaborate a new orientation for the Party. This applies to all spheres of our Party's activities—action for the unity of Communists and Socialists, for the daily interests of the workers and in the sphere of international relations.

The new orientation means that the Party will first of all concentrate its efforts on fulfilling its national task, proceeding from the concrete assessment of Dutch reality and the possibilities for political and social progress. This means that its activity must be attuned to the political developments and the level of the progressive movement in the Netherlands. To solve these problems demands must be advanced that can be directly realized through the greatest possible cooperation with other people, organizations and parties. At the same time the Party must increase the politically conscious kernel of the masses and organize it in the course of struggle and by means of intensive ideological Marxist-Leninist educational work.

This orientation also calls for strict observance of the Party's autonomy in its relation to the international Communist movement. The Party is linked to this movement in the world-wide struggle for coexistence and peace and for the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, but it must keep its hands absolutely free in the matter of its political actions in the Netherlands.

The international activity of the C.P.N. serves its national task. Its best contribution to the international struggle is to augment the progressive forces of Dutch society for peace, democracy and socialism, to build up the Party itself and work for the reunion of the whole Dutch labour movement.

The main task in the future will be to overcome and refute the prejudices against our Party which the reactionaries have fostered over the years among the masses, partly facilitated by our own actions in the past.

Our goal is: to convince ever greater numbers of people that the C.P.N., the party of the Dutch Communists, is not, as the reactionaries claim, an appendage of a foreign state, but that it is serving exclusively the Dutch people.

I

Influenced by developments of the past period the views of large numbers of Social-Democrats and of Communists have come closer together. This can be seen both in the sphere of foreign policy and in the new issues of home policy.

Since the P.v.d.A. (Labour Party) was removed from office in December 1958, the ultra-reactionary forces have done their utmost to exclude it more and more from participation in state power. When the latest government was being formed it was rudely ousted by the K.V.P. and V.V.D.* though its leadership, through Vondeling, had already accepted a Rightist government programme.

---

* K.V.P.—the ultra-reactionary Roman Catholic People's Party.
V.V.D.—liberal People's Party for Liberty and Democracy, also reactionary.

This led to a change in the policy of the P.v.d.A. towards the Marijnen Government and on other burning issues, (e.g., it indirectly dissociated itself from the war budget by voting against the War Secretary de Jong).

The P.v.d.A. Party Congress revealed the existence of a minority in its ranks opposed to NATO.

The growing domination of the ultra-Rights in the K.V.P. and other parties in office, their efforts to unite the Right-wing coalition into one party following the example of the Western-German C.D.U., and the playing up of artificially formed splinter parties against democracy, all show how irrational it is to cherish any illusions, as the P.v.d.A. leadership did during the cabinet formation, about accepting the P.v.d.A. in government by capitulating to the reaction.

The P.v.d.A. and its socialist-thinking following are now faced with the choice of either continuing the policy that led to decline and a loss of votes and which benefited the reactionary parties mainly, or of forming, together with the Communists, a force to counteract reaction.

If unity in the struggle against reaction is to be achieved one must rise above narrow party egoism. The immediate future of the Netherlands is at stake.

The realization of a Dutch contribution to the prevention of war and for peaceful coexistence, the defence and renewal of democracy against the monopolies heading for fascism, and the promotion of the social and other interests of the population depend on the development of unity between Socialists and Communists.

Amongst the religious workers—in the trade unions, in the countryside, in the denominational parties themselves and amongst intellectuals—there exist trends opposing the present government policy and advocating a peaceful and democratic course (Prof. Delfgaauw, for example).

The efforts of the P.v.d.A. to bring these trends into its party organization by means of denominational communities came to nothing.

The building up of a force through the unity of Socialists and Communists will encourage these elements to break away from the Right-wing parties and will stimulate their cooperation with the Left-wing parties.

The C.P.N. deems trade union unity within the N.V.V.* of the utmost importance for building this force. The Communists have been very active in this respect during the past years and will continue to devote themselves to strengthening the N.V.V. for the purpose of thus strengthening the opposition against the reactionary Marijnen Government.

At its conference in December 1962 the C.P.N. made the formation of a common parliamentary opposition and trade union unity within

---

* N.V.V.—Trade union federation affiliated with the Labour Party.

the N.V.V. the point of departure in working to build up this force in the labour movement. The purpose was to win a parliamentary majority for a labour government with a view to realizing the main planks common to the election programmes of C.P.N., P.v.d.A. and P.S.P.

Under the existing circumstances the C.P.N. deems it also possible and desirable to win Roman Catholic and Protestant circles for a coalition on which a labour government could lean.

The experiences gained in the course of common actions for a peaceful settlement of the New Guinea (West Irian) question, and in the mass struggle against the wage policy of the Marijnen government, have shown that important victories may be scored against reaction.

To achieve joint working-class action against the Marijnen government, as well as on the community and provincial level, the C.P.N. intends to conduct a broad exchange of views with the above-mentioned parties and circles, between individuals, local organizations and between party committees.

It deems it important, with a view to maximum mobilization of forces, to limit the exchange of views to questions on which the points of view approximate, viz.,

in the sphere of home policy: defence of parliamentary democracy against the attacks of the K.V.P. and other Right-wing parties, struggle for higher wages and price controls, for increasing the building of homes and against higher rents, for full employment, for drastically raising the old-age pensions as much as possible at the expense of public funds, and for shortening the term of military service. It is especially important for further development to place on the order of the day the common demand of the P.v.d.A. and C.P.N. for the nationalization of the natural gas and oil resources, and for measures to prevent the income from these riches from flowing into the coffers of foreign concerns;

in the sphere of foreign policy: improvement of East-West relations, termination of all atomic tests, opposition to taking part in a multilateral nuclear force, combating the Bonn—Paris axis, rejection of fascist regimes, such as those in Spain and Portugal, and condemnation of racial discrimination.

An obstacle to joint action is the distrust of the Communists fostered by the Right-wing elements; to counteract the policy of unity advocated by the C.P.N., they allege that its purpose is to undermine and ultimately abolish the other Left-wing parties.

A great deal of this distrust may be overcome by correct action on the part of the Communists in the struggle for the interests of the working people. In this struggle the C.P.N. proceeds from the fact that under the circumstances of today it is possible to work fruitfully for the same demands and that, though still marching separately, to defeat the reaction by joint action.

This opens another prospect, that of the gradual lessening and

eventual overcoming of the division in the labour movement. It is now 70 years since the first division in the labour movement took place at the Zwolle congress of the Social Democratic Association; later the gulf was widened by the breach between Social Democrats and Communists.

In the new conditions of our time the reunion of the Dutch labour movement is a historic task. It demands, besides common struggle, a deepgoing and creative discussion and elaboration of theoretical questions of socialism and democracy in our day on the asis of the experiences of the whole labour movement.

The vital question before humanity is the prevention of a nuclear world war.

It is now a matter of reaching agreement between Socialists and Communists on the theoretical assessment of this question and on the ways in which the Dutch people can contribute to coexistence and world peace.

If this agreement is reached, the main obstacle to the reunion of the Communists and Socialists will be removed.

Connected herewith are the questions of the peaceful road to socialism, the role of parliamentary democracy therein and the utilization of the possibilities the Constitution offers for further democratization, as well as for nationalization of the monopolies.

Difficult as the road to reunion may be, the C.P.N. wants to take it. This alone proves that the C.P.N. does not want to cause injury to other progressive forces. It is concerned with the advance of the whole labour movement and the victory of democracy and socialism as the cause of the whole Dutch people.

II

The C.P.N. has repeatedly set forth in the resolutions of its congresses its programme for the future development of our country. Our Party reaffirms this programme, which can be realized in the future in the course of the struggle against the monopolist reaction.

But it cannot limit itself to this.

It must work, cooperating to the maximum with other forces, for practical improvements which can be achieved already under the existing conditions. Under the Marijnen Government the problems of the workers and of all non-monopoly groups of the population are aggravated. The masses do not remain passive in the face of these problems, which play a big role in their lives. Their discontent is expressed in the many demands for improvements they and their organizations have advanced.

Our Party must maintain close contact with the masses and organize them to win their demands.

The issue, then, is not that of drawing up a schematic programme of demands, or a list of what the Communists want to attain in the

future. The main thing is the movement of the masses for the purposes it considers to be within reach under the existing conditions.

In the wage struggle the Party has already gained much experience. The Communists have worked for unity of action for the immediate demands of the masses, and this unity has brought results.

It is necessary to draw on the experience gained in this field also in other spheres of daily life.

The Central Committee holds that it is necessary to decide at the Twenty-First Congress on a line of action in this respect.

The following proposals for a new approach to some topical questions afford an idea of the course which the Central Committee believes should be taken.

It should be pointed out, however, that it is impossible and even wrong to go into details on all questions, because in many cases the circumstances change continually and further consultations with the people concerned are necessary.

The struggle for wage increases is now on the order of the day. To win higher wages the fight must be carried on at every enterprise and in every branch of industry.

The C.P.N. is also working for improvement of the existing wage policy. It considers it necessary that the bodies chosen by workers and office personnel in the enterprises, such as industrial councils and other workers' representative bodies, should play a bigger part in wage negotiations. Besides, the industrial councils and other workers' representative bodies should be entitled to conclude wage agreements at each enterprise (in addition to general collective agreements) on terms fixed by the local trade union organizations, as was done, for example, at the A.D.M. (Amsterdam Dock Company) in Amsterdam.

Substantial wage increases raising the living standard must be won, if necessary through a still broader strike movement than last autumn

The decision of the Council of Opsterland* to abolish the municipal classification of salaries is an example of how the municipal councils can raise wages for their personnel.

The C.P.N. is working to achieve similar results in as many other municipalities as possible. The abolition of the municipal classification will be a stimulus for all-round improvement of the position of civil servants.

By initiative within and without the municipal councils the Party will give full support to the action started by Opsterland to break down the resistance of Minister Toxopeus.

To combat the price increases it is necessary, besides advancing new wage demands, for the trade unions and organizations of women and consumers to institute democratic price control.

The increase of the petrol tax and rents, which are indicative of the general price-raising tendency, must be sharply opposed.

---

* Opsterland—a rural community in the Province of Friesland.

Old-age pensions must be raised this year to the social minimum.

With every rise in the level of wages and prices the burden of taxation increases. It is possible to act together with large sections of the population, especially the farmers and the middle sections, for adapting taxes to the existing level of incomes and prices. For this purpose it is necessary to extend the category exempt from income tax and to reduce the tax rate for lower and middle incomes.

The taxation of the income of working married women must be lowered.

The general demand of the farmers is a fair price for their products.

Here the Party must disprove the claim that this would inevitably lead to higher prices for the consumer. If this were to happen, it could be counteracted in the same way as the rent increases were dealt with, that is, by compensation at the expense of the employers. The C.P.N. unconditionally supports fair prices for the farmers and will take part in actions to this end.

As pointed out in the previous section, the C.P.N. advocates nationalization of the natural gas and oil resources. But inasmuch as this demand has not been met, we must strive for a further skimming of the profits of the oil monopolies by the state. The revenue from this should be used to reduce the price of gas, to develop regions hitherto considered "unprofitable", as well as for housing construction and other purposes in the interest of the population.

In order to be able to combat the housing shortage more effectively, our Party advocates setting up enterprises for industrial building of houses. Factories for the production of building elements may be financed by the state, provinces and municipalities, and, if necessary, by trade unions and housing corporations. Another form would be financing by private capital with government participation. To make houses built in the private sector available for people with low incomes, our Party advocates long-term loans granted by the government. An end must be put to speculation in land and housing.

The C.P.N. will support any initiative from anybody that may lead to abolishing the housing shortage. Extension of the industrial building of houses, which now accounts for only 10 per cent of the total house building, would contribute to alleviation of the housing shortage.

In the sphere of education it is necessary to raise teachers' salaries and to extend the building of schools. More living space must be made available for students and subsidies must be provided for cheap Mensa-meals.

To democratize the educational system and adapt it to the existing needs, all possibilities existing in the Mammoth-bill* must be used, after thorough discussion with all concerned.

---

* Mammoth-bill—a school- reform act introduced last year by the government.

With regard to television the Central Committee holds the view that the second TV network should be inaugurated as soon as possible, without raising the TV taxes. To make this possible, it advocates a compromise solution making the network available to broadcasting corporations and TV advertisers, under parliamentary control.

The boycott of the C.P.N. in the radio and TV must cease.

There are many other big and small problems burdening the daily life of the working people. The C.P.N., while charting broad perspectives for the future, is doing everything possible to bring about improvements today as well.

III

In the period since the Twentieth Party Congress the C.P.N. has registered some major successes.

It has consolidated its position in three elections, in which, among other things, the Right-wing schismatic "Bridge" group was defeated.

The damage caused by this group has been gradually repaired. Membership has risen, as has interest in our Party, its literature and speakers, and the attention paid it by its adversaries. In the wage struggle the Communists take the lead, a fact which is recognized by everybody.

Nevertheless the number of readers of *De Waarheid* remains unchanged, sales have declined, the gains in membership are still too small, and organizational activity is unsatisfactory.

The question of strengthening the Party must be seen in relation to the striving for unity.

Experience of the past months has shown that wherever the C.P.N. acted strongly and resolutely, the advances in the sphere of unity are the greatest. This proves that the strengthening of the C.P.N. as the inspiring force of action and unity, is of the utmost importance for the future of the whole Dutch labour movement.

The growth of the Party membership makes it necessary to attach more importance to the ideological education of the Party. It is likewise important to combat erroneous Right-wing and sectarian tendencies. In this way the members of the Party and its followers will be able to overcome the obstacles and difficulties that will be raised on the new roads the Party wishes to take, and to pursue resolutely and daringly the policy of unity and the struggle against reaction.

This year our Party celebrates its 45th anniversary. We shall make it the occasion for reviewing the highlights of its history, showing how closely bound up the C.P.N. always has been with the interests of the workers and their struggle for a better life, for democracy and peace. During these 45 years of struggle many sacrifices have been

made. In the war against German fascism many of our best cadres gave their lives.

It is essential for the work of our Party to uphold these glorious traditions. Members who have joined the Party since the war, and especially the young people, will draw energy and inspiration for their work from the knowledge and experience of the Party.

The new orientation being put before the Congress demands flexibility and resolution as well as a principled approach to the practical work of the Party. It demands a party leadership on the national and local level and representation in public bodies that enjoy great authority and trust both outside and inside the Party.

This makes the election of the new Central Committee one of the most important tasks of the Congress.

The present Party leadership was mainly formed in the struggle against the Right-wing splitters of the "Bridge" group.

Now it is a matter of forming a party leadership in the struggle for the new line, a leadership with the ability and the conviction to carry out that line without hesitation, and with cadres which enjoy an authority earned by their long record of Party activity and experience in the struggle.

These qualities are indispensable, on the one hand, in order to overcome the deep-rooted routine and prevent the new orientation from remaining on paper; and, on the other hand, to overcome all kinds of resistance concealed behind "Left-wing" phraseology or opportunist watering-down, and to steer the Party firmly and fruitfully along the new course demanded by the new conditions.

In choosing cadres we often find the tendency to proceed from the physical suitability of one or another comrade for the daily work or for the work in public bodies. There is a tendency to ignore old tried cadres, and continually to "advance new cadres to the fore", meaning the younger Party members mainly. This practice must be discontinued.

Naturally the Party always needs new forces, and it cannot function if the practical work is not being done by suitable people.

But political guidance which brings the Party policy to the masses is the main thing.

That is why Party leaders must first of all be endowed with ability and insight, and at the same time they must have the full confidence of the Party and its followers for the leadership to be able to steer the correct course in situations that are often quite complicated.

It is necessary to develop full democracy in inner Party life, to combat weaknesses where they occur.

The Central Committee proposes that the Congress adopt a decision to carry out a campaign for the further strengthening of the Party.

Emphasis should be on:

— the recruitment of new members, paying special attention to

intellectuals, who are showing more and more sympathy and interest for our Party and its ideals;

— the formation of new Party organizations through which the influence of the Party can be extended, especially in the countryside;

— the winning of new readers for *De Waarheid* to be achieved, among other things, by large-scale canvassing and distribution of specimen copies; at the same time, the contents of our paper must be made more popular and militant;

— the raising of funds for propaganda.

IV

It is necessary clearly to define the relations between our Party and the Communist parties in other countries, especially the socialist countries. The form of relations should correspond to the tasks facing us today.

In the decisions of the Central Committee of July 18, 1963, it was pointed out that the C.P.N. can fulfil its task in the interest of the working population of our country only if its policy takes the concrete situations and possibilities in our country as its starting point. It is responsible for its activity solely to the Dutch workers.

The policy of peaceful coexistence advocated by the Communists is gaining more and more ground. During the past years our Party concretized this for our country in its actions for a politically neutral and atom-free Netherlands. Under the influence of the growing strength of socialism and the increasing contradictions of imperialism, broad circles are feeling the need for a new assessment of the position of the Netherlands in the world. The economic and political interests of our country make it increasingly imperative to maintain relations with all sides. A neutralist policy would create the best conditions for this.

The C.P.N. supports the peace policy of the socialist states as set forth in the Declaration and Statement of 1957 and 1960 adopted at the conferences of Communist parties.

This found expression in the statement of Comrade P. de Groot endorsed by the Central Committee at its session of July 18, 1963, and welcomed enthusiastically by the whole Party.

The Twenty-First Party Congress will have to concretize these ideas still more, especially those concerning the relation between the C.P.N. and the other Communist parties in the world.

Here must be underlined:

1) the autonomy of the Party as set forth in the introduction of these theses. This is essential in order effectively to lead the struggle of the workers and to achieve a solution of the specific problems of our country, which the Dutch party alone has the right and the ability to do.

2) Full respect on the part of other Communist parties for the political line elaborated by the Party bodies and the Party leadership elected by the Party. Any violation of this principle, any interference or guardianship, or even a semblance thereof, must be avoided. Any infringement of this rule by anybody, will have to be dealt with in the Central Committee. If a difference caused by interference on the part of another Communist Party cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the C.P.N. through internal discussions, our Party will have to reserve itself the right to defend its views openly.

The C.P.N. wishes to cooperate with all Communist parties—without exception—on the above-mentioned conditions, in the struggle for peace and in the theoretical debate. It declares itself willing to enter, on this basis, into friendly contacts with the Yugoslav Communist League as well.

3) The C.P.N. does not hold itself responsible for any action taken elsewhere, or for views expressed by Communist parties in other countries without its foreknowledge or cooperation.

4) The international contacts of the C.P.N. should be exclusively maintained by the Party secretariat or delegations or persons nominated for this purpose by the Central Committee or Executive Committee.

In the matter of the differences in the world Communist movement, the C.P.N. maintains the standpoint it has already taken. It rejects the general line of the Chinese Communist Party and all attempts at forming factions or interfering in Communist parties from without or within.

The Twenty-First Congress will have to make it clear that although differences in development necessitate a fruitful and principled discussion—which of course takes time—unity of action of the Communist parties to curb imperialism must nevertheless come first. This applies in equal measure to the ideological and tactical controversy.

The forms of the discussion must be subordinated to this supreme demand, so as not to be an obstacle to united action.

Like many other Communist parties, the C.P.N. holds that on the international plane no one party can, either alone or together with another party, lay down the basic line of action for all Communist parties. Neither should there be parties that might lay claim to some sort of "infallibility". Nor, in elaborating the Marxist-Leninist theory, should parties with the biggest membership from countries with the largest populations necessarily have the final say.

In international theoretical discussion the only criterion should be the correctness of the arguments and the results of the policy founded on them.

A carefully prepared conference of all parties held at the right moment should make it its object to strengthen the unity of action of all Communists based on the Declaration and Statement of 1957 and

1960, and also to normalize the discussion and the conflict of opinions in such a way as to promote unity.

Delegations of the Italian and French Communist parties visited our Party and country in 1963 on the invitation of the C.P.N. The discussions with these delegations have been very fruitful and deepened the understanding of the problems of the parties.

The C.P.N. will continue its exchange of views with Communist parties of all countries in order to contribute to their unity of action and to defend the creative theory of Marxism-Leninism.

Central Committee, Communist Party of the Netherlands

Amsterdam,
January 26, 1964.

■ ■ ■

On Slanderous Attacks and Open Call for Disruption and Split by the Communist Party of Indonesia

(Resolution adopted by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India, January 14, 1964)

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India has read with pain and regret the official version of a speech delivered at Jakarta on September 29, 1963 by Comrade D. N. Aidit, Chairman of the Communist Party of Indonesia.

This speech was delivered at a welcome-home meeting for the delegation of the Indonesian Communist Party which had just returned after visiting the Soviet Union, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic. The text before us is an authorized version of the main points of Comrade Aidit's speech, issued by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Party on October 5 and published in the Indonesian Party press.

Comrade Aidit in his speech asserts that there are four types of Communist parties:

"Firstly, the Communist parties that are Marxist-Leninist from the top-most leadership to the cadres and members, being the only Communist Party in the country in question.

"Secondly, the Communist parties whose leaderships are controlled by the revisionists or which are inclined towards revisionism, being the only Communist Party in the country in question, but within the Party there is a strong opposition or a rather strong opposition of genuine Marxists-Leninists.

"Thirdly, the Communist parties that are fully controlled by the revisionists, being the only Party in the country in question; the genuine Marxists-Leninists have been expelled and these expelled people, together with others, or on their own, have reached the stage of publishing a magazine, while there are also those that have not yet reached this stage but which actively propagate their own ideas orally in a variety of ways.

"Fourthly, the Communist parties that have already for a long time now had alongside them a new Communist Party, so that in the country

---

Reprinted from *New Age* of January 19, 1964.

in question there are two Communist parties—the new one has been set up as a correction to the old one which is considered as having deviated from Marxism-Leninism, of having taken the path of revisionism."

Having made this assertion, Comrade Aidit proceeds straightaway to declare:

"The Communist Party of Indonesia is a Party of the first type, the Marxist-Leninist type, that is Marxist-Leninist from the topmost leadership to the cadres and members."

In the authorized version of the speech, only one other Party has the distinction of being characterized in detail by Comrade Aidit. This Party is the Communist Party of India. Comrade Aidit has these remarks to make about our Party:

"Take, for example, India. Can the Dange clique that already act as spies for Nehru so that the Marxists-Leninists can no longer talk freely in the Communist Party of India which, hand in hand with the reactionary Nehru government, is hunting down, arresting and imprisoning Indian Communists, still be called the general staff of the Indian proletariat? Indonesian Communists cannot but have sympathy with and support for the genuine Communists who are now in Nehru's prisons or who are compelled to work underground because they are being hunted down by Nehru—Dange. It depends entirely on the firm unanimity and unity of genuine Marxists-Leninists in India as to when the vacuum of leadership, the vacuum in the vanguard, the vacuum in the general staff of the Indian proletariat will come to an end. But Indonesian Communists are fully convinced that a time will come when the Indian proletariat will definitely obtain a correct vanguard or general staff; the ranks of the genuine Marxists-Leninists are sufficiently strong in India."

Further on in the same speech there is another reference to our Party:

"How terrible it would be for the international Communist movement today if there were no resistance to the revisionists, how dreadful it would be if all Communists were shouting the slogan, 'Long Live Dange and Nehru'. From one point of view it is not a good thing that many Communists have been imprisoned by Nehru, but from another point of view, it is a very good thing indeed because this proves that the ranks of the Marxists-Leninists are large in India and that there are many courageous genuine Communists. Of course, Marxists-Leninists throughout the world must do everything possible to get them released from the Nehru—Dange prisons."

The Communist Party of India has always had the greatest respect and fraternal affection for the Indonesian Communist Party, whose contribution to the national-liberation struggle of the Indonesian people has made it a powerful force and one of the biggest Communist

parties of the world. The Communist Party of India has always maintained proper fraternal relations with the Communist Party of Indonesia and has never interfered in any way in its internal affairs or sought to question its policies.

It has therefore been a matter of deepest regret for the Central Executive Committee to note the abusive and totally unprincipled attack made by Comrade Aidit on the Communist Party of India. Aidit stoops to the worst forms of slander and vituperations and repeats the lies put forward by the Chinese leadership that a so-called "Dange clique" is acting as "spies of Nehru". He talks of "Nehru—Dange prisons", of genuine Communists being "hunted down by Nehru—Dange".

It is not necessary for us to point out how such attacks are a total violation of the spirit of the 81-Party Conference which the Indonesian Communist Party claims that it supports.

The Central Executive Committee, however, is more concerned at the open call which the Indonesian Communist Party leader gives for the splitting of Communist parties, and particularly the Communist Party of India, and for the formation of rival parties.

Aidit insists that: "The Communist Party of Indonesia does not want and may not intervene in the internal affairs of other parties".

But immediately afterwards he negates this entirely by saying:

"Marxists-Leninists, who have been expelled are naturally duly entitled to propagate their ideas outside the Party, or organize circles and issue magazines, and they are also entitled to establish a new party.

"It requires investigation to ascertain whether these circles, magazines, and new parties are genuinely Marxist-Leninist, whether they are really a correction to the old party that is considered to be revisionist. If these circles, magazines, and new parties are really a correction of the old revisionist party, if they really and truly hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism that has been thrown aside by the old party, then they must be given a good reception by Marxists-Leninists in all countries. How dreadful it would be if the Marxists-Leninists did not put up resistance to the ladership of a party that has gone revisionist.

"Indonesian Communists must and will be as objective as possible regarding the differentiation and selection that is now taking place in the Communist parties in many countries. The yardstick is quite clear, namely Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the 1957 Communist Declaration and the 1960 Communist Statement.

"Indonesian Communists cannot possibly adopt a passive attitude in face of all the facts mentioned above. If the differentiation and the process of selection in the Communist parties were to go on endlessly without beginning and without end, the proletariat in the country in question would be deprived of leadership, deprived of its vanguard, deprived of its general staff."

Here is an open call for disruption and the formation of rival parties, together with an assurance of "a good reception". If this is not interference in the affairs of other parties, what else is?

The call for splitting the Communist Party of India is clear and unmistakable. Aidit appeals for "firm unanimity and unity of genuine Marxists-Leninists in India" to end "the vacuum of leadership, the vacuum in the vanguard, the vacuum in the general staff of the Indian proletariat". In fact the assurance of "a good reception by Marxists-Leninists in all countries" for a new party is immediately followed by the slanderous attack on the Communist Party of India.

Seldom in the history of the international Communist movement has such an unashamed call to set up another Communist Party in opposition to an existing one been made by the Party of another country.

The Press Communique of the Second Plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia (issued on December 25 at Jakarta) indicates that the Central Committee has endorsed in full the position taken by Comrade Aidit in his speech. This Communique summarizing the report presented to the Central Committee, says:

"The Section 'International Communist Movement' says that at present the leadership of Communist parties in certain countries is in the hands of revisionists who expel from the Party ranks true Marxists-Leninists and the latter are compelled to organize Marxist circles or new Communist parties, and the Communist Party of Indonesia will establish contacts with them."

■ The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India appeals to the leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia to put an immediate stop to its unprincipled splitting activities, which are in complete contradiction of all norms of relations between brother Communist parties. The Central Executive Committee believes that the unity of each Communist Party and of the international Communist movement demands that such splitting activities are halted without delay.

■ The Central Executive Committee draws the attention of all fraternal Communist parties in the world to the conduct of the Indonesian Communist leaders. The international Communist movement cannot permit such interference in the internal affairs of other parties, such slander and abuse against a brother party, such open and defiant calls for the formation of a rival party.

■ The C.E.C. appeals to all members and supporters of our Party to be vigilant against all disruptive steps taken by any individual or group of Communists to split our Party in response to the open directives of the Chinese or Indonesian Party leaderships.

■ ■ ■

Defend the Unity of Our Party

ROMESH CHANDRA,

Member of the Central Secretariat,
the Communist Party of India,
Editor-in-Chief of New Age

The editorial departments of *Jenminjihpao* (People's Daily) and *Hungchi* (Red Flag) have come out a few days back with their seventh article in the series, which purports to be comments on the Open Letter of July 14, 1963 of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The full text of this 30,000 word article is yet to be received in India, but enough has already been reported in the press to indicate that this article beats all previous records of the Chinese leadership itself in slander and disruption of the international Communist movement.

The Indian monopoly press has, of course, joyfully quoted in full the portions of this article which attack the Communist Party of India. What can give the press of the monopolists greater satisfaction than to headline the news in blazing types: *"Dange Accused of Betrayal"!* (*Times of India*, February 5).

The Chinese leadership writes of the Communist Party of India as follows:

"The renegade clique headed by Dange has betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, betrayed the revolutionary cause of the Indian proletariat and people and embarked on the road of national chauvinism.

"This clique has usurped the leadership of the Indian Communist Party and, conforming to the will of big Indian capitalists and landlords, has been transforming the Party into the lackey of the Nehru government, which represents these interests."

The article is not satisfied with these slanderous lies. It goes on:

"What has happened to the Indian Communist Party since then? Now everybody can see that the Dange clique is still travelling on the road of betrayal. It is still advocating class collaboration and realization of socialism in India through the Nehru government. It actively supported the Nehru government's huge budget providing for arms expansion and war preparation and its measures for fleecing the people.

"In August last year, it sabotaged the great strike of one million people in Bombay against the Nehru government's ruthless taxation

---

Reprinted from *New Age*, February 9, 1964.

policy. It tried to obstruct the holding of a mass rally in Calcutta, demanding the release of imprisoned Communists, in which 100,000 people participated.

"It is continuing its frenzied anti-Chinese activities and supporting the Nehru government's expansionist policy. It is following the Nehru government's policy of hiring out to U.S. imperialism."

This is not the first time that the Chinese Communist Party's leadership has thought fit to describe the leaders of the Communist Party of India as traitors. On March 3, 1963 the notorious "Mirror for Revisionists" was published. The Communist Party of India has already replied to the lies and falsehoods in the "Mirror".

Our only regret is that while the Indian Party press published the "Mirror" in full for all to read and have the benefit of the Chinese leadership's abusive attack on our Party, the Chinese Party press refused to publish our reply, thus leaving the Chinese Party membership ignorant of the truth.

It is not necessary to tell the Indian working people that every phrase in the Chinese leadership's attack is a blatant and deliberate lie. The millions who signed the Great Petition, the lakhs who marched on September 13 know the record of the Communist Party of India in regard to the budget and the anti-people taxes. The workers of Bombay know well the key role played by the Communist Party in making the memorable *Bombay Bandh* strike action a success.

And every Indian democrat knows of the tireless battle waged by the leadership of the Communist Party of India for the release of Communist detenus—a battle which has already succeeded in winning the release of the vast majority of the detenus, and which shall continue without pause till every Communist detenu is out of prison.

It is not necessary for the Indian Communists to reply again to these old accusations of "betrayal". It is only the timing of the repetition of this unprincipled attack that will horrify all who stand for the cause of the world working class. This is the time when Indian Communists in all parts of the country are preparing for the biggest working class action in the history of our country.

The Chinese leadership's attack has come at the same time when the National Campaign Committee was meeting in Hyderabad to give a new impetus to the great working-class struggle for dearness allowance and bonus. The Chinese leadership's attack has come as a mighty peasant struggle begins in Andhra Pradesh—the precursor of a new round of peasant battles which will sweep the country. The Chinese leadership's attack comes in the midst of a series of demonstrations, organized and led by the Party against the U.S. imperialists' decision to send its Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean.

The Chinese leadership's slanders against the leadership of the Communist Party of India will delight only the enemies of the working

people. Only the imperialists and the monopolists can gain at this time from the foul abuse which the Chinese leadership hurls so glibly at us.

What, however, is of greater concern to every Indian Communist is that the Chinese leadership in this article gives openly a new call for disruption and split of the Communist Party of India. The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India at its meeting last month had taken serious note of the directives for splitting the Communist Party of India given by the chairman of the Indonesian Communist Party.

The Chinese leadership's latest article is an even more unashamed directive to those termed as "the genuine representatives and hope of the Indian proletariat and Indian people" to oppose and resist the Party's leadership and "rehabilitate" the Party's traditions.

This is what the Chinese article says:

"As their renegade features are revealed, Dange and company meet increasing opposition and resistance from the broad rank and file of the Indian Communist Party. More and more Indian Communists have come to see clearly that Dange and company are the bane of the Indian Communist Party and Indian nation. They are now struggling to rehabilitate the Party's glorious and militant revolutionary tradition. They are the genuine representatives and the hope of the Indian proletariat and Indian people."

Here again the timing of this call for a split must be noted. The Communist Party of India has already launched its preparations for the Seventh Party Congress: the principal aim of the Congress and its preparations is the strengthening of the unity of the Party.

The Chinese leadership's call for a split becomes all the more reprehensible in the context of the efforts for Party unity, which are being made by all Party members at all levels, who are devoted to the sacred cause for which the international Communist movement stands.

The Central Executive Committee of our Party at its last meeting appealed to all fraternal Communist parties in the world to help prevent "such interference in the internal affairs of other parties, such slander and abuse against a brother party, such open and defiant calls for the formation of a rival party". The international Communist movement must act against the splitters and compel them to mend their ways.

One can be confident that all members and supporters of the Communist Party of India will respond positively to the appeal made by the Central Executive Committee "to be vigilant against all disruptive steps taken by any individual or group of Communists to split our Party in response to the open directives of the Chinese or Indonesian Party leaderships."

It is the broad rank and file of our Party, to which the Chinese leadership has the effrontery to refer, which is acting today to preserve and defend that which is most precious to every Communist: the unity of our Party, the unity of the international Communist movement.

Unity shall triumph. The splitters can never succeed.

■ ■ ■

The Manifesto of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party of Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria Today

After the achievement of independence in 1960, states the Introduction, "British and other foreign rule" continues to grow in Nigeria, while poverty, ignorance and sickness continue to be the lot of the common people. Throughout the country it is being said that "only a national-democratic revolution for complete independence, ultimately leading to socialism, can solve Nigeria's problems".

Our Time: An Epoch of Change and Revolution

We are living in a unique period of world history in which the common people everywhere are demanding change. The exploiters and oppressors of the people in order to maintain their positions against change spread despair among the people. They would have the common people believe that the feudal rule of chiefs or so-called natural rulers will and must never pass away.

Inspired by the Great Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917, the people of China broke for ever with explaitation and carried out the great Chinese Revolution which defeated imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic compradore capitalism, and brought the people to power throughout the vast land of China in 1949. The great socialist revolution has spread and is spreading to other lands.

The socialist revolutions have greatly inspired the exploited nations of the world in their struggles to free themselves from the domination of imperialism. Colonial revolutions are sweeping through the world as part and parcel of the great revolt of the poor, the proletarian revolution. The struggles of the African people, including the Nigerian people, form an important part of the proletarian revolution of our time.

The African Revolution

Imperialism imposed monopoly capitalist rule on Africa because of the technological and military weaknesses of the African people As a result, Africa was colonized and peculiar transformations took place

---

Abridged. Printed according to the pamphlet published in Lagos.

in African society. Our cultures were partially destroyed. Our economies fell into the hands of foreign monopolists. We lost our political independence and human dignity. After long years of colonial domination and imperialist exploitation, Africa became a backward continent of semi-feudal, semi-capitalist, partly primitive, partly bourgeois communities. The task before the African people is to change this picture.

To achieve progress, to march away from the backward past, the African must wage a determined struggle against imperialism. To this end the unity of the African people is essential. Our party is out to build up the full and unflinching support of the Nigerian people for the African revolution. In waging a battle against imperialism, however, the African people cannot ignore those classes in Africa whose aim is to collaborate with imperialism for their own selfish ends. To picture Africa as a classless continent is to give a distorted picture. Our Party is committed to waging a relentless battle against the internal enemies of the African people who collaborate with imperialism.

In our country, Nigeria, such enemies of the people have been waxing strong. But our great people are rich in traditions of unity and struggle against oppression, local or foreign.

II

THE PEOPLE'S STRUGGLES

Mass Struggle in Nigeria

For long centuries the common people of our country have lived under constant fear under the oppressive rule of powerful and well-armed ruling groups of exploiters. Through these long centuries they have waged a great and heroic struggle against the exploitation, the cheating, the plunder, the oppression of the ruling classes and groups.

Nigeria achieved self-government, the Manifesto states, thanks to the valiant struggles waged by its people.

In this struggle the Nigerian people aimed at three things:

(a) complete independence,

(b) democracy,

(c) social and economic progress for everyone.

These were the aims of the Nigerian people generally, but it is now clear that a section of the Nigerian businessmen and professionals who took part in the revolt did so in order to push out the British colonialists, set up a government of businessmen and place seekers, and use the State to enrich themselves. As for the chiefs, the majority of them opposed self-government, whilst some businessmen and professionals sided with the British colonialists.

The People Betrayed

Thus the people of Nigeria were betrayed. The British handed over power, the Manifesto states, in such a way as to "ensure the rule of those who are opposed to change", and the Constitution was drawn up in such a manner as to "divide the country and give power to the conservative feudal nobility of Northern Nigeria; militarily Nigeria was tied hand and foot not only to Britain but virtually also to the NATO bloc", as may be gathered from the fact that the NATO countries are given priority rights in Nigeria's naval ports, aerodromes, etc. Finally, the British handed over power to the elements who ensured their economic penetration in the country. The Manifesto goes on to say:

These things happened because the common people were not organized in their own party, so that the handing over of power became a matter of round-table negotiations between the British colonialists and Nigerians some of whom were anxious to grow rich from the national wealth created by the toil of the common people.

III

THE RICH RICHER, THE POOR POORER

Imperialist Penetration

Nigeria today, irrespective of ethnic group or religion, is divided into two nations: the nation of the rich made up of the rich classes and the nation of the poor made up of the poor classes.

The most important fact about Nigeria today is that our country is dominated by foreign businessmen. These foreign businessmen are growing stronger at the expense of Nigerians. Our import trade, mining, banking and finance are still dominated by foreigners. The manufacturing industry now developing in Nigeria is dominated by foreign firms. Foreign firms own most of the extensive palm or rubber plantations in Nigeria. Our shipping and air transport is dominated by foreigners. Even in road transport foreign firms like Arab Transport or Armels Transport own the largest enterprises. Foreign firms like the United Africa Company (U.A.C.) and John Holt dominate retail distribution either by direct selling or through factors. The building and construction industry in Nigeria is dominated by large and expanding foreign firms, like Taylor Woodrow (U.A.C.), Richard Costain and Cappa & D'Alberto.

Foreign business in Nigeria is expanding by leaps and bounds. For instance, in the first three years after independence, the foreign banks opened forty new branches, whereas the indigenous Nigerian banks opened only five branches. In 1951, the larger foreign monopolies alone invested about £4.5 million in Nigeria; in 1955 they invested nearly

£12 million; in 1962 £25 million, and the expansion continues. Such investment represents only a fraction of the profits made by foreign monopolies in the country. Whereas investment by the monopolies rose 300 per cent from 1951 to 1955, the real national income of Nigeria rose only 25 per cent for the same period—from about £590 million to £740 million.

Exploiting and Exploited Classes and Gropus

But imperialists would not be able to exploit Nigeria if they had not among Nigerians their agents, partners and middlemen. The upper class-parasites are:

(a) *The Compradore Businessmen*—the class of African businessmen who are in partnership with foreign businessmen. These men grow rich and expand their business by playing the role of business tycoons, contract brokers claiming ten to twenty per cent commission by acting as representatives, agents, sub-agents or factors of foreign companies.

(b) *The Feudal Nobility*—the Chiefs, the Emirs, Obas, Obis, Obongs and so forth. These rulers are installed in Houses of Chiefs, Local Councils, Customary Courts, and Boards, where, by virtue of their birth or position, they can enjoy power, allowances, bribes, and customary gifts; misappropriate extensive communal land and get money by various forms of influence.

(c) There is prominent in the country's ruling circles a group of corrupt and bureaucratic careerists out to make money or acquire position by all and every means, however ruthless. As such this group cannot be separated from the compradore. No matter to what class these elements belong, they form the second line of defence of imperialism; for they feed fat from the sharing of the spoils of office that arise from the financial manipulations of the neo-colonialist state. They will oppose any change in the state that aims at installing merit as against corrupt careerism encouraged by the influences of neo-colonialism.

(d) In order to entrench themselves more effectively, the imperialists, right from the first days of colonial rule, created a group of privileged trade union bureaucrats who are well financed from the imperialist countries. They use these hangers-on to split the Nigerian workers' movement and to pursue the policies of the imperialist-sponsored International Confederation of "Free" Trade Unions (I.C.F.T.U.).

As against the imperialists and their allies and agents who want to maintain the present regime of oppression over the people, we have the actual creaters of the wealth of the country, and those who desire a great change in our country for the benefit of all. These are:

(a) *The Wage and Salaried Workers:* in plantations, farms, factories, mines, transport establishments, civil service, offices and elsewhere;

(b) *The Farmers or Peasants,* especially the poor peasants who hardly have enough land from year to year to farm;

(c) The unemployed;

(d) The self-employed artisans—carpenters, blacksmiths, weavers, tailors, barbers and so forth;

(e) The students, the youth, patriotic intellectuals, teachers and other professionals, with a social conscience;

(f) Petty traders and small businessmen whose business is daily threatened with ruin for lack of capital or because of the competition, policies and robbery of imperialist monopolies and their hangers-on.

IV

THE PEOPLE'S ANSWER

A Party of a New Type

The people need first and foremost a party of a new type, a party of workers, farmers and patriotic and progressive citizens. Such a party is the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party of Nigeria—the Party of the oppressed.

Today in our country there are many parties canvassing for support. Day by day they pour out volumes of propaganda to deceive the people. Politicians make promises today only to back out of them tomorrow. Lying and corruption are the order of the day.

The Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party is different from the other existing parties in that:

Whereas the existing parties came into being in order to achieve three things: to fight for the status of a self-governing country for Nigeria; to have Nigerian chiefs, traders and professionals take the place of British administrators; to give expression to the ambitions of the educated, feudal and business elements amongst the three major ethnic groups, the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party on the other hand, has come into being because three years of self-gevernment have shown a marked divergence between the interests of the people and the interests of some chiefs, businessmen and professionals who are collaborators with imperialism. What is wanted today is a party of socialism, a party that will fight for power not for chiefs, businessmen and professionals but for our cheated and neglected people.

Secondly, our party is guided by a social science—the science of Marxism-Leninism. This is a science which brings together all the experiences of mankind in struggle and from there draws lessons for the guidance of the common people in their fight to overthrow capitalism and imperialism and build socialism. It is a science which enables the people to know the roots of their poverty andt weakness, to see through

all the deceits, confusions, pretences and lies of the ruling classes. It reveals to the people the actual realities of a situation. It shows them how socialism can be built. It guides the people in their day-to-day struggles, explains to them why certain events occur to their detriment or advantage and exposes the workings of the capitalist-imperialist system of oppression so that the people can see what to do in their fight for socialism. It shows the people how the fight is to be conducted from stage to stage. It guides the workers, farmers and socialists in the building of the party. It shows how the party is to be organized, educated and led and what the party must or must not do, may or may not do in order to gather strength, in order to be a reliable instrument and vanguard of the people and win the revolution.

Socialism is the goal. There have been many recommendations in the past and there are still a few today on how the struggle for socialism should be waged to achieve success. But it is only in countries where the battle for socialism has been guided by the Marxist-Leninist science of socialist struggle that the battle has actually been won and socialism established. Every worker, every farmer, every artisan relies not on a tool that looks beautiful but cannot do the work he wants done but on one that has been proved by experience to be strong and equal to the appointed task. Such a tool is the science of Marxism-Leninsm, the reliable science of socialist revolution which can be applied in any country at any stage of development to guide and enlighten the people.

Thirdly, our party has its roots in the people. It is the fundamental principle of our party that it is built by the peoples and is out to serve the people. Any word, any deed from whatever quarters that runs contrary to the interests of the workers and peasants is a violation of the fundamental principle of the party. In the actual building of our party our constitution ensures that workers and farmers and persons absolutely loyal and devoted to the cause of the workers and farmers and other common people of our land play the leading role.

National Democratic United Front

Apart from the workers and farmers there are other groups that also wish to change the present state of things in Nigeria in the direction of true independence, democracy and progress.

Not all sections of the bourgeoisie are in collaboration with imperialism. There are progressive businessmen, professionals and intellectuals who oppose neo-colonialism and desire democratic rule of the people in a truly independent Nigeria. Other strata of the people—petty traders, artisans, progressive youth, women, students and ex-servicemen—are also opposed to imperialism and reaction, opposed to the oligarchic, corrupt rule of a few.

A national democratic united front becomes a revolutionary necessity. We call on all progressive and patriotic businessmen, pro-

fessionals, intellectuals, youths, women, ethnic organizations, students, ex-servicemen, the anti-imperialist fighters in other parties and other democratic sections of our people to rally round our party and build a national democratic united front of the people against imperialism. We call on them to build and strengthen their organizations as a bastion against neo-colonialism. We call on them to forge a new bond of brotherhood against imperialism. With our Party deep in the struggle, under the leadership of the oppressed and fighting vanguard of workers and farmers, the democratic united front must achieve its purpose.

Immediate Task—National Democratic Revolution

The present stage of the Nigerian revolution is the second stage of the national revolution against imperialism. The first stage of our national revolution started in the 1920's-1930's with the formation of the Nigerian National Democratic Party and the Nigerian Youth Movement. This stage of our revolution aimed at giving Nigeria the status of a self-governing country. The main parties in the final struggle were: the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons, representing mainly the Ibo bourgeoisie; the Action Group, representing mainly the Yoruba feudal and bourgeois alliance, the Northern People's Congress, representing the feudal nobility of Northern Nigeria; and the Northern Elements Progressive Union, representing the down-trodden mass of the petty bourgeoisie, including to a limited extent the peasantry, in Northern Nigeria.

The leadership of the first stage of our natpional revolt remained to the end in the hands of the national bourgeoisie that emerged in Nigeria in colonial days, mainly professionals and businessmen. Because of their weaknesses the bourgeoisie have been compelled to share power with the feudal nobility. The result is a post-colonial state structure that is pregnant with inherent contradiction and crisis. With the attainment of self-rule in 1960, the colonial phase of the Nigerian Revolution came to an end.

On the eve of the transfer of power, the working-class movement which had played a big role in the colonial revolution was without a party, and was further weakened by bad leadership, the machinations of the imperialist master, and the betrayal by the bourgeoisie. The peasants equally were without an adequate party.

A State of National Democracy

Having defeated imperialism and its feudal and compradore allies, the revolution will establish a state of independent national democracy. This state will:

(a) Achieve true as distinct from nominal independence;

(b) Establish true democracy in which the common people will have have real and not merely nominal power;

(c) Carry out progressive economic and social reforms.

To the emergent nations of the world two roads are possible: the capitalist road or the socalist road. When the people have overthrown imperialism and its allies and established the independent national democratic state, which way will that state move—the capitalist way or the socialist way: the way of private businessmen, of private wealth grabbing, of greed, of private profit, of corruption, treachery and selfishness; or the way of expanding democracy, of patriotism, of service and honour, of using the country's wealth and resources in the interest of all?

Nigeria is at the moment going the capitalist way and the evils of capitalism are already becoming clear. There is neither moral justification nor common sense in calling on the common people of Nigeria to rise and overthrow foreign exploiters so as to leave a free field for local exploiters and fortune seekers to take over completely.

Therefore the nation must go in the direction of socialism. By socialism we mean the ownership of the means of production and distribution (mines, factories, banks, etc.), by the community as a whole, so as to end the exploitation of one man by another, to end the division of the country into rich and poor, the powerful and the weak. The movement to socialism in Nigeria can only proceed by stages, but our advance must be in that direction.

V

SOCIALIST NIGERIA

Under socialism the larger businesses will become the people's businesses run by agencies set up by the people's government. They will be run strictly in the interest of the people and their profits will belong to the people. These profits from socialist people's industries will be used to educate everyone and everyone's child, to provide equal health facilities for everyone, cheap dwelling for everyone, cheap transport for everyone and increasing personal or domestic property for everyone. Further, since the industries will be the people's industries, the workers will play the leading part in determining how the production is to be organized and how the profits are to be shared. The farmers and self-employed artisans will be helped in every way. They will be encouraged to form cooperatives in order to increase their earnings. For once, they will enjoy political liberty.

It is in this way that the exploitation of man by man in Nigeria will begin to end right from the roots. In this way the regime of growing

inequality which we have witnessed under colonialism and which we are witnessing now under capitalist self-rule will turn into a regime of growing equality. But in our country the enemies of the people are not asleep. They are busy inventing all sorts of "socialisms" to confuse the people. We hear of "Pragmatic Socialism", "Democratic Socialism", "Conventional Socialism", "Commonwealth Socialism", "Arab Socialism", "African Socialism", "Fabian Socialism", "Christian Socialism", "Agrarian Socialism", and what you will. Some who call themselves socialists have even come out to say that socialism means whatever anyone cares to mean by it.

The reason for this multiplication of "socialisms" is obvious. Everywhere in the world, everywhere in Africa, everywhere in Nigeria the people are dissatisfied with capitalism and find no alternative other than turning towards socialism as the answer to their problems, as the only system that can give them independence, food, clothing, shelter, education, health, justice and peace. Since the enemies of the people cannot turn the people away from the path of socialism, they have to pose as interpreters of socialism. Thus every corrupt nationalist, every opportunist politician, every barely progressive liberal finds the label of "socialism" useful to cover up actions, policies and programmes that are essentially capitalist.

Experience has shown that the struggle for socialism must take different roads in different countries depending on the specific historical, economic, political and social circumstances of each country. But both common sense and experience also indicate that everywhere the struggle for socialism must mean throwing off the yoke of capitalists, imperialists and other exploiters and winning power for the people. The form of struggle for the people's power will vary here and there. The form of organization of the peoples power will also vary here and there. In Britain, for instance, there is no peasant class; in Nigeria the peasantry forms three-quarters of the population. In the United States there is a powerful class of native monopoly capitalists; in Nigeria the native capitalists are not of that type. In France there is no class of feudal nobles; in Nigeria there is. In some African countries there is hardly a native compradore class; in Nigeria this class is powerful and growing.

Many differences exist between one country and another. Experience has shown that precisely because of these differences and for other reasons the struggle for socialism in every country has to be guided by a powerful science of society. Such a science is the science of Marxism-Leninism: the socialist science of struggle which everywhere points out what is real from what is unreal; what is possibile from what is not possible; what is imperative from what is not imperative; what is urgent from what is not urgent; what is in the peoples' interest from what is not; what will lead to socialism and freedom from what cannot lead to it.

What the Socialists and the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party are saying is that the ruling class should not be allowed to sit tight in power, to use political power to benefit themselves; they urge the people to help themselves. The people are willing to help themselves; they want to build everything they need, but first they must take political power into their own hands in order to help themselves most effectively. Socialism means no more than this.

It is necessary to warn the people that the struggle for socialism cannot be a walk-over anywhere. It cannot be so in Nigeria. The party of the people must be ready for a really rough road and rough weather. With Nigeria as one of the last strongholds of imperialism, the struggle may not even be short. We must be prepared for a long march. The reactionaries have installed themselves in power, and with the aid of their imperialist masters, they are preparing to remain there for ever.

Experience has shown that no ruling class has ever yielded power withhout throwing everything into the battle to remain in power. The ruling classes may make concessions here and there, but they will not surrender total power without a stiff fight. Our party must be steeled for a fight. Experience has shown that the struggle for complete independence and socialism may take any form ranging from parliamentary to armed struggle. Everything depends on the experiences of the people and the way in which the ruling classes choose to conduct their own side of the struggle. And in the African context the ruling classes include the class of absentee monopoly capitalists in Europe and America whose businesses and money dominate our economy. We must remember that the Western ruling circles are committed to a policy of militarism, that long before we launched our party the absentee imperialists of Western Europe and the United States had been building up a vast military pover all over Africa as a base of violent operation against any struggle for complete independence and socialism in Africa.

But we shall not be frightened by mere military power. Experience has shown that no power pitched against the people can defeat the people. Where the people have the will and are guided by the science of socialist struggle they must find a way to socialism.

VI

ONWARD TO VICTORY

Guarantee of Success

The people of Nigeria are at the moment poor and weak: they are not in power. They are weak because of ignorance, lack of organization, because of oppression. They are divided by tribalism, by the conflicting ambitions of feudalists and capitalists, by the organized

propaganda and intrigues of imperialism. But the propaganda of the ruling classes and groups makes it appear that without them there is no salvation. Can the people unite? Can they create their own leaders? Can they carry forward the Nigerian revolution and take over power for themselves?

The answer of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party is that the people have the strength and can accomplish the task of winning power from the exploiters and building themselves a new society free from exploitation and based on freedom and equality, a socialist society. The people can succeed for the following reasons:

Firstly, in the past when an Emir, Oba, or other ruler became too oppressive the people did unite to overthrow him and set up a new power. The people of Nigeria did unite to overthrow British colonialism. The workers of Nigeria are used to uniting in their trade unions under their own leaders to fight their oppressors. The general strike of Nigerian workers in 1945 is one of the greatest events in Nigerian history and in the history of the world working-class movement. These instances show that the people can unite for struggle and create their own leaders.

Secoundly, unity of the workers and farmers to throw off the yoke of imperialists and local capitalists and to establish a socialist state has been achieved in other countries. The socialist revolution and the building of socialism are no longer experiments but accomplished facts in the world today. The period in which we live, as we have noted, is the age of colonial and socialist revolution when everywhere the common people are rising like one man to throw off their oppressors and fight for freedom, food, education and good health. The Nigerian people cannot, will not tail behind world history. We were one of the very first to raise the banner against British colonialism in Africa. We shall, we must carry on the unfinished fight. We must be one of the very first, if not the first to abolish exploitation in Africa. Therein lies the assignment of the day.

Thirdly, everywhere in Nigeria today, at home or in the streets, in towns or in villages, on play-grounds or in work-places, in parliaments or in market places, there is growing discontent, insecurity and inequality. The common people are speaking the same language everywhere. Everywhere they want change. Everywhere they want a system that will serve the people and not a rich few. All experience shows that when people have a serious common problem they can unite to solve that problem.

Fourthly, a revolutionary situation is developing fast in Nigeria. Bourgeois parliamentary democracy has been discredited; the people are so disappointed that they are more and more becominig indifferent and hostile to the regime in power. Every election reveals less and less interest by the people in the affairs of the ruling class. As a result efforts have to be made by the ruling classes to bribe, deceive and intimidate the people. There is among the intellectuals and students

of the country growing discontent against the ruling classes. Among the workers, farmers and the youth frustration is deep-seated. The workers through their trade unions are coming out more and more with political programmes that have revolutionary implications. What the people need to achieve unity is organization and clarity of thought. And this will be the principal task of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party. Organized and guided, the people will unite and win their revolution. This is inevitable.

OUR GOAL: THE PEOPLE'S NEEDS

The supreme goal of the Socialist Working People's Party of Nigeria is to secure and guarantee for the people of Nigeria:

(a) All social rights—the right to work, education, rest and leisure, and to social security;

(b) Full unresticted suffrage—all Nigerian people to enjoy equal social status irrespective of birth, sex, religion or ethnic origin;

(c) The opportunity to take a direct part in the management of production and in the distribution of the fruits of their labour;

(d) The radical solution of the women's question—equal opportunity to both man and woman in our society; the elimination of the existing social, cultural and economic differences and prejudices between the Nigerian man and woman; the raising of the status of the Nigerian woman to that of the man in all spheres of activities;

(e) The conditions for genuinely solving the question of the different ethnic groupings and minorities in our society, and ensuring their rapid advancement (social, cultural and economic).

Towards this goal the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party, guided always and only by the true interests of the people, shall work earnestly to raise the political consciousness of the entire working people of Nigeria, guide and lead them to win political power from the exploiters and oppressors and use this power to transform Nigeria into a truly socialist democracy.

THE PARTY'S IMMEDIATE TASKS

In the present situation when neo-colonialism and its agents constitute the main enemy of the Nigerian people, the immediate objective of the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party is to defeat neo-colonialism, weaken and isolate its agents and attain complete independence for our country.

Realizing that this can be achieved only by the conscious endeavours and struggles of the entire Nigerian people, the immediate task of the Party is to secure and guarantee:

(a) A strong united conscious labour movement..

(b) A strong united conscious alliance among the people of our country.

(c) A strong united National Democratic Front of all anti-neo-colonialist and anti-feudalist forces in the country.

(d) The attainment of complete National Independence (social, cultural and economic) and the establishment of a popular National Democracy in which the entire masses of our people will play a fundamentally new role in the life of our society.

VII

PEOPLE OF NIGERIA, ARISE!

Imperialism must be defeated. Nigeria must belong to Nigerians. The rich natural resources of our country must be used for the development of all sons and daughters of the land. The workers and farmers, their children and children's children can no longer continue to live like lower beasts whilst others build up private fortunes with the wealth they create. All who work must eat; all who have the honour to be citizens of Nigeria must be equally free, no matter their occupation. There must be work for all; good food for all; cheap and comfortable dwellings for all; adequate education for all; sound health for all; a well-equipped, comfortable and happy home for all; equal social oppotrunities for all; respect for all; an end to all discriminations. This country belongs to all of us; the fruits of her resources and the sweat of her sons and daughters must benefit all equally.

The Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party is the revolutionary party of Nigerian workers, farmers, toilers, patriots, democrats, progressives, socialists and oppressed, with the workers in the vanguard, and guided by scientific socialism, the teaching that guides the common people's struggles everywhere against oppression. The workers and farmers are the only ones who are anxious and able to wage the struggle against exploitation and oppression to the very end. They have no wish like others to stop half-way. They cannot condemn some oppression and favour others.

People of Nigeria, arise. Build your organization. Close your ranks. Unite around the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party. Organize the Party, build it, guide it with your toil and experience, inspire it with your tradition of struggle against oppression. Unite with other toilers, with the youth, democrats, progressive intellectuals and professionals with the socialists. Organize and support a national democvratic united front. Together we can, we must, we will overthrow imperialism, and defeat its allies. A state of independent national democracy must be built in Nigeria, with the workers and farmers in the forefront, for the

interests of the workers and farmers and other common citizens of our land.

We shall march along the path of struggle, the road of socialism, to victory.

Long Live the People's National Democratic Revolution against Imperialism and its Local Allies!

Long Live the People of Nigeria!
Long Live African Unity!
Long Live World Peace!
Long Live Friendship among the Peoples of the World!
Long Live Socialism!

The Road of Revolution

(Short Programme of the National Democratic Revolution)

(A) *Building a Revolutionary Movement*

The central task of the Party is to build socialism in Nigeria.

To accomplish this it has to:

(a) Organize and educate the workers and farmers of Nigeria.

(b) Organize and educate the artisans, petty traders and unemployed of Nigeria and educate other patriotic and progressive groups: the youth, students, intellectuals, professionals and national businessmen.

(c) Defend the interests of workers, farmers and other toilers against the interest of the exploiters and ruling groups.

(d) Help to form and develop the national democratic united front against imperialism and its feudal, compradore and other allies.

(e) Guide the people to take over political power and establish a fully independent state of national democracy as a basis for the building of a socialist society.

(B) *Task before the Nation*

In the present period of the national democratic revolution led by the common people against imperialism and its allies the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party will fight for the following:

Political Objectives:

1. A constituent assembly of workers, farmers and progressive citizens to change our Constitution and make it a real instrument of progress.

In this respect we shall fight for:

2. A Republican Constitution;
3. The creation of more States to give freedom to the ethnic minorities and strengthen national unity;
4. The re-allocation of power between the Federal and Regional (or State) governments; especially the transfer of economic planning, foreign borrowing, labour, secondary and higher education and the judiciary to the Federal Government;
5. Abolition of the Houses of Chiefs and their replacement by upper houses made up of equal representatives of provinces in a State or of the various States in the Federation;
6. Guarantee of basic human and political freedoms for all over the age of 18, irrespective of sex, tribe, religion, financial position or education;
7. Re-allocation of revenue on the basis of population and need;
8. The right of constituencies to recall their representatives in parliament;
9. The right of all workers to take part in politics;
10. The full representation of workers and peasants in parliament;
11. The full participation of workers and peasants in local councils;
12. Abolition of all oppressive councils, courts or other similar institutions;
13. Democratization of the statutory boards to permit full workers' and farmers' participation;
14. Removal of all foreign, exploitative and oppressive influence from our politics.

The Party will fight for the following economic objectives:

Economic Objectives:

15. The nationalization of all imperialist enterprises so as to remove once and for all the economic and political dependence of Nigeria on foreign powers;
16. Nationalization of all businesses owned by feudal nobles and compradore capitalists;
17. Redistribution or nationalization of all communal land usurped by feudal nobles or other landlords, or all excessive land held by feudal nobles or landlords;
18. Nationalization of all State businesses sold to private businessmen; all wealth and property accumulated through graft by the compradore;
19. Abolition of all feudal relations;
20. Development of uncultivated land; mechanization and modernization of farming;
21. State establishment of industries and promotion of rapid industrial-

ization of Nigeria. We note the vast industrial potentials of Nigeria in water, coal, mineral oil and gas as sources of power; in varied mineral and agricultural raw materials; in man-power, in a potential internal market, in native intelligence. We note that the £45,000 used to build each of the houses of Federal Ministers, the £2½ million used to reclaim swamp land to enable the ruling groups to own land on the Lagos waterfront; the £1½ million wasted on the 1962 census which was cancelled because of the tribal rivalry of ruling groups, the £6 million squandered by the Western Nigeria Government on this kind of building and other useless projects as revealed by the Coker Inquiry, and many other such funds squandered by all the governments of the Federation are sufficient to establish scores of large factories every year;

22. Encouragement of national, that is, independent or non-compradore African businessmen;
23. Abolition of unemployment;
24. Drastic scaling down of the salaries of Ministers and Parliamentarians to what the workers and farmers want them to be;
25. Scaling down of all excessive salaries and allowances;
26. Establishment of a national minimum wage to guarantee a decent minimum standard of life for all wage-earners;
27. Formation and encouragement of farmers' cooperatives;
28. Encouragement of partnerships, cooperatives and general development and modernization of their enterprises among independent artisans, pettytraders and profesionals;
29. Control of prices of imported goods, of rents and of other excessive charges;
30. Scaling down of taxes on workers and farmers.

In the social sphere we will fight for the following:

Social Objectives:

31. Abolition of illiteracy;
32. Institution of free education up to University level;
33. Abolition of all private schools;
34. Expansion of medical, especially of maternity services;
35. Giving of maximum State encouragement to the development of folk culture, music, writing, sculpture, painting, sports, etc.;
36. Strengthening and expansion of trade union rights;
37. Formulation jointly by the State and trade unions of a new Trade Union Ordinance with a view to improving conditions of work;
38. Guaranteeing of living standards and proper conditions of work for all workers;
39. Protection of female workers;
40. Encouragement of organizations for the defence of farmers' rights;
41. Abolition of all debts owed by poor wage earners to capitalists and landlords;

42. Abolition of repayment of debts owned by poor farmers to richer people;
43. Allocation of sufficient land and granting of loans to poor farmers;
44. Abolition of all bribes, forced gifts, prostitution, nepotism and other forms of corruption;
45. Abolition of all discrimination based on race, tribe or religion;
46. Carrying out of all other social reforms in the interest of the workers, farmers and other toilers in our land.

Policy on Africa

47. In the realm of African affairs the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party will fight for the immediate independence of all African countries;
48. The unity of all African States and the peoples in the struggle against imperialism;
49. The abolition of all foreign bases on African soil.

We shall do the above because the democratic national independent state of the Nigerian people cannot be safe so long as imperialists can intrigue against it from other African states.

In addition, so as to ensure maximum progress of all Africa we will:

50. Fight for the political union of all African states on the basis of democracy and progress;
51. Conduct any other fight that shall be in the interest of the African revolution.

International Policy:

In the realm of world affairs, we will:

52. Fight actively for peace, for our revolution is endangered and retarded so long as the great powers arm for war;
53. Support the right of all nations to self-determination, for the denial of self-determination to any one country is a step towards its denial to other countries;
54. Support the cause of all countries fighting against imperialism;
55. Support the cause of progress—of the workers and farmers of all countries against cheating and backwardness.

These specific steps shall pave the way for the people to build a free socialist society where wealth shall begin to be distributed according to the principle, from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

Workers of Nigeria, unite!

Peasants of Nigeria, awake!

Socialists and Democrats of Nigeria, rally to the people's banner!

Working people of Nigeria, unite and smash imperialism and feudalism!

■ ■ ■

Splitting Activities of Chinese Repudiated

The following statement was issued last week by the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Canada:

We are greatly concerned with a recent editorial article published by the editorial departments of *People's Daily* and *Red Flag,* entitled "The Leaders of the C.P.S.U. Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times".

The sole essential content of this article is a call for splits, for disuniting the world Communist movement, and for the establishment of an international centre headed by the Communist Party of China, whose purpose is to impose its own dangerous and non-Marxist line against the line of the world Communist movement.

The Communist Party of China is striving recklessly to split the countries of the world socialist system. By this action it is weakening the world front of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

Our Party repudiates this splitting activity of the Communist Party of China. This most recent reckless attempt by the leaders of the Chinese Party to force splits, compels us to point out that it is necessary at every level of party organization to oppose this unscrupulous attempt to divide the world Communist movement. We stand firmly on the positions which we have repeatedly taken in rejecting the totally wrong and un-Marxist line of the Chinese leaders.

For some time now, our Party has called for a world conference of Communist and Workers' parties. We believe the developing situation makes such a conference more necessary than ever so as to unite all the forces of the world Communist movement in defence of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the documents of the world movement.

■ ■ ■

Reprinted from *The Canadian Tribune*, February 24, 1964.

Latest Chinese Statement Discussed by Gus Hall

The following statement by Gus Hall was issued to the press on Friday, Feb. 7.

The latest statement of the Communist Party of China, appearing as an editorial in its theoretical publication *Hung chi* is one which demands detailed study and reply. It contains one point, however, which requires immediate reaction.

The statement presents a political and philosophical thesis seeking to justify the splitting of the working class and its organizations as a necessary and even desirable thing. It is a thesis that glorifies irresponsible, disruptive factional activities aimed at splitting Communist parties—that sets disunity as a goal for which to strive.

There is no other way in which one can interpret such statements as these: "First it (the history of the international Communist movement) demonstrates that like everything else the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is inevitably reflected in the Communist ranks." Or: "Unity, struggle, or even splits, and a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement."

■

A thesis which justifies splitting ranks can at no time be in the interests of the working class. It is a disservice to the struggle for world peace, harmful to the struggle against imperialism and for colonial liberation, and detrimental to the struggles for democracy and for socialism.

To appeal to processes of growth through division in nature as an argument for splitting the working-class movement is a mechanistic, even fatalistic, approach which fails to take into account what is most important: the conscious human element and its influence in social development.

There is indeed a struggle within the ranks of the working class. It is a struggle against capitalist ideology, whose purpose is to divide the workers and set them against one another. The method of fighting against this influence is to fight for unity of the working class, for a common struggle against a common enemy. It cannot be fought by striving deliberately to split the working class. Such a thesis of disunity and splitting is neither new nor original. It has been the stock-in-

---

Reprinted from *The Worker*, February 16, 1964.

trade of diverse anti-Communist splinter groups for generations, serving always as a cloak for disruptive activities.

It is important to note that the promotion of disunity is defended as a necessary means of struggle against "a line which consists of 'peaceful coexistence', 'peaceful competition', 'peaceful transition', 'a state of the whole people' and 'a party of the whole people'." That is, it is directed, among other things, against those who seek the establishment of the broadest possible unity in the struggle for world peace.

The thesis of the Chinese Party editorial is a counsel of defeatism—a lack of confidence in the working class, in socialism, in Marxism-Leninism. There can be no other meaning of their statement concerning the C.P.S.U.: "They have thus made a mess of the splendid socialist camp." For the truth is the very opposite. The outstanding feature of today's world is not the existence of such a "mess" but rather the growing power of the socialist sector, the liberated and colonial peoples and the working class in the capitalist countries, who now exert the dominant influence in world relations.

It is the recognition of this cardinal fact that gives the world Communist movement its confident outlook for victory over imperialism and capitalism. The "mess" is in the camp of imperialism which would be the only real beneficiary of any policy of splitting the world working class.

■ ■ ■

Statement of the Iraqi Communist Party

The following statement of the Iraqi Communist Party, which functions in illegal conditions, has been distributed in Baghdad:

"You have seen how right the Iraqi Communist Party has been in warning against the danger of reactionary conspiracies and the damage they can cause the interests of the people. The Communist Party's warnings came as a result of its objective study of the nature of the traitors and conspirators as groups and as individuals, as a result of its analysis of their base aims. The Communist Party warned that the conspirators represent a movement which is opposed to the aims of the July 1958 revolution in which the entire people united to carry it out; that they commit the most foul and brutal crimes against the people and their democratic forces, irrespective of their trends and convictions; that they are the most bitter enemies of the just national aspirations of the fraternal Kurd people; that they are the agents of imperialism and as such will greatly prejudice our national interests, the sovereignty and independence of our country and its peace policy directed against imperialism, the oil monopolies and aggressive military blocs. Our Party warned you of all this. The facts and the results to date of the policy pursued by the February 8 reactionary gang in all spheres of life show how right the Party was.

"It is common knowledge that the Iraqi Communist Party did not confine itself to warnings. It heroically led the democratic movement of the broadest sections of the working people, the resistance movement against the February coup.

"The bloody reign of terror led to the complete isolation of the conspirators, aggravated the differences among their leaders, intensified the rivalry among the ruling groups, which erupted in an armed conflict in the Baathist fascist clique and revealed the crisis in the regime of the fascist putchists in the political, economic and ideological spheres. This crisis could not be liquidated or localized; it was impossible to avoid new upheavals and inevitable defeat, even with the support of bayonets and the Syrian Aflaks, and even given the moral and material aid of imperialist circles.

"Some of the military leaders from among those who had taken part in the fascist reactionary coup, decided to stage the putchist movement of November 18 as quickly as possible because they realized, for one thing, that they were losing ground as a result of the frenzied attempts by the Saadi and Aflak Baathist groups to do away with the opposition and all who do not support them and, for another, because they took fright at the mounting anger of the people and their heroic struggle. They managed to strike a blow at the leading force of the February

coup, that is, at the Iraqi Aflaks and, in the first place, at their criminal gangs in the National Guard, precisely because they took advantage of the people's bitter anger at the actions of these gangs.

"However, the November 18 coup is nothing but an attempt to find a way out of the acute crisis of power, a possibility of closing the gulf between the February putchists and the people. This coup in no ways guarantees an end to the abnormal situation existing in Iraq, to the consequences of the criminal policy of the Baathist gang and those who are responsible for all its crimes against our Iraqi people, Arabs and Kurds alike.

"Dear Citizens,

"All sincere forces, the heroes of the armed struggle in Kurdistan, all who want security and peace for the people, must understand that the struggle of the people is not finished. The latest events show that these forces are exposed to great danger because of the unceasing attempts to throttle the revolutionary movement, to create a sense of false security and thereby blunt vigilance. This enables the reactionary forces, the supportes of the dictatorship and imperialism to pursue their ends.

"Victory in the battle can be achieved only by continuing the struggle and by taking as one's criterion the establishment of a democratic national government that will put an end to the unworthy war against the Kurd people and meet their legitimate demands for autonomy, will punish those who shed the blood of our people, violated the flower of our womanhood, who betrayed the national interest and undermined the economy, those who sowed terror, particularly the Aflak clique; the democratic national government will release political prisoners, will pursue a firm policy of agrarian reform, of preserving the national economy and developing it along lines ensuring prosperity and work for all, will introduce democratic liberties, maintain the policy of Arab solidarity based on the development of democracy, the struggle against imperialism and its pacts, on support of the Arab movement for freedom and progress; it will pursue a foreign policy of peace and friendship with ali peoples and peace-loving countries and, first and foremost, with the great Soviet Union which is the guarantee and bulwark of the consolidation of our Iraqi Republic.

"These are the aims for which our people fought, and for which they are now waging a heroic struggle against the forces of fascism and reaction; our people cannot agree to anything less.

"We once again stress that no regime will be successful if it will pursue the policy of the Baathists, the policy of the February coup which is hostile to communism and the democratic forces, a policy that continues the line of the war advocates and imperialists—the official policy of the aggressive blocs" (Salam Adil). Vague statements and attempts to play on the sentiments of the people and their desire for stability and peace will not reinforce it and less so a policy

of bloody terror. Experience has shown and continues to show that such a policy cannot be pursued for long, cannot be successful.

"Heighten revolutionary vigilance, unite still more closely in a broad national front and thus bar the road to the intrigues of the forces of fascism, reaction and imperialism!

"Forward to a bright future, to building a democratic and prosperous Iraq!

Iraqi Communist Party"

January 1964.

■ ■ ■

Workers of all lands unite!

Documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties

Articles and Speeches

INFORMATION BULLETIN

8–9

PEACE AND SOCIALISM
PUBLISHERS
PRAGUE 1964

Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the World Communist Movement. Speech by M. A. Suslov at the February (1964) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU and Decision of the Plenary Meeting Adopted on February 15, 1964

The Political Resolution of the Fifth Conference of the I.C.P.

On the Situation in the International Communist Movement. Report by R. Guyot

Resolution of the C.C., Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

Statement of the Communist Party of Salvador

Should the National-Liberation Movement Fear International Détente. Article by L. Bouhali

CONTENTS

Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the World Communist Movement Speech by M. A. Suslov at the February (1964) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU 275

Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the World Communist Movement. Decision of Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, Adopted on February 15, 1964 349

The Political Resolution of the Fifth Conference of I.C.P. 352

On the Situation in the International Communist Movement. Report by R. Guyot 356

Against the Subversive Activities of the Chinese Splitters. Resolution of the C.C., Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party 361

Statement of the Communist Party of Salvador on Differences in the International Communist Movement 365

Should the National-Liberation Movement Fear International Détente. Article by L. Bouhali 379

Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the world Communist Movement

Speech by Comrade M. A. Suslov at the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, February 14, 1964

Comrades, this Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU has examined basic questions of agricultural development, questions that are of the utmost importance to our country, to the Soviet people. This Plenary Meeting is working in an atmosphere of complete unanimity of the Central Committee, the entire Party, the whole Soviet people. Its decision will open up broad vistas for the Soviet economy and vast opportunities for a steady rise of socialist agriculture, for the flourishing of our country's production forces, for the creation of the material and technical basis of communism and for the fullest satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of Soviet people.

In showing constant concern for the development of the country's economy, our Party is fulfilling its internationalist duty to the working people of the whole world. The greater our economic successes, the better the life of the Soviet people, the higher the prestige of the world's first socialist state and the greater the attractive force of the ideas of socialism and communism. By their tireless labour the Soviet people are making their contribution towards strengthening the world socialist system and rendering increasing aid and support to the struggle of the peoples of all countries for social and national liberation, against imperialism and colonialism.

The revolutionary process, which has embraced all the continents of the world, continues to develop in breadth and depth. New successes have been scored in the development of the world socialist system. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries is gaining strength. The national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is broadening out. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace over the forces of imperialism and war is becoming ever clearer. Through the joint efforts of the world socialist system and all other peace-loving forces it has become possible to achieve a certain relaxation of international tension and take further important steps towards consolidating peace and foiling the attempts of the most aggressive imperialist circles to start a thermonuclear war. The course of world development fully bears out the correctness of the general line worked out for the international Com-

munist movement at the 1957 and 1960 meetings of the fraternal parties, and the vitality of the conclusions and propositions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of our Party and of the Leninist Programme of the CPSU.

The achievements of the socialist countries, of the entire world Communist movement, are obvious. But our successes could have been much more far-reaching had it not been for the serious difficulties that arose in the socialist camp and the Communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The Central Committee members have been repeatedly informed of the differences between the CPC leadership and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. However, the Presidium of the CC considered it necessary to raise this question once again at this Plenary Meeting because the Chinese leaders have gone even further in their factional activities and created a direct threat of a split in the world Communist movement.

If we analyse the evolution of the views and actions of the CPC leadership, beginning with the 1960 Moscow Meeting, we shall see that during all these years, instead of trying to eliminate the differences, the Chinese leaders have been making them more acute. Starting out with a revision of certain tactical propositions of the world Communist movement, they have, step by step, widened their rift with the CPSU and other fraternal parties on cardinal problems of modern times and, in the end, have opposed to the general policy of the world Communist movement their own special line, in which the fundamental theses of the Declaration and Statement are revised from the standpoint of great-power chauvinism and petty-bourgeois adventurism.

The new assessments and conclusions made collectively by the fraternal parties on the basis of a creative application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions obtaining in our epoch—on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, on the need for combating the personality cult ideology and practices, and on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and in newly-free countries—are distorted and, to all intents and purposes, thrown overboard by the Chinese leadership.

Having to all intents and purposes rejected the Declaration and Statement collectively drawn up by the Communist and Workers' Parties, the CPC leaders offer the fraternal parties their own notorious "25-point programme", which, essentially, boils down to the renunciation of the ever growing influence of the socialist system on the course of world development, a disparaging attitude to the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, the setting of the national liberation movement off against the world system of socialism and the international working-class movement, adventurism in foreign policy and the preservation of the state of cold war, sectarianism and

putschism in questions of revolution, the defence and preservation of the personality cult methods and practices, which have been condemned by the Communist movement, and justification of the factional struggle in the Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have thus brought their disagreements with the Communist movement to such a stage where they have virtually developed into differences on all basic questions.

The participants in this Plenary Meeting know that the CC, CPSU, has on many occasions shown initiative in an effort to create the conditions for surmounting these differences, for normalising the relations of the CPC with the CPSU and other parties.

Like other Marxist-Leninist parties, we have repeatedly proposed to the CPC leadership that the public polemics be stopped. Such a proposal, in particular, was made in N. S. Khrushchov's speeches on October 25 and November 7, 1963. At the close of November 1963 the Central Committee of the CPSU sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China a letter in which a number of concrete proposals were made for eliminating differences and strengthening economic, scientific, technical and cultural cooperation between the USSR and the CPR. In that letter the CC, CPSU, once again proposed stopping the open polemics. You know, comrades, that during the past few months, acting in conformity with that proposal, the Soviet press has refrained from publishing any polemical material.

How did the Chinese leaders react to these steps? Blinded by nationalist arrogance, they paid no heed to the opinion and appeal of the fraternal parties. They rejected our initiative and took the road of open political struggle against the collectively worked out line of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Chinese press continuously publishes material containing the most flagrant attacks against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. In only the period after October 25, 1963, the *Jenminjihpao,* organ of the CC CPC, carried more then 200 articles of this nature. Slanderous articles are circulated throughout the world by Chinese organisations and broadcast over the radio in foreign languages; moreover, many anti-Soviet articles are broadcast several score times on end. Strange as it may seem, the indoctrination of the Chinese people in a spirit of hostility towards the USSR and the CPSU has now become almost the main aspect of the activity of the CC, CPC. A huge propaganda machine is now fully in gear preparing material slurring the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The general trend of Chinese propaganda and the brazenness of its attacks against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties are increasingly bringing it in line with the anti-Soviet, anti-communist organs of the reactionary imperialist circles.

As an example, let us take the article of a series of so-called "answers" to the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU, of July 14, 1963, published on February 4 by the newspaper *Jenminjihpao* and the magazine *Hung-*

chi. From first to last, this article, beginning with its heading. *The CPSU Leaders Are the Greatest Splitters of Our Times,* consists of foul anti-Soviet thrusts and slander against the CC CPSU and its leadership. It has nothing in common with the most elementary norms governing relations between Communists and is an insult to our entire Party, the whole Soviet people. This article contains such wild allegations as that our Party "in collusion with US imperialism, world reaction, the Tito clique of renegades and Right-wing Social-Democrats is waging a struggle against fraternal socialist countries, against fraternal parties, against all Marxists-Leninists and revolutionary peoples of the world".

Not very long ago Chinese propaganda aimed its attacks mainly at the CPSU's foreign policy, but now it openly attacks our home policy as well. The CPC leaders are doing their level best to discredit the line adopted at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU on all questions, proclaim the struggle against the Stalin cult a mistake and cast aspersion on the Programme of the CPSU.

Reviving the practices and methods used by Trotskyites, the Chinese leaders are trying to drive a wedge between the Soviet people, the Soviet Communists, on the one hand, and the Party leaders, the leadership of the country, on the other. Matters have reached a stage where the Chinese press and radio are calling upon Soviet people to oppose the CC, CPSU, and the Soviet Government.

What is this? A struggle for the "purity" of Marxism-Leninism? No. It signifies a complete renunciation of elementary norms of relations between Communist parties, a renunciation of Marxist-Leninist principles of relations between socialist countries, a transition to positions of undisguised anti-Sovietism.

The leaders of the CPC no longer limit themselves to action in the sphere of ideology. They have transferred ideological differences to inter-state relations, to the sphere of the practical political line of the socialist countries and the Communist parties. Seeking to weaken the unity and solidarity of the socialist commonwealth, the CPC leaders are resorting to all sorts of manoeuvres and dodges in order to undermine the economic and political relations between the socialist countries and disorganise their actions in the international arena. Recently the Chinese leaders have sharply intensified their splitting, undermining activities in the world Communist movement. There is now no longer any doubt that Peking is steering a course towards splitting the Communist parties, towards setting up factions and groups hostile to Marxism-Leninism.

Such, comrades, is the actual situation that has taken shape in the Communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the CPC leadership.

In an effort to screen their departure from Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese leaders have recently become more active in their manoeuvres, masking their objectives and designs and harping importunately on their "revolutionism", "courage", "determination" and so forth. But

the farther events develop, the more hysterical is the tone of Chinese propaganda and the more evident it is becoming that the real plans of the Chinese leadership have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, with the interests of world socialism. It is becoming increasingly clear that under the mask of ultra-revolutionary phrases and slogans, the CPC leadership are now savagely attacking the gains of world socialism, concentrating their main fire not against the imperialists but primarily against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

True, the Chinese leaders continue to talk a lot about their striving for unity and solidarity in the socialist commonwealth. But their deeds completely diverge from these words.

They harp on unity, but all their actions have a different purpose, that of disorganising and splitting the socialist camp, undermining the ideological foundations and organisational and political principles that rally and unite the peoples of the socialist commonwealth. They want to impose upon the socialist countries a "Sinified socialism", an adventurist line in foreign and domestic policy, and the personality cult ideology and practices.

The Chinese leaders keep harping on their desire to "strengthen" the international Communist movement, to "purge" it of "modern revisionism" and unite it on a "new foundation". But the real aim of the CPC leadership it to split the united Communist front, oppose the Communist movement with a bloc of pro-Chinese factions and groups, and subordinate the Communist parties to their influence, using all sorts of political apostates—renegades from communism, anarchists, Trotskyites and so on.

The Chinese leaders prattle about their being the most reliable and tested friends of the national-liberation movement. But whoever believes this will be sadly disillusioned. The aim of the CPC leadership is to impose their adventurist concepts and methods upon the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, to counterpose the peoples on racial grounds, and disrupt the alliance between the national liberation and the working-class movement, which can only disorganise and weaken the national liberation movement.

Lately the Chinese leaders have been claiming that they are the true champions of peace and consistent advocates of peaceful coexistence between states with different social and economic systems. But who will believe them? Their provocatory stand during the Caribbean crisis, their refusal to sign the Moscow partial test ban treaty, and their ceaseless efforts to slander the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union have shown the whole world their reluctance to work for relaxation of world tension and their desire to preserve the cold war as a suitable background for an adventurist policy.

All the arguments that the leaders of the CC, CPC, so eagerly put forward about the interests of the world revolution and about the liberation struggle of the peoples are, in effect, designed to screen from

world opinion, from Communists, the principal strategic line of subordinating at all costs the Communist and national-liberation movement to their great-power, egoistical interests. For the sake of this the principles of proletarian internationalism are being flagrantly trampled. To this end the Marxist-Leninist teaching is reshaped and distorted and use is made of the worst traditions of petty-bourgeois nationalism and the most unscrupulous demagogy and slander.

In view of the splitting stand taken by the CPC leadership and their increasing attempts to disorganise the international Communist and working-class movement there is a pressing need for a deeper analysis of what led the Chinese theoreticians astray and what the splitting activity of the CPC leadership may result in.

I

Two Approaches to the Problem of the Role of the World Socialist System

The radical changes that took place in the world after the Second World War are linked up chiefly with the rise and development of a world system of socialism. The countries of the socialist commonwealth are the main bulwark of all the revolutionary forces of modern times, a reliable champion of world peace. The struggle between world socialism and world imperialism is the principal content of our epoch, the pivot of the class struggle on a world scale.

There was a time when the Chinese leaders subscribed to this major proposition of Marxism-Leninism. Lately, however, the CPC leadership have been setting the national liberation movement off against the socialist system and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, proclaiming it as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and undermining the unity of the revolutionary forces of our time. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CC, CPC, makes the claim that the "vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America" are the centre of the contradictions of the modern world, the "storm—centre of the world revolution".

An editorial carried by *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on October 22, 1963, states: "The national liberation revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is now becoming the most important force that is dealing a direct blow at imperialism".

This clearly revises the Marxist teaching on the historical role of the working class and belittles the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries. As regards the world socialist system, the Chinese theoreticians apportion to it only the role of a "strong point" to support and develop the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples of the whole world. It goes without saying that this stand can only harm both the socialist system and the national liberation

movement, the great cause of the struggle of the international proletariat.

According to the views of the Chinese theoreticians, the world socialist system not only fails to exert an increasingly decisive influence on the entire course of world development but does not even play an independent role in the revolutionary struggle of the masses against imperialism.

This interpretation of the role and significance of the world socialist system does not conform with the actual balance of forces in the world and runs counter to the conclusions drawn by the fraternal parties in their Statement of 1960.

The idea that modern world development is based on the contradiction between socialism and capitalism belongs to Lenin. He wrote: "...the relations between peoples, the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. If we lose sight of that we shall be unable correctly to formulate a single national or colonial question, even if it concerned the most remote corner of the world. Only by proceeding from this standpoint can the communist parties correctly formulate and resolve political problems both in the civilised and in the backward countries" (*Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 216, Russ. ed.).

This was written during the early years of Soviet power. In our day, when instead of only one socialist country there is a mighty socialist camp, its influence on "the relations between peoples", on "the entire world system of states" and, in the final analysis, on the world revolutionary process has grown tremendously.

Attaching the utmost significance to the national liberation movement, Marxists-Leninists at the same time hold that the main content, the main trend and the main features of the historical development of human society in the modern epoch are determined by the world socialist system, by the forces struggling against imperialism, for the socialist reorganisation of society. The most organised class forces, primarily the bulk of the working class, the most advanced class of modern society which, as our teachers—Marx, Engels and Lenin—pointed out, is the grave-digger of capitalism, are concentrated precisely in this bridgehead.

The prime role in the world revolutionary process is played by the socialist countries. This is seen firstly in the fact that the working class, the working people of these countries, are successfully resolving social problems and building a new society where oppression and exploitation are unknown and for which the peoples are taking the road of revolution. By creating the material and technical basis of socialism and communism, the socialist countries are inflicting one blow after another on imperialism in the decisive sphere of human activity, in the sphere of material production. When the workers and

peasants in the capitalist countries see the achievements of the socialist states in economic development, in raising the standard of living, in promoting democracy and in drawing the masses into state administration they become convinced in practice that the basic requirements of working people can be satisfied only on the road of socialism. All this infuses the masses with a revolutionary spirit and helps to draw them into an active struggle against the capitalist system, for social and national liberation.

Secondly, the farther we progress the greater becomes the role of the socialist states as a force directly opposing the aggressive counter-revolutionary designs of imperialism. Under conditions where the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth holds the main forces of international reaction and aggression in check, the working masses and peoples of the colonial countries have the most favourable opportunity for waging a struggle against imperialism and internal reaction. Anyone who followed the development of international events in the post-war years could not fail to see that there is an extremely close link between the successes of the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries, the victories of the national liberation movement and the growth of the might of the world socialist system.

Victory over capitalism on a world scale can be achieved solely through the joint efforts of the world socialist system, the working class movement and the national liberation struggle of the peoples. Each of these forces makes its own contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. However, one cannot fail to see that the struggle of the world socialist system against imperialism is the focal point of world policy, of the whole of social development.

The Marxists-Leninists can have no doubt as to the primary, increasingly decisive role which the world socialist system plays, and has to play, in bringing about the triumph of the new social system all over the globe. The historical mission of the socialist countries is determined by the objective laws of social development, by the irrefutable fact that the countries in which socialism has triumphed are today in the van not only of the socialist forces, but of the progressive forces of the world. They are not only a beacon lighting up mankind's road to social progress but a powerful material force embodying Marxist-Leninist ideas, a force which is fighting capitalism and is bound to defeat it in the decisive sphere of human activity, the sphere of material production.

All the facts indicate that the socialist countries can within a historically short time surpass the capitalist countries economically as well. Let us recall that total industrial output in the socialist countries in 1962 was roughly eight times as great as it had been on their territory in 1937, whereas the capitalist countries registered only a 2.6-fold increase. The world socialist system has now attained a new stage in the economic competition with capitalism. In 1950 the socialist

countries' share in world industrial production was about one-fifth; today it exceeds one-third.

It is the internationalist duty of the Communists of the socialist countries to continue effectively building the new society, promoting their economy and strengthening their defences, consolidating the socialist community, and to strive to ensure that socialist ideas exercise an increasing appeal to the working people as they are translated into reality. Nowadays the merits of socialism are judged not only by theoretical writings, but, above all, by what is done in practice, by the way in which Communists actually solve the problems of building the new society. If we accomplish this task properly, we shall greatly promote the struggle for socialism in other countries, and if we don't, it will be a blow to that struggle.

What is the attitude of the CPC leadership towards Lenin's conclusion that socialist countries influence the development of the world revolution mainly by their economic achievements? Do the CPC leaders stand for peaceful economic competition?

The CPC leadership, misrepresenting the issue, argues that economic competition means that "the oppressed peoples and nations have no need at all to fight and to rise in revolt" and that "they have merely to wait quietly until the Soviet Union outstrips the most developed capitalist country in level of production and standard of living . . .".

It would never occur to a Marxist-Leninist, however, to affirm that peaceful economic competition "can take the place of the struggle of the peoples of different coutries for their emancipation", or that the achievements of socialism in economic competition will lead to the "automatic" collapse of capitalism and release the peoples from the necessity of waging class and national liberation struggles. Peking is putting about these false ideas with the express aim of discrediting the idea of economic competition between the two systems. The fact is that the Marxists-Leninists see the revolutionising effect of the victories of socialism in economic competition precisely in the fact that these victories stimulate the class struggle of the working people and make them politically conscious fighters for socialism. Peaceful economic competition, far from dooming the people to waiting passively, arouse their revolutionary activity. This is fully realised by the imperialists, who dread progress in the socialist countries and try to hold up that progress.

You will observe, comrades, that the issue of peaceful economic competition is far from being merely an economic issue. It also has profound political significance, for to defeat capitalism economically means making it much easier for all revolutionary forces to fight against imperialism. And this is a political issue.

Our Party regards it as its chief task to build up the economic and defence potential of the Soviet Union and the world socialist commonwealth as a whole, and to increase its influence on the entire revolutionary process. We shall continue steadily and consistently to press

forward our policy of carrying out the Programme of the CPSU for the construction of communism, the most just of social systems, in our country. Communist construction is a tremendous contribution to the fulfilment of the Soviet people's internationalist duty. This road was charted by the great Lenin. Nothing and no one can ever divert us from this Leninist road.

To win the economic competition with capitalism, the socialist countries must make proper use of the advantages of socialism, both in each country and throughout the world socialist system. In practice, this implies a considerable expansion of political as well as mutually beneficial economic relations between socialist countries, and the promotion of cultural, scientific and technical co-operation among them. It is in this direction that the activities of the CPSU and other fraternal parties have been developing.

By contrast, the Chinese leaders have in recent years shown that they have no interest in strengthening the unity of the world socialist system. The CPR has not only stopped co-ordinating its actions with other socialist countries, but is openly combating the agreed line of the socialist countries in the world arena. The Chinese leadership has openly set out to shake the foundations of the socialist community and to abolish economic relations with socialist countries, particularly with the countries affiliated with the Council for Mutual Economic Aid and above all the Soviet Union. In 1962 the CPR's trade with the Council countries decreased by 65 per cent compared with 1959, and in 1963 it dropped by almost another 20 per cent.

The Chinese leaders' propaganda shows that they are frankly bent on discrediting economic relations between the socialist countries belonging to CMEA; this evidently meets their disruptive aims. Trying to sow discord among the socialist countries, the Chinese leaders do not stop at using lies and slander dished up by imperialist propaganda. No sooner does the bourgeois press carry a falsehood about the Soviet Union or some other socialist country than Chinese propaganda seizes on the calumny.

The Communist parties of the socialist countries, in doing away with the consequences of the personality cult, have cleared the ground for closer relations between fraternal countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism. It is well known that a necessary condition for the development of the socialist system as a whole is to promote the independence and sovereignty of each socialist country. Failing this there can be no truly voluntary and solid union of nations. Fraternal parties reacted to the line adopted by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU as the only correct, Leninist direction in which to develop relations between the socialist countries.

The Chinese leaders do not like that line, however. All indications are that they would like to be able to give orders in the socialist commonwealth as in their own estate, to impose their will on other countries, and to dictate the terms on which they would either admit whole

parties and peoples into the socialist system or "excommunicate" them from it at will.

Take, for example, the CPC leaders' attitude towards Yugoslavia. As late as 1955—56 the Chinese leadership spoke highly of the progress of socialist construction in the FPRY. In the autumn of 1957, *Jenminjihpao* wrote, in an article devoted to Chinese—Yugoslav friendship: "The peoples of our countries are advancing along the socialist road." The same newspaper stated: "... Yugoslavia has made great progress in socialist construction." This was how people in China spoke of the nature of the socio-political system in Yugoslavia a mere five or six years ago. Today they say and write something entirely different about Yugoslavia. *Jenminjihpao* now alleges that in Yugoslavia "there exists a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; indeed, it not only exists but is the most barbarous fascist dictatorship," and that Yugoslavia is a "counter-revolutionary special force of US imperialism ..."

The question arises: what has happened in Yugoslavia? What facts, what actual developments in the socio-economic and political life of that country, have entitled Chinese theoreticians to reverse their estimations so abruptly? There are no such facts or developments, and there haven't been any. Anyone who proceeds not from a subjective standpoint, but from objective laws, from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, must admit that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that, moreover, the positions of socialism are growing stronger in Yugoslavia. Indeed, while in 1958 the socialist sector comprised 100 per cent in industry, 6 per cent in agriculture and 97 per cent in trade, today, a few years after the Chinese press praised Yugoslavia's achievements in socialist construction, the socialist sector is still 100 per cent in the country's industry, as much as 15 per cent (instead of 6 per cent) in agriculture and 100 per cent (instead of 97 per cent) in trade. All these fact go to show that the Yugoslav economy is developing as a socialist economy.

Anyone who does not take white for black but looks at things objectively, is bound to see that Yugoslavia supports the socialist countries' fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the CPR in the UN, and so on.

Why, then, do the Chinese leaders shut their eyes to all these facts? Why do they now insult the heroic Yugoslav people by calling Yugoslavia a fascist country? We have put this question to the Chinese leaders on more than one occasion but have never heard from them anything like a coherent answer.

The Chinese leaders quote the 1960 Statement of fraternal parties, which said that the revolutionary gains in Yugoslavia were imperilled by the errors of the LCY. Let us note, however, that from what the Statement says, it did not deny even then but, on the contrary, confirmed the existence of definite revolutionary, socialist achievements in Yugoslavia and that, secondly, later years showed the positions of

socialism to have become much stronger in Yugoslavia, a development which we certainly welcome.

While striving to improve relations with Yugoslavia, and being firmly convinced that this meets the interests of the socialist cause, we Soviet Communists do not at all conceal the ideological differences which exist between the Communist movement and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. We have said as much to the Yugoslav comrades. But we maintain that the existence of differences is by no means a reason for "excommunicating" Yugoslavia from socialism. One cannot arbitrarily, acting on a subjective impulse and, furthermore, doctoring and distorting the facts, permit or forbid this or that people to build socialism. And yet this is precisely what the Chinese leaders are trying to do.

The Yugoslav example brings out with particular clarity the Chinese leaders' claim to the role of "supreme arbiters" of relations between the socialist countries who should judge which country is socialist and which isn't. Today they have, in defiance of the facts, "excommunicated" Yugoslavia from socialism. Tomorrow it may occur to the CPC leadership to do the same with regard to other socialist countries. But what has this subjectivist and arbitrary approach to do with Marxism-Leninism? This is a method fit only for those who set at nothing the interests of the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries.

Or take the so-called Albanian question, of which the CC membership and our Party as a whole have been repeatedly informed. It is well known that from 1960 on, the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labour abruptly changed their political line, although we did not give them any cause to do so, and embarked on hostile actions against the CPSU and other fraternal parties. The government of the People's Republic of Albania has virtually broken off political, economic and military co-operation with the Soviet Union and most of the other socialist countries.

It was hard to see at first what had prompted Hoxha's and Shehu's anti-Soviet moves. But as time went on it became more and more obvious that the Albanian leaders were taking their cue from someone else, for they repeated word for word what was said or written in Peking.

The Sino-Albanian alliance is no accidental development. It arose on the basis of opposition to the Leninist line of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, on the basis of a hostile attitude towards the elimination of the consequences of the Stalin personality cult. Just as in the case of China, the Albanian leaders' defence of the personality cult is due to the fact that over many years they have themselves been implanting the personality cult and using pernicious methods of leadership in Party and country.

At the Third Congress of the APL, in 1956, the Albanian leaders, finding themselves under pressure from the Party membership, who after the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU had demanded that the suf-

focating atmosphere of the personality cult be removed and the Leninist standards of Party life re-established in the APL, had to admit publicly that the personality cult in the APL had become "sharply pronounced". But this "admission" and the promise to end the personality cult were no more than a stratagem. As a matter of fact, the Albanian leaders had no intention at all of renouncing their harmful practices. Just when Hoxha was doing "self-criticism" from the rostrum of the Third Congress, the Albanian police was busy putting in jail or sending into exile members of the Tirana Party organisation who at the city Party conference had criticised the Albanian leaders for violating the Leninist standards of Party life, for arbitrary practices and for the persecution of honest Communists.

Hoxha and Shehu combated the line of the Twentieth Congress because they were afraid of losing their posts, because the establishment of the Leninist standards of Party life in the APL would have ended their arbitrary rule. The Albanian leaders, in taking an anti-Soviet road, put their people in a trying position. They created in Albania difficulties that would have been out of the question given normal cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Soviet people are confident that in spite of the present difficulties in Soviet-Albanian relations, caused by the policy of the Albanian top leaders, the peoples of our two countries will advance together to the common goal, the triumph of socialism and communism. As far as the CPSU is concerned, we are willing, as in the past, to take all necessary steps in this direction.

The CPSU regards it as one of its major tasks to work for the close unity of the world socialist system, for close fraternal relations with all the socialist countries on the basis of complete equality and voluntary cooperation, for the increased solidarity of the socialist countries with the aim of waging a joint struggle against the imperialist aggressors, for world peace, for the complete triumph of communism.

II

Questions of War, Peace and Revolution

Comrades, the fortunes of our great cause, and of the peoples, depend in decisive measure on the Communist movement employing the correct strategy and tactics on questions of war, peace and revolution. It is particularly important to take account of the interconnection and interdependence of these questions today, for never before have the revolutionary achievements of each particular country been so directly bound up with the development of the international situation as a whole, with the world revolutionary process.

The Marxist-Leninist parties see their consistent struggle for peace as fulfilment of their historical responsibility to mankind, which is to prevent the extermination of peoples in the flames of a thermonuclear

war. Furthermore, they see it as a most important condition for the successful construction of socialism and communism and for the expansion of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the capitalist countries and of the liberation movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

An all-round analysis of the balance of world forces enabled the Communist and Workers' parties to draw the cardinal conclusion that world war can be averted even before socialism triumphs throughout the world, and to re-emphasise that the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is the unshakable basis for the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

As we know, these propositions were laid down in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement adopted in Moscow. The experience of recent years, far from shaking belief in the vital necessity of the policy of peaceful coexistence, has, in fact, fully borne it out. It is due to the socialist countries' consistent implementation of this policy, which is supported by hundreds of millions of people all over the world, that we have been able to foil the imperialist reactionaries' schemes against peace. The blessings of peace which mankind enjoys today do not come from the gods. They are a concrete result of the staunch resistance of the peace forces to attempts to unleash a thermonuclear war, a result of the growing power of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as of the correct policy of the Communist parties, which have raised aloft the banner of the struggle for peace and rallied the whole of progressive mankind to this banner.

The Chinese leaders, who engaged first in a controversy with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and then in a political fight against them, showed especial zeal in attacking the conclusions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the theses of the Moscow meeting of fraternal parties on questions of war, peace and revolution. They imagined that it was on these points that they would be able to make political capital, and with this aim in view they accused the entire Communist movement of "losing sight of the revolutionary perspective" and "surrendering to imperialism".

To impart at least a semblance of veracity to their infamous charges, the Chinese theoreticians resort to a device that is neither clever nor new. Artifically separating two aspects of a single social process from each other, they contrast the fight for peace to the revolutionary movement, and claim that these two highly important tasks are mutually exclusive. From what they allege it follows that those who fight to maintain peace and ward off world war are against revolution and hamper the revolutionary struggle.

One does not require a special Marxist education to see that the CPC leaders, who pose as grandmasters of dialectics, have in fact killed dialectics, which Lenin described as the "living soul" of Marxism. The Communist parties, which hold aloft the banner of the struggle for peace, are with increasing energy stepping up the class struggle of

the proletariat and all working people, and the national liberation movement against imperialism.

In their fight against the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, which they counter with the idea of giving revolution a "push" by means of war, the CPC leaders have gone as far as to assert that war is an acceptable and, in fact, the only means of settling the contradictions between capitalism and socialism. They ignore the experience of the world Communist movement and exalt the road of the victorious revolution in China as something absolute, trying to make it an incontrovertible truth for all countries and peoples. On every occasion, whether suitable or not, Chinese propaganda quotes what Mao Tse-tung said about war and peace in the thirties, during the civil war in China.

Among the widely popularised statements of Mao Tse-tung are the following: "the war to be waged by the overwhelming majority of mankind . . . will become a bridge over which mankind will pass into a new era in history", "the world can only be reorganised by means of the rifle"; "we stand for abolishing war, we have no use for it, but war can only be abolished through war. If you want rifles to go out of existence, take to the rifle."

Almost three decades have passed since those statements were made. Radical changes have occurred in the world—the world socialist system has formed and has become a mighty force, the revolutionary movement of the working class has assumed a mass scale, and the national-liberation movement has scored historic victories. Today the alliance of the peace forces can, as the documents of Communist parties point out, overcome the forces of imperialism and prevent them from launching a new world war. The prevention of war has become a particularly pressing task because the most destructive weapon recorded in history has been created and has been stockpiled in quantities that can bring untold calamities to all nations.

The Chinese leaders refuse to take all that into consideration. Plainly showing off their irresponsible attitude, they affirm that the nuclear bomb is a "paper tiger" and in no way affects the issue of war and peace. In keeping with this logic, which runs counter to elementary common sense, Mao Tse-tung, speaking at the Moscow meeting in 1957, argued that the struggle for socialism even stood to gain from a world thermonuclear war. "Can one foresee," he said, "the number of human lives that the future war may take? It may be one-third of the 2,700 million inhabitants of the world, that is, a mere 900 million people . . . I had an argument over this matter with Nehru. He is more pessimistic in this respect than I. I told him that should half of mankind be destroyed, the other half would survive; in return, imperialism would be wiped out completely and there would be only socialism in the world. In half a century or a whole century the population would grow again—even by more than half."

This concept is even more lucidly expressed in the collection of articles *Long Live Leninism!*, which the CC, CPC, has approved and is

circulating. "On the ruins of fallen imperialism," it says, "the victorious people will build a thousand times more wonderful future at an extremely rapid rate." That is the kind of ultra-revolutionary verbiage, complete political irresponsibility that is particularly dangerous because it is being demonstrated by people standing at the helm of a large socialist country.

It is common knowledge that Lenin pointed out as far back as 1918 that a world war in which the mighty achievements of technology are used with such great energy for the mass extermination of human life, apart from being a major crime, can also lead "to the undermining of the very foundations of human society" (*Works,* vol. 27, p. 386). In our days, with the production and the development of nuclear missile weapons, this danger has increased still more. How can people, particularly the adherents of the communist teaching, ignore this fact?

Neither the socialist countries nor the working people want a world war; it cannot serve the cause of the triumph of socialism. The conclusions drawn by specialists on the possible consequences of another world war are quite unambiguous. For example, the progressive American scientist Linus Pauling gives figures to show that within 60 days after the outbreak of a nuclear war out of 190 million Americans 170 million would perish, 15 million would suffer greatly and only five million would remain relatively unharmed. The situation in other regions drawn directly into the sphere of military operations would evidently be the same. Moreover, account must also be taken of such delayed consequences of a nuclear war as the disorganisation of society due to the destruction of key industrial centres and of the means of transport and communication, and increasing radioactive pollution. Without mincing words, one can say that if a world thermonuclear conflict breaks out it would be the greatest tragedy for humanity and would, of course, deal the cause of communism a heavy blow.

No party that really cherishes the interests of the people can fail to appreciate its responsibility in the struggle for averting another world war. Yet the Chinese leaders, as we have seen, even boast that, allegedly for "the sake of the revolution", they are prepared to agree to the destruction of half of mankind. It does not worry them in the least that the losses in densely-populated countries that would find themselves in the centre of military operations would be so great that for entire peoples there would no longer be any question of the triumph of socialism because they would have disappeared from the face of the earth.

Here it would be appropriate to recall certain facts. When in a conversation with Tao Chu, member of the CC, CPC, a Czechoslovak journalist mentioned that in the event of a thermonuclear war the whole of Czechoslovakia, where 14 million people live, might be destroyed, the answer he received was: "In the event of a war of annihilation the small countries in the socialist camp will have to subordinate their interests to the common interests of the camp as a whole." Another

well-known CPR official told Soviet representatives that Comrade Togliatti, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, was wrong when, expressing anxiety for the fate of his people, he said that if a thermonuclear war broke out the whole of Italy would be destroyed. "Other people will remain," declared this official, "and imperialism will be wiped out . . .".

In an effort to disprove the conclusion of the international communist movement concerning the possibility of averting war, in Peking it is alleged that in pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence the CPSU and other fraternal parties proceed from the assumption that the nature of imperialism has changed, base all their calculations on the "peace-loving and humane nature of the imperialists", and "appeal and beg for" peace from them. On the other hand, the CPC leaders, it is claimed, are waging a determined and relentless struggle against imperialism and exposing its aggressive nature.

But these crude falsifications and distortions can fool no one. The attempts to portray Marxists-Leninists as some kind of pacifists are simply ludicrous. In the 1957 Declaration it is recorded that as long as imperialism exists there will always be the soil for aggressive wars. From this, however, the Communist parties did not draw the conclusion that world war is fatally inevitable. They showed that while the nature of imperialism, its rapacious essence, remains unchanged, there has been a change in the balance of forces in the world, that the place and role of imperialism in the world economy and world politics are not what they were, and that its influence on the course of events is diminishing. All this forces the imperialists to accept peaceful co-existence.

Consequently, it is not that the imperialists have become "peace-loving" or more "tractable," but that they have no alternative but to take the growing strength of socialism into account. They are aware that the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, possess a formidable weapon and are able to deal any aggressor a crushing blow. They cannot help but take into account the strength of the mighty working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist countries, and the huge scale of the national liberation struggle of the peoples. The fact that capitalism will be wiped out and buried if the imperialist madmen unleash a world war is being more and more clearly apprehended in the camp of our class enemies.

The possibility of averting war, the threat of which remains as long as imperialism exists, does not arise of itself. It requires that the peace-loving forces display the greatest energy in the struggle for peace and show the greatest vigilance with regard to the intrigues of its enemies. It depends to a vast extent on the policy of the socialist countries, on their defensive might, on the unswerving implementation of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence. That is exactly the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist

countries that firmly adhere to the positions proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties.

However, it is precisely against this, the only sensible policy, that the Chinese leaders have declared war. Having their own special objectives in mind, they are trying to discredit the principles of peaceful coexistence, assuring the peoples that their efforts to preserve peace are futile. Strange as it may seem, the Chinese leaders have proclaimed this point of view optimistic.

In *Long Live Leninism!* it is asserted: "Wars of one kind or another may break out as long as an end is not put to the imperialist system and the exploiter classes." "Naturally, whether or not the imperialists in the end start a war does not depend upon us for we are not the chiefs of their general staffs." At the Peking session of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC CPC, said: "The assertions about the possibility of peaceful coexistence only make the imperialists happy." At the World Peace Council session in Stockholm in December 1961, the same Liu Ning-yi made himself more plain: "Those who think agreement can be reached with the imperialists and peaceful coexistence ensured only delude themselves." It is not difficult to notice that one and the same importunate and gloomy refrain that "war cannot be averted" is repeated in all these statements.

The opposition of the Chinese leaders to the policy of peaceful coexistence is closely tied up with their stand on the question of disarmament, on international negotiations between the socialist countries and the Western powers. They regard disarmament as an "illusion, an unrealisable slogan" that can only mislead the peoples. For example, speaking at the Peking session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in 1960 Liu Chang-sheng, member of the CC, CPC, declared: "Some people think that the disarmament proposal can be carried into effect while imperialism exists. That is an illusion that has nothing to do with reality . . . A world without wars and without arms is possible only in an epoch when socialism triumphs throughout the world."

It is not hard to see in these statements the desire of the Chinese leaders to distort the clear stand of the CPSU and of all the Marxist-Leninist parties and at the same time to undermine the policy of disarmament which is an important condition in the struggle for the prevention of a new world war and for a relaxation of international tensions.

It is absurd to assert that our Party entertains any illusions concerning the military policy of the imperialist powers and their readiness to agree to general and complete disarmament. As long as imperialism exists, the reactionary forces will clutch at armaments as a last resort to retain their domination, and will use these armaments in wars, if they manage to unleash them. All this is quite obvious.

Does this, however, mean that the Communists should drop the struggle for disarmament and admit the inevitability of the arms race and of a new world war? No, such a passive stand would be contradictory to the entire revolutionary spirit of our teaching and to the vital interests of the peoples.

We are convinced that the revolutionary struggle of the working people, the general democratic upsurge, the growing might of socialism and the resolute actions of all the peaceloving forces can and should force the imperialists to comply, contrary to their desire, with the peoples' demands for disarmament. We are not fatalists, we believe in the tremendous capacities of the popular masses. Already 70 years ago Frederick Engels called upon the Communists to fight for disarmament, and this at a time when capitalism held undivided sway in the world.

"It is 25 years already that all Europe has been arming on an unprecedented scale. Each great power endeavours to outstrip the other in military might and preparedness for war. Germany, France and Russia do their utmost to surpass one another," wrote Engels in a series of articles entitled "Can Europe Disarm?" "Is it not foolish to talk of disarmament under such circumstances?" he asked, and replied: "I maintain: *disarmament, and hence a guarantee for peace, is possible*" (Works, Ed. 2, Vol. 22, p. 387. Russ. Ed.).

That is how Engels put the question! Already in those days he saw the vast social forces rising against war. How, then, can one speak of disarmament as of an "unrealisable illusion" today when all progressive mankind is coming out for disarmament and when the forces of peace have the mighty support of the socialist countries?

The slogan "A World Without Arms, A World Without Wars" — is for the Communist parties a mighty means of uniting and mobilising the popular masses for an active struggle against the inveterate militarist imperialist circles. This slogan is clear to every man, regardless of his political convictions. Disarmament means ending the arms race and, consequently, reducing the tax burden. It conforms to the vital interests of the broadest sections of the population. Not only the Communists, but also many other social forces actively support and propagate this slogan. Then why should we, Communists, discard it? Is it not clear that rejecting this slogan could only weaken the influence of the Communists among the masses, and that this would play into the hands of the reactionary forces.

Are the Chinese leaders so naive as not to realise where their strange logic leads them and how grave a responsibility they are assuming before the peoples of the world by advancing such reckless theses fraught with the direst consequences?

The Chinese leaders not only take a negative stand on such vitally important questions of international policy as disarmament, termination of nuclear weapon tests and relaxation of international tension,

but also try to paralyse the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries fighting against the threat of world war.

The facts show that time and again the CPR Government has acted in the world arena as a force opposing the peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries and disorganising the common anti-war front, that time and again when the world was faced with an acute situation in which unity of action among the socialist countries and all peace-loving forces was particularly imperative, the Chinese leaders became active. But against whom? Against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries seeking a relaxation of tension. Moreover, it has been noted that Peking could not conceal its chagrin and annoyance every time the situation was normalised and a military conflict avoided. That was the case, for example, during the Caribbean crisis. The CPC leadership did nothing to help avert a world war and effectively support revolutionary Cuba. They did nothing to support the defensive measures of the Warsaw Treaty powers, adopted to meet possible imperialist aggression, and said nothing about China siding with the socialist countries in the event of a US attack against Cuba. It was quite evident that at a time when the Soviet Union was prepared to defend the Cuban revolution with all the means at its disposal, the Chinese leaders strove to benefit from the crisis in the Caribbean region.

It is a fact that when the Caribbean crisis was at its height the CPR Government extended the armed conflict on the Sino-Indian frontier. No matter how hard the Chinese leaders try belatedly to justify their behaviour at the time they cannot escape the responsibility for the fact that by their actions they essentially helped the extreme reactionary circles of imperialism, thereby aggravating an already complicated and dangerous situation in the world.

The Sino-Indian conflict arose over the possession of frontier territories in the Himalayas which had not been disputed either by China or India in the course of many centuries. However, inasmuch as this problem did arise, everything should have been done to settle it peacefully, by negotiation. The Government of the USSR has repeatedly advocated such a settlement of this frontier dispute. Hostilities broke out in the region of the Himalayas. The disastrous consequences of this conflict are now fully evident. It has rendered a great service to imperialism and caused great harm to the national-liberation movement, the progressive forces of India and the entire front of the anti-imperialist struggle. Utilising the Sino-Indian conflict for their own purposes, the imperialists and their supporters are seeking to undermine the trust of the peoples of the young national states in the socialist countries, to draw India into military blocs and strengthen the positions of the ultra-reactionary forces in that country.

While allowing relations with India, which as everybody knows is not a member of military blocs, to deteriorate sharply, the Chinese leadership at the same time actually leagued together with Pakistan,

a member of Seato and Cento, which threaten the peace and security of the Asian peoples. It is a fact that having discarded their "revolutionary phrase-mongering", the Chinese leaders have in effect adopted a line that can hardly be dovetailed with the principled position of the countries of the socialist commonwealth with regard to imperialist blocs.

The approach of the Chinese leaders to the choice of friends and allies is strange, to say the least. How is it possible, it may be asked, to fling mud at the socialist countries, at the Communist parties and, at the same time, with the whole world watching, shower compliments on the reactionary regime in Pakistan? That is simply incomprehensible.

Can anyone believe that the rapprochement with Pakistan has been dictated by the interests of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia against imperialism that the Chinese leaders talk so much about?

The dangerous, adventurist views and propositions on questions of war and peace that the CPC leaders seek to impose upon the fraternal parties have quite understandably been categorically rejected by the international Communist movement and broad circles of progressive world opinion.

Not only Marxists-Leninists but also all friends of socialism and peace noted with alarm that the "bellicose" outpourings from Peking practically border on direct justification and even lauding of war as a means of settling social conflicts.

Hysterically attacking the Moscow partial test ban treaty of July 31, 1963 and thereby finding themselves aligned with the most aggressive circles of imperialism, the Chinese leaders still further exposed themselves as opponents of the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The enemies rejoiced over their actions and friends could not but condemn them.

The Chinese leaders realized that they had gone too far and in order to extricate themselves from this situation they made a complete volte-face in their propaganda. Lately a stream of "peace-loving" statements has suddenly gushed from Peking, while representatives of the Chinese government are hastening to sign documents concerning the struggle for peace and fidelity to the policy of peaceful coexistence. Such was the tenor of many of the statements made by Chou En-lai during his tour in Africa and Asia.

"World war cannot be averted," they were saying plainly in Peking only yesterday. Today they are trying to persuade people to believe that the thesis that war can be averted was put forward by none other than the leaders of the CPC. Yesterday they abused peaceful coexistence, today they are posing as practically its only and most zealous supporters. Yesterday they declared that disarmament was a deception of the peoples, today they sign statements in which they undertake to work for disarmament.

This volte-face could only be welcomed if there were signs that

the CPC leadership really realizes its mistakes and is taking a correct stand. Unfortunately everything points to the fact that the aims and objectives of the Chinese leaders have not changed. Their "love of peace" is nothing but a screen masking their real intentions, which have received a rebuff and been censured by world public opinion. One cannot fail to see that the "love of peace" now emanating from Peking is in glaring contrast to the actual deeds, to the concrete policy of the Government of the CPR.

The obviously adventurist position of the CPC leaders makes itself felt in their attitude to the question of nuclear weapons.

It is well known that the CPC leaders insistently sought to obtain the atomic bomb from the Soviet Union. They expressed their deep mortification when our country did not give them samples of nuclear weapons.

The CC, CPSU and the Soviet Government have already explained why we consider it inexpedient to help China produce nuclear weapons. The inevitable reaction to this would be the nuclear arming of powers of the imperialist camp, in particular, West Germany and Japan. Having a higher level of economic, scientific and technological development they could undoubtedly produce more bombs than China and build up a nuclear potential much faster. It should be borne in mind that revanchist aspirations are particularly strong in these countries. These are the countries which in the past were the main hotbeds of military threats and militarism.

The Soviet Union's atomic weapon is a reliable guarantee of the defence not only of our country but also of the entire socialist camp, including China. The leaders of the CPC are well aware of this fact. Nonetheless, they want to acquire the nuclear weapon at all costs. Very indicative in this respect is the interview given to Japanese journalists in October 1963 by Chen Yi, member of the Politbureau of the CC, CPC, and Deputy Premier of the CPR. Saying that China would create her own nuclear weapon whatever the price, he declared, as was reported in the Japanese press, that possibly it would take China several years and perhaps even longer than that to begin the mass production of the bomb. But China, he said, would produce the most modern weapon even if it would cost them their last shirt. And several days later a statement by a Chinese government spokesman, published in *Jenminjihpao,* stated that China would adhere to this line "even if the Chinese people will not be able to create the atom bomb in a hundred years . . .".

It thus turns out that possession of the atom bomb, which the Chinese leaders call a "paper tiger", is their cherished goal.

In a fit of anger, the CPC leaders went so far as to say that the threat of a nuclear war comes not from imperialism but from the "modern revisionists", unambiguously hinting at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In a speech in Pjongyang on September 18, 1963, Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the CPR, stated: "Imperialism did not

use the nuclear weapon everywhere and at will and would not dare to do so." He followed this up with the wild assertion that "in agreement with the imperialists" the Soviet Union "has monopolised the nuclear weapon" and organises "nuclear blackmail with regard to the peoples of the socialist countries and the revolutionary peoples of the whole world". If the "modern revisionists," he pathetically exclaimed, "go so far as to use the nuclear weapon first and will thereby provoke a nuclear world war, they will earn the stern condemnation of the peoples of the whole world."

What touching concern Liu Shao-chi shows to lull suspicion that the imperialists have any intention of unleashing a nuclear war. After this, is it not hypocrisy on the part of the CPC leadership to call for an "adherence to the class approach", for "distinguishing friend from foe", for a struggle against US imperialism as the chief enemy of peace? In this connection one cannot help but recall the treacherous rule of bourgeois diplomacy, which Palmerston expounded as "We have neither eternal allies nor eternal friends. Only our interests are eternal." All this shows how little significance the Chinese leaders attach to their own statements concerning the aggressive nature of imperialism and their uncompromising attitude to class enemies.

The following example of the discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and do must also be pointed out. This concerns the relations between the socialist countries and the countries of the capitalist world. Here the Chinese leaders have two yardsticks—one for appraising the policy of the USSR and other socialist countries and the other for assessing China's foreign policy. Everyone knows the sharply negative reaction of the Chinese leaders to the efforts the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are making to normalise and improve economic and other relations with the capitalist countries, including the United States of America. Why, one involuntarily asks, does any normalisation of relations between the USSR and the USA, the two great nuclear powers on whose efforts a relaxation of international tension largely depends, evoke such opposition from the Chinese government? With a persistence worthy of better application, the Chinese leaders are doing their utmost to hinder an improvement of US-Soviet relations, portraying it as a "conspiracy with the imperialists". At the same time the CPR Government is making feverish efforts to establish better relations with Britain, France, Japan, West Germany and Italy. All the indications are that they would not be averse to an improvement in relations with the USA if the opportunity presented itself.

Never before has Peking received so many businessmen, political leaders and statesmen from the capitalist countries as now. CPR representatives have talks with them and sign agreements on trade, credits, scientific and technical aid and even on political issues.

Do we want to reproach the CPC leaders for this activity? Of course not. It is a normal and intrinsic element of the policy of peaceful co-

existence. All socialist countries ultimately have to have contacts with people from the bourgeois states and not only with friends but also with representatives of the ruling imperialist circles. But the thing is that the Chinese leaders consider that when they themselves develop such activity it is an expression of the policy of real "revolutionaries", but when other socialist states do the same thing it is "revisionism" and "treachery".

But the attempts to slander our peace-loving foreign policy will inevitably collapse. Our Party shall continue to wage a struggle to avert a world thermonuclear war, secure lasting world peace and steadfastly pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. Our peaceful policy, Lenin said, is approved by the overwhelming majority of the world's population. Peace helps to strengthen socialism. The working people of all countries, of all continents desire peace. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has won deserved glory as the banner-bearer of peace and shall always remain faithful to this banner.

The course of events has shown that the programme of struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism drawn up by the Moscow Meetings is the programme which closely links up the immediate and ultimate goals of the working class and ensures the advance of the world revolution.

At the same time, far from facilitating the development of the world revolutionary process, the theoretical platform and, chiefly, the practical activity of the CPC leadership create additional difficulties for the realisation of the age-old aspirations of the peoples, who are hungering for peace and social progress.

It is absurd to oppose the struggle for peace, for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, to the revolutionary class struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples. For Marxists-Leninists there neither is nor can there be a dilemma of whether to wage a struggle for peace or a revolutionary struggle. The two are inter-related and are, in the final analysis, spearheaded against imperialism. The struggle for peace is one of the main forms of the struggle of the peoples against imperialism, against the new wars being prepared by it, against the aggressive acts of the imperialists in the colonial countries, against the military bases of the imperialists on the territory of other countries, against the arms race, and so on. Surely this struggle expresses the vital interests of the working class and all working people.

We know that peace is a true ally of socialism. The situation created by peaceful coexistence also favourably influences the development of the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries.

The working class movement has made particularly great headway in recent years. Experience shows that in many countries the struggle

of the working class for democratic and social rights is closely intertwined with the struggle for peace and against the forces of militarism. In the struggle against militarism a political complexion is imparted even to the economic actions of the working class. The efforts of the working class and all working people to avert the threat of another world war help to educate the peoples in a spirit of international solidarity because under present-day conditions the struggle for peace is, as never before, essentially an international struggle.

What, for example, does it mean to work for peace in a country like the Federal Republic of Germany? It means, first and foremost, active opposition to the big monopolies, which are hatching ideas of revenge, opposition to their offensive against the vital rights and political freedoms of the working people. By participating in this struggle, the revolutionary working class, far from "dissolving" in the mass democratic movement, as the Chinese leaders maintain, gets a schooling in revolutionary organisation and discipline, unites its ranks and wins greater influence among the masses.

Naturally, being a general democratic movement the struggle for peace neither sets itself nor can set itself the task of effecting socialist changes. This, incidentally, is what the CPC leaders, who are trying to foist on the peace movement tasks alien to it, fail to understand. But the struggle for peace is furthering the cause of socialism inasmuch as it is waged against imperialism, the source of the war threat, inasmuch as it is helping the masses better to understand what are their vital interests.

The repudiation of this extremely close bond between the struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism reveals in effect the utter lack of confidence of the CPC leaders in the popular masses, in their ability to take organised action in the class struggle. The essence of the CPC leadership's present concepts regarding revolution lies in rejection of the Leninist precept that the socialist revolution is the result of the mass struggle, in relying solely on armed uprisings everywhere and in all cases, without taking into account the sentiments of the masses, their preparedness for revolution, without taking into account the internal and external situation.

The immense harm of this line lies in the fact that it rejects painstaking and patient work with the masses and reliance on the maturing of the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist revolution in favour of revolutionary phrase-mongering, or, what is still worse, in favour of adventurist actions by a handful of men who have no ties with the people. What has this kind of action in common with Marxism-Leninism? Is this not the propagation of Blanquist and Trotskyite ideas that have been rejected long ago?

No matter what the CPC leaders say to the contrary, one of the pivotal points of the polemics in the Communist movement is the problem of "the ways of carrying out the revolution" and not the dilemma of "whether to carry or not to carry on the revolution". If the

Communist parties pin all their hopes solely on an armed struggle without taking into consideration whether the masses are prepared to support such a struggle this will inevitably lead only to bitter failures.

In other words, the Chinese leaders have forgotten one of the prime propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory, namely that the revolution cannot be accelerated or made to order, that it cannot be given a push from without. "Some people," Lenin said, "think that revolution in a foreign country can be made to order, by agreement. People who think so are either madmen or provocateurs" *(Collected Works,* Vol. 27, p. 441, Russ. ed.). Revolution is made by the masses headed by the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard. Naturally, this does not in any way imply that Marxists-Leninists must passively wait for a favourable situation to arise. The experience of the CPSU shows that even a relatively small, steeled party that has the support of the proletariat and the advanced section of the peasantry can head the revolution and lead the people. But for this, as Lenin repeatedly emphasised, there must be a revolutionary situation in which the "upper strata" are no longer able to rule and the "lower strata" no longer want to live the old way.

Realistically assessing the present situation, the fraternal parties allow for the possibility of transition from capitalism to socialism either by peaceful or non-peaceful means.

However, no matter how the transition from capitalism to socialism is achieved, it is possible only through a socialist revolution, through a dictatorship of the proletariat in its various forms. In each given country the actual possibility for a peaceful or non-peaceful transition to socialism is determined by concrete historical conditions. The fraternal parties in the capitalist countries are invariably guided by Lenin's proposition that the working class must master all forms and means of revolutionary struggle without exception, that it must be ready to pass from one form of struggle to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner and to utilise it in conformity with the concrete situation. But the Chinese leaders oppose this creative approach to questions of tactics by the fraternal parties and attempt to instruct them from Peking on how and when to carry out a revolution in their countries. Quite understandably these "instructions" are meeting with a unanimous rebuff from Marxists-Leninists.

Our Party has always unswervingly adhered to positions of proletarian internationalism. No slander and no foul fabrications can smear the banner of proletarian internationalism which is sacred to us. Our Party will continue tirelessly to strengthen its solidarity with the working class, with the working masses of the capitalist countries who are struggling to destroy the capitalist system and to reshape society on socialist lines. This road was charted for us by Lenin and we shall steadfastly follow it.

III

The CPC Leaders' Policy of Isolating the National-Liberation Movement from the International Working Class

The Chinese leaders pin special hopes on using the national-liberation movement for their own ends.

The collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and the tasks and prospects of the newly-free countries constitute one of the cardinal problems of the social progress of all mankind. Imperialism and internal reaction are trying to stop the development of national-liberation revolutions and to push the newly-free countries into the trap of neo-colonialism. The progressive democratic forces are fighting for complete national freedom, for the transition to the non-capitalist path of development. The historical destinies of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people depend on the outcome of this struggle.

The Communist parties of the world, after generalising at their international conferences the vast experience of the anti-imperialist movement, put forward a clear-cut programme of action to promote the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for complete national and social liberation.

The Chinese leaders countered this Marxist-Leninist programme with a policy of their own, and are trying to impose upon the national-liberation movement principles which may push it on to a perilous path and endanger the achievements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is particularly typical of the Chinese leaders that they completely ignore the immense variety of conditions in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is well known that these countries are at different levels of socio-economic and political development. One group of countries has already taken the socialist road. Another group has won political independence and set about effecting radical social reforms. A third group of countries, where the national bourgeoisie has come to power, adheres on the whole to an anti-imperialist position. Then there are the countries which, although they have formally won political indepedence, actually are not independent because of the puppet regimes set up in them or because of their participation in imperialist blocs. Lastly, there are countries where colonial regimes remain and whose peoples are waging a heroic struggle for their freedom.

It is obvious to the Marxists-Leninists that the peoples of each of those groups of countries are faced with different tasks. The Chinese leaders, however, are trying to impose the same stereotyped patterns and methods of struggle on the Communist parties and all progressive forces. This is particularly evident from what they contend to be the main tasks of the national-liberation movement at the present stage.

Marxists-Leninists consider that the main tasks of the former colonies where an end has been put to the political rule of the imperialists —and those countries constitute the overwhelming majority—are to strengthen the independence achieved, uproot colonial practices in their economy and develop it at a fast rate, achieve economic sovereignty, and to advance along the road of social and economic progress. Among the primary general national problems are the expulsion of foreign monopolies, the implementation of agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasants, the promotion of national industry, above all by setting up a state sector, and the democratisation of social and political life. In a number of countries, conditions are already being created, as these tasks are being accomplished, for development along non-capitalist lines, for taking the socialist road.

In their interviews with delegations from the Communist parties of newly-free countries, and in their statements at world conferences, Chinese representatives speak of nothing but the necessity of waging an armed struggle in those countries. At the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council, for example, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC CPC, claimed that "the road of armed struggle is the road to the complete liberation of the oppressed nations".

The Marxists-Leninists have always supported armed risings against the colonialists, against tyrannical regimes; they have supported the liberation wars of oppressed peoples. But they have always opposed stereotyped tactics based on the dogmatic use of some one form of struggle, irrespective of the actual conditions. Such tactics are particularly harmful now that in many of the Asian, African and Latin American countries national governments have come to power that are pursuing an anti-imperialist policy. In these circumstances, to advance the slogan of armed struggle as a universal method means causing double harm, disorienting the forces of national liberation and diverting them from the struggle against imperialism.

After all, it is absurd to say that the working people of Algeria, Ghana, Mali and certain other countries are faced with the task of starting an armed revolt. Such an idea amounts to an appeal to back the reactionaries, who are intent on overthrowing the governments of those countries. And what else but harm can one expect from an attempt to put this idea into effect in such countries as, for example, Indonesia or Ceylon?

The "Leftist" recommendations of the Chinese leaders for an armed struggle everywhere are nothing but an attempt to push the Communist and all democratic forces in the newly-free countries on to a path of adventurism. Experience shows that those who blindly follow such recommendations, refusing to take account of the actual conditions, doom themselves to isolation, make useless sacrifices and, far from promoting social progress in their countries, handicap it.

In the question of the prospects of the historical development of the newly-free countries the Chinese leaders come out against such cardinal

principles of the Communist movement as Lenin's thesis on the possibility of the non-capitalist way of development of the newly-free countries.

Speaking at the Moscow bilateral meeting in July 1963, Teng Hsiao-ping, General Secretary of the CC, CPC, said outright that the thesis of the non-capitalist path was "meaningless talk", although every Communist knows that this thesis was put forward by Lenin and has been borne out by the experience of a number of former colonial peoples.

The idea of the non-capitalist path is gaining ground among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and for a number of the peoples it has become a call for practical action. This is a tremendous victory for socialism. Capitalism has discredited itself in the eyes of the peoples, and the appeal of socialist ideas in the newly-free countries is so strong that the advanced forces and national leaders of many countries advocate taking the socialist path, and are actually taking steps in this direction, counting with good reason on support from the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Except for "Leftist" phrases about the armed struggle, the Chinese leaders have nothing to say to the peoples of the newly-free countries concerning the lines along which they should wage their struggle for a better future. They have, in fact, no positive ideas that would help the progressive forces in one-time colonies to fight for socialism.

The Chinese leaders pretend that the interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are particularly near and dear to them and that they are concerned above all else with the further progress of the national liberation movement. The facts, however, give them the lie. It is becoming increasingly evident that they are prompted by other considerations. The CPC leadership is clearly trying to establish control over the national liberation struggle in order to make it an instrument for the implementation of its hegemonic plans. The arguments contained in the *Jenminjihpao* article of October 22, 1963, already mentioned, are typical in this respect. That newspaper tries hard to prove that "true" Marxists-Leninists are to be found in Peking only, and makes it perfectly clear that the national liberation movement should take its bearings from them. The Chinese leaders call on the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to follow Peking's lead in everything. The article clearly expresses the CPC leadership's claim to hegemony in the national liberation movement, and their desire to subordinate it to their own special aims.

That perhaps more than anything else sheds light on the true object of the Chinese leaders' policy of dissociating the national-liberation movement from the world socialist system and from the international working class.

It is with that object in view that the CPC leaders have spread the outrageous falsehood that the CPSU "understimates" the historical role of the national liberation movement and that the Soviet Union "refuses to help" the national liberation movement on the pretext of fighting

for peaceful coexistence. We need not refute this ill-intentioned slander. Whatever "strong language" the Chinese leaders may use against the CPSU, they cannot cite a single fact bearing out their lying contentions.

But the CPC leaders do not confine themselves to slander. In their official actions and also in their activities in various world democratic organisations, they concentrate not on furthering the unity of the anti-imperialist forces, but on the struggle against the USSR and other socialist countries. That was what they did, in particular, at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi.

At that Conference Liu Ning-yi, head of the Chinese delegation, said in an interview with our delegates: "East European countries should not interfere in Asian and African affairs. We regret the fact that you have come here at all. Who wants you here? It is an insult to the solidarity movement of the Afro-Asian countries... You may do as you will, but we shall be against you." The Chinese delegates at that Conference suggested to Asian and African delegates that since the Russians, Czechs and Poles are whites, "they cannot be trusted", that they would "always be able to come to terms with the American whites", and that the peoples of Asia and Africa had interests of their own and should form their separate associations.

Lately, the Chinese leaders have actually begun to form separate organisations (trade union, journalistic, writers', student, sports, etc.) for Asian, African and Latin American countries, which they plan to set up against the World Federation of Trade Unions and other international associations.

In the light of the practical activities of the Chinese leaders in recent years, the true political meaning of their slogan—"The wind from the East is beginning to prevail over the wind from the West"—has become all the clearer. It will be recalled that at the Meeting of 1960 that slogan was sharply criticised as a nationalist slogan substituting the geographic, and even the racial, approach for the class approach. It is clearly an attempt to minimise the role of the world socialist system, the working class and the peoples of Western Europe and America.

The Chinese theoreticians would like to substitute the call for setting the Eastern peoples apart on a nationalist and even racial basis for the Leninist idea of uniting the anti-imperialist forces of all countries and continents, expressed in the slogan "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" Their slogan about the supposedly magic power of the wind from the East is plainly designed to foment nationalist and even racial sentiments among the peoples fighting against colonialism.

Long years of enslavement and exploitation by the imperialists, who mocked at the honour and national dignity of the oppressed peoples, have aroused distrust of people of the white race in a section of the population of the former colonies and semi-colonies, and still nourish

that sentiment. It is this sentiment that the Chinese leaders are trying to fan in the hope of setting the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonies against the socialist countries and the working people of the developed capitalist countries, and of representing themselves as the sole defenders of the interests of those peoples. For, if we are to lay bare what lies behind the Chinese slogan and reveal the long-range aim of the CPC leaders, we see the following: China, according to them, is the biggest country of the East, it embodies the interests of the East, and it is here that the "winds of history" spring up that are to "prevail over" the winds from the "West".

In other words, that slogan is nothing but an ideological and political expression of the hegemonic aspirations of the Chinese leadership.

It is natural that the Chinese leaders, who are hatching that sort of plans, regard close ties between the national liberation movement, on the one hand, and the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, on the other, as a most serious obstacle to the realisation of their schemes. Hence the CPC leaders' policy of dissociating the Asian, African and Latin American countries from the USSR and other socialist countries and from the working class of the capitalist countries. Needless to say that policy is in crying conflict with the vital interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As the facts show, it is meeting with growing resistance on their part.

And that is understandable, because the policy of the CPC leaders, which is aimed at undermining the alliance of the newly-free countries and the socialist countries, may cause great damage primarily to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In effect, that policy dooms the peoples of those countries to insularity and isolation, tends to perpetuate national narrow-mindedness; it shuts them off from the international experience of the revolutionary movement and the construction of the new society, and thereby facilitates the imperialist struggle against the national-liberation movement.

The tremendous progress which the national-liberation movement has made in our day was made possible by its close links with the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and with the revolutionary movement of the international working class. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Marxist-Leninist parties regard the national-liberation movement as a major revolutionary force of today, one which makes a historic contribution to the struggle against imperialism for peace and socialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution for the first time in history showed all the enslaved people the real way to liberation from national oppression. It initiated the great revolutionary process which today has culminated in the collapse of the colonial system, an event of history-making significance.

The national-liberation revolutions triumphed in new historical conditions. First of all, there arose, and has been developing and gaining

strength, the world socialist system, which is becoming the decisive factor in the progress of society. Secondly, the defeat in the Second World War of the spearhead forces of imperialism—Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan—resulted in a considerable weakening of world reaction. Thirdly, the working class and all working people of the colonial powers stepped up their fight against the colonial policies of the imperialists.

All these factors provided an exceptionally favourable situation for the victories of the national-liberation movement and enabled it to encompass the colonial and semi-colonial periphery of imperialism on three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America. We greatly appreciate the assistance which the national-liberation struggle is rendering to the socialist countries and to all revolutionary forces.

Unity of all the revolutionary forces is an earnest of victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. The fundamental national interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fully coincide with those of the socialist commonwealth, and of the working class and all working people in all countries. This is the objective basis of the growing solidarity of the revolutionary forces fighting against imperialism.

When our country was the only socialist state in the world, Lenin wrote that "the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop successfully, and can come to a culmination, only in direct connection with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 130, Russ. ed.). Lenin's words sound with particular force now that there exists the world socialist system.

What, specifically, does support for the national liberation movement on the part of the socialist countries mean today?

The internationalist duty of the socialist countries is to foil imperialist attempts to re-establish colonial regimes in the newly-free countries and prevent the realisation of the national aspirations of the peoples who have thrown off colonial tyranny. In all such cases, the duty of the socialist countries is to give those countries political and diplomatic support, and when necessary, to curb the imperialist aggressors by bringing the whole might of the world socialist system to bear.

Our policy, which is aimed at assisting the peoples fighting for their freedom, is based on the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism, on the behests of the great Lenin.

Our Party and Government have time and again stated, clearly and comprehensively their views on problems of the national-liberation movement. In the answers which Comrade Khrushchov gave to the questions of a number of African and Asian newspapers and which were published not long ago, it is clearly stated: "Every people fighting against the colonialists has been firmly supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Today we declare once again, for

all to hear, that the peoples fighting for their liberation can continue to count firmly on our support."

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America know well that the Soviet Union actively supports the just wars of national liberation, which the people wage against their enslavers. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, is doing everything to help the national liberation movement—economically, politically and, if necessary, militarily—and to prevent the imperialists from unleashing local wars and exporting counter-revolution by force of arms.

We have only to refer to such facts as the support given to Egypt during the Suez venture of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggressors, the assistance extended to Indonesia in its struggle to consolidate its independence and recover Western Irian, not to mention many other facts. No people who have asked our support have met with a refusal. The soldiers of the heroic national-liberation army of Algeria and the armed forces of Indonesia, Yemen and other countries know well whose arms helped them in the struggle against the colonialists for freedom and independence.

In the recent period the Soviet Government has repeatedly and resolutely come out in defence of peoples fighting for their national independence. It has supported the peoples of Panama and Cyprus in their anti-imperialist struggle, voiced its solidarity with the courageous resistance offered by the Vietnamese people to US aggression, warned the British and US imperialists against interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Zanzibar, and exposed colonialist intrigue in East Africa.

Now that the achievement of economic sovereignty and social progress have become the chief direction in which the anti-imperialist struggle of the newly-free countries is developing, it is particularly important to expand economic cooperation between them and the socialist countries, and to render them fraternal economic assistance.

The Soviet Union unfailingly fulfils this duty. Soviet credits to newly-free countries on favourable terms add up to a total exceeding 3,000 million rubles. The Soviet Union is helping to build about 500 industrial and other establishments in many of the newly-free countries. It is rendering disinterested assistance to the newly-free countries in setting up a national industry, the backbone of economic independence. The Bhilai Iron and Steel Works and the Aswan High Dam will always be remembered by the peoples as symbols of fraternal cooperation between socialist countries and the countries that have freed themselves from colonial tyranny.

Thousands of students from newly-sovereign states are studying in our country. Growing economic relations between the USSR and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and Asian, African and Latin American countries, on the other, have ended the monopoly which the imperialist powers had on deliveries of plant and the granting

of credits. These powers often have to make concessions to underdeveloped countries with regard to loan terms, in the field of trade, and so on. Economic blockade, an extremely effective weapon in the past, has been knocked out of the hands of the imperialists.

The peoples of the newly-free countries know that they can win the battle against the domination of international monopolies if they draw on the economic power of socialism. The growing economic potential of the socialist countries is in their best interest. Today the achievements of the socialist countries in the economic competition with capitalism, and their expanding economic relations with newly-sovereign states constitute one of the most important forms in which socialism gives the peoples of the newly-free countries effective support.

But the Chinese leaders try to persuade the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America that the socialist countries' policy of peaceful economic competition allegedly runs counter to their interests. They do all they can to smear the economic assistance which the USSR and other socialist countries render to the underdeveloped countries, and try to induce them to question the purpose of that assistance. But the peoples of the newly-free countries, who have gained considerable political experience, will see for themselves what the Chinese leaders are driving at and what they really want, and will reject a policy aimed at subordinating them to the selfish plans of the Chinese leaders.

Soviet people are confident that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are well familiar with the actual facts concerning Soviet assistance, will themselves draw the right conclusions as to the worth of the slanderous fabrications of the Chinese leaders. They can do this all the more easily because they can compare the deeds of the Soviet Union with the Chinese leaders' actions in recent years.

We are firmly convinced that the national liberation movement, which has become one of the greatest progressive factors of our time, will, despite all difficulties, and in close alliance with the world socialist system and all the anti-imperialist forces, march on along its own path towards final victory over the imperialist forces and will bring the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America deliverance from agelong backwardness, will lead them to national and social prosperity.

The Soviet Union has invariably advocated the abolition of every form of colonial oppression. It considers fraternal alliance with the peoples that have cast off colonial and semi-colonial tyranny as a corner-stone of its foreign policy.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always helped the peoples fighting against imperialism, for their freedom and national independence, and will continue to do so. No amount of slander and no falsehoods can hinder the growing friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the peoples of the countries which have freed thmselves from colonial dependence.

IV

On Soviet-Chinese Relations

Comrades,

The CC, CPSU, and the Soviet Government have always attached great importance to the development of friendship and co-operation with the Chinese People's Republic. We have never sought any advantage or profit, and have always been internationalist in our attitude towards the CPC and the Chinese people.

For many years we have supported the working people of China, their Communist vanguard, in the struggle for independence, for the victory of the socialist revolution. We considered it our duty to help the Chinese people fraternally in the building of socialism, the strengthening of the international position of the CPR, and in the defence of its socialist gains.

Our Party, the Soviet people know the scale and the nature of the economic assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to China. In a short period of time the USSR helped the Chinese People's Republic to build over 200 large industrial enterprises, shops and other projects, equipped with modern machinery. The CPR has built with Soviet aid whole branches of industry which China did not have before: aircraft-, automobile- and tractor-building industries, power-producing, heavy machine-building and precision machine-building industries, instrument-making and radio-engineering and various branches of the chemical industry.

The factories built and reconstructed with Soviet assistance enable China to produce annually 8,700,000 tons of iron, 8,400,000 tons of steel, and 32,200,000 tons of coal and shale. Enterprises built with the help of our country account for 70 per cent of China's tin output, 100 per cent of its synthetic rubber output, 25 to 30 per cent of its electric power output, and 80 per cent of the lorries and tractors produced annually. The defence factories built with the technical assistance of the Soviet Union constituted the basis for China's defence industry.

More than 10,000 Soviet specialists were sent to the People's Republic of China for varying terms between 1950 and 1960. Some 10,000 Chinese engineers, technicians and skilled workers, and about 1,000 scientists, were taught and trained in the USSR between 1951 and 1962. More than 11,000 students and post-graduates graduated from Soviet higher educational establishments in this period.

Soviet-Chinese cooperation reached its peak after 1953, when the elements of inequality in the relations between our countries imposed during the Stalin personality cult were removed on the initiative of the CC, CPSU, and Comrade N. S. Khrushchov. "In the Chinese question," Mao Tse-tung said in 1957, "the credit for removing the disagreeable and the extraneous belongs to N. S. Khrushchov."

In 1959 the proportions of Soviet-Chinese economic contacts were nearly double those of 1953, while deliveries for the building projects increased in that period as much as eightfold. Between 1954 and 1963 the Soviet Union turned over to China more than 24,000 sets of scientific and technical documents, including 1,400 projects of large industrial enterprises. These documents embodied the vast experience accumulated by the Soviet people, by Soviet scientists and technicians. In effect, all these scientific and technical documents were turned over to China gratuitously.

The Soviet Union granted the Chinese People's Republic long-term credits totalling 1,816 million rubles on favourable terms.

The CC, CPSU, and the Soviet government spared no effort to enable China firmly to assume its place on the international scene as a great socialist power and worked perseveringly for the restoration of the rights of the CPR in the United Nations. We regularly informed the leadership of the CPR of all the key political actions of the Soviet Union and strove to co-ordinate the foreign policies of our two countries.

It should be said that, while assisting People's China, the CC, CPSU, for its part always highly appreciated the support of the CPR. We refer not only to the various valuable Chinese export items received by the USSR and the experience made available to us by the Chinese scientists, but also to the common struggle for the consolidation of peace, against imperialism and colonialism.

In 1950, the Soviet Union and the CPR concluded a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which became an important factor not only in the all-round development of relations between our two countries, but also in the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

The Soviet Union has always faithfully abided by all the commitments under this Treaty. Every time a threat arose to the security of the CPR, the USSR demonstrated its readiness to perform its allied duty to the end. In the autumn of 1958, for example, Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, head of the Soviet Government, declared in a message to US President Eisenhower that "an attack on the People's Republic of China, the great friend, ally and neighbour of our country, would be tantamount to an attack on the Soviet Union." This declaration was emphatically re-affirmed in July 1962. The above shows how earnestly the Soviet Government approached the strengthening of Soviet-Chinese friendship.

However, to our regret, ever since 1958 the Government of the CPR has increasingly resorted to measures undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and unilateral actions creating difficulties on the world scene not only for the Soviet Union, but also for other socialist countries.

Soviet-Chinese relations deteriorated most markedly after the CPC leaders went over from isolated unfriendly acts to a sharp curtailment of economic and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and other so-

cialist countries. Already on the eve of the 1960 Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties, the Chinese Government insisted on the revision of all earlier agreements and protocols concluded with the Soviet Union on economic, scientific and technical cooperation; besides, the Chinese Government turned down a considerable part of the planned deliveries of Soviet equipment, reducing to a minimum the volume of of Soviet-Chinese trade.

Although the Soviet Government was aware that this course of the Chinese leaders would harm Soviet-Chinese friendship and cooperation, it had no choice but to consent to it. As a result, the total volume of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the CPR (including trade and technical assistance) dropped in 1962 to 36.5 per cent of what it was in 1959, while deliveries of sets of equipment and materials decreased 40-fold. In 1963 economic cooperation and trade continued to drop.

It stands to reason that we could not look on indifferently while Soviet-Chinese cooperation was sharply curtailed. Time and again the CC, CPSU called on the CC, CPC, to avert this process. We suggested a number of concrete measures, but the Chinese leaders did not respond to our suggestions. In pursuance of their special aims, they worsened China's relations with the Soviet Union step by step and began to spread the ideological differences to the sphere of inter-state relations.

Having set their course on curtailing economic contacts with the USSR and other socialist countries, the CPC leaders at first explained this as follows:

"Firstly, thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union the primary foundations of modern industry and technology have been laid in China, and, therefore, the building and designing of most projects will in future be done with our own forces. We want to ease the efforts of the Soviet Union with respect to its assistance to China. However, in the future, too, we shall have to ask for Soviet assistance in relation to projects that we shall not be able to design, build and equip on our own.

"Secondly, the CC, CPC, and the Chinese Government consider it necessary to concentrate their efforts on the building of the most important projects, while reducing the total number of capital projects and non-urgent projects in order to put into practice the 'better, greater faster and more economical' principle of socialist construction in the CPR. The scale of building in the country will continue to be big and the rates high.

"Thirdly, due to the natural calamities in the last two years, certain difficulties have arisen in agriculture affecting the balance of payments, and, therefore, by reducing the number of projects built with the help of the Soviet Union we hope to create conditions for more favourable co-operation between our countries." (Quoted from

the statement by Ku Cho-hsin, head of the CPR Government delegation at the Soviet-Chinese negotiations on February 10, 1961.)

Yet today, having evidently "forgotten" its previous explanations, the CPR Government maintains that Soviet-Chinese contacts were reduced on the initiative of the Soviet Union and that this is the cause for China's difficult economic situation in the last few years.

Today, Chinese propagandists go out of their way to prove that there has never been any Soviet assistance to China and that there have been no more than ordinary commercial operations. Bent on erasing the memory of Soviet assistance among the people, the Chinese have gone so far as to remove trade marks from Soviet lathes and other machinery, and to allege that the Soviet Union delivered obsolete equipment to China. This is said in spite of the fact that the Chinese themselves, and the foreign press as well, noted that enterprises built with Soviet assistance, such as the Changchun Automobile Works, the Harbin Electrical Engineering Works, the Loyang Tractor Works and many others, are splendid examples of modern industry.

Such actions have little in common with any concept of common decency. While leaving them to the conscience of the Chinese leadership, we cannot help noting the obvious discrepancies in their charges against the Soviet Union. On the one hand, they try to blame the USSR for reducing its assistance and creating serious difficulties for China's economy. On the other, they spread rumours that Soviet assistance was ineffective and insignificant. But if our assistance really was "ineffective and insignificant", how could its cessation harm China's economy?

To use the favourite expression of the Chinese leaders, where is the truth and where the untruth on this score? The facts show that it is nothing but untruth all round.

In spite of the candidly hostile actions of the CPC leadership, our country is living up faithfully to earlier commitments and continuing to assist China in the building of 80 industrial enterprises. Engineers, technicians, scientists and students from the CPR are being trained in the Soviet Union as before. The Soviet Union responded fraternally to the economic difficulties that arose in China in 1960 and 1961. At a time when particularly acute food shortages occurred in the CPR, the CC, CPSU, and the Soviet Government offered the CPC leadership a loan of 1,000,000 tons of grain and 500,000 tons of sugar. At the same time, the Soviet Union granted the CPR five years' deferment on payments due for commercial transactions to the amount of 288 million rubles.

If, as the Chinese leadership claims, the Soviet Union sought to curtail its economic relations with China, why did it have to take all these steps, why continue its assistance in building industrial enterprises, and why make repeated offers of greater mutually advantageous trade and economic co-operation? The CPC leadership gives no reply to this question. Nor can it do so, because it was none

other than the Chinese leadership that sought the curtailment of co-operation between our countries.

Seeking to justify, to some extent at least, the economic failures of the CPR, brought about by the "big leap" policy, the CPC leaders lay a particular accent on the question of Soviet specialists. So, although this issue has been repeatedly dealt with in our Party's official documents, we are compelled to dwell upon it once more.

The Government of the USSR sent specialists to China in the belief that they were needed to assist in the development of China's national economy, which did not have qualified personnel in sufficient numbers. It was by no means a commercial transaction, but an act of genuine fraternal assistance to the Chinese people.

Seeing that the demand for foreign specialists is temporary in nature and that qualified personnel of their own was rapidly growing in the fraternal socialist countries, the Soviet Government broached the question of recalling our specialists first in 1956, and once again in 1958. Similar offers were also made at the time to the other People's Democracies where Soviet specialists were still working then. Since the specialists were not needed any longer these offers were accepted by all the countries, excluding the CPR, whose government requested that the Soviet specialists stay on for a certain time.

While insisting that the Soviet specialists remain, the Chinese authorities deliberately treated them worse than before, and created intolerable conditions for their work.

The last years of our specialists' stay in the CPR coincided with the "big leap" policy, which unbalanced the proportions of economic development and caused departures from accepted technical standards. The Soviet specialists could not help seeing the dangerous implications of this policy. They warned the Chinese authorities against violating the technical requirements. But their advice fell on deaf ears. Due to the fact that the recommendations of the Soviet specialists were ignored and that the Chinese officials grossly violated the technical standards, serious accidents occurred, some of them involving a loss of life. This happened on the building site of the Hsinantsiang Hydropower Station, where thousands of tons of rock crashed down because the technical requirements were not observed, and work on the project was considerably delayed. The dams burst and the pit was flooded at the Hsinfungtsiang Hydropower project for the same reason. In both cases there was a loss of life. It is only natural that the Soviet engineers and technicians could not treat all this with indifference. They protested, but being ignored, they began asking to be sent home.

Furthermore, beginning in the spring of 1960 the Chinese authorities began "indoctrinating" the Soviet specialists, trying to turn them against the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Government of the USSR. This aroused the legitimate indignation of our people.

The Government of the USSR has repeatedly called the attention of the Chinese authorities to all these outrageous facts, and requested

insistently that normal conditions be provided for the work of the Soviet specialists. But the Chinese authorities responded by treating our people in a still more unfriendly and insulting fashion, by spurning them as "conservatives", and by reviling Soviet experience and technology in every way. Surveillance of Soviet people increased, searches of personal belongings became more frequent, and the like. In the circumstances, there was no choice but to recall our specialists.

Now, after many additional facts have come to light, there is every reason to believe that after 1959, when the Chinese leadership began aggravating its relations with the USSR, it did not need the specialists so much as the question of these specialists, which they could use as one of the pretexts for the struggle against the CPSU.

After recalling the Soviet specialists, the Soviet Government sought an adjustment of the matter in the interests of strengthening Soviet-Chinese friendship. In November 1960, on the instructions of the CC, CPSU, Comrade A. I. Mikoyan told the Chinese leaders at the Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties in an official conversation that if China really needed Soviet specialists and if they were provided normal conditions for work, we were prepared to send them to the CPR. Comrade N. S. Khrushchov said the same thing in his talk with Chou En-lai and the other members of the CPC delegation to the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU. At the bilateral meeting of the CPSU and CPC delegations (in July 1963) and in the Letter of the CC, CPSU, of November 29, 1963, the Chinese leadership was again officially informed that if it required the technical help of our specialists, the Soviet Government was prepared to examine the question of sending them to the CPR. The Chinese leaders did not reply to any of these proposals, while continuing to exploit the question of Soviet specialists for their unseemly ends. They even tried to blame the revision of their economic plans, the reduction of capital building and the difficulties which arose in the various branches of their economy on the withdrawal of our specialists.

But, firstly, everybody knows that the economic difficulties in the CPR arose before the Soviet specialists had been recalled, and that they arose due to the dangerous "big leap" experiment. Secondly, the greatest difficulties arose in those branches where there were very few or no Soviet specialists at all.

How, for example, could the recall of the Soviet specialists affect the coal, oil, timber, light and other industries, and agriculture as well, if, in 1960, there were two specialists working in the coal industry, three in the Ministry of State Farms and Virgin Lands, and one each in the departments of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry? Yet it was these very branches, and especially agriculture, that suffered the greatest failures.

Is it not high time for the Chinese leaders to stop misleading their Party, their people and world opinion, and to speak the truth about the real reasons for the difficulties of the Chinese people?

These reasons stem from the fact that the CPC leaders ignore the objective laws in their economic policy.

How is the fact to be explained that lately, due to the exertions of the CPC leadership, Soviet-Chinese economic co-operation, cultural relations and exchanges between public organisations are dwindling from year to year, while insinuations and slander pour forth against the Soviet people? There is only one explanation: the Chinese leaders want to fence their people off from the Soviet Union. They are afraid that their people will learn the truth about the selfless fraternal Soviet proposals for the development of relations between the USSR and the CPR, and that then their vicious slander, whereby they seek to tarnish our Party and the Soviet people, will explode in their faces. The CPC leadership fears that co-operation with our country may carry as far as China the purifying breath of the Twentieth Congress ideas, which dissipated the intolerable situation created by the Stalin personality cult.

We also consider it necessary to tell the Plenum about the violations of the Soviet-Chinese border, occasioned through the fault of the Chinese side. This has already been mentioned in the documents of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. In 1962 and 1963 violations of the Soviet border kept occurring continuously, often assuming the form of crude provocations.

The Soviet Government has come forward with the initiative of holding consultations in order to specify the border line between the USSR and the CPR at certain of its points. We do so in the belief that no territorial issues exist between the USSR and the CPR, that the Soviet-Chinese border took shape historically, and that the issue can concern only some sections of the border, to make them more precise wherever necessary.

Undermining the foundations of Soviet-Chinese friendship, the CPC leaders have organised a malicious anti-Soviet propaganda campaign at home and abroad. The Chinese newspapers are full of slanderous articles which malign Soviet reality and cast foul aspersions on the Soviet people. In one CPR Government statement the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is described as "a policy of alignment with the forces of war for struggle against the forces of peace, alignment with imperialism for struggle against socialism".

All these contentions are, from beginning to end, nothing but ranting slander, absolutely obvious not only to our friends, but also to our enemies. The Soviet Communists, all Soviet people, reject these brazen lies with indignation. The slanderers may go about their foul business, but the Soviet Union will continue to advance along the Leninist course as before.

V

Attacks by the CPC Leaders on the Programme of the CPSU

Comrades, lately the CPC leaders have spread their polemics also to questions concerning the internal development of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

They have made the Programme of the CPSU the object of their attacks.

It is generally recognised that our Party Programme is one of the most outstanding documents of modern times and that it reflects with exceptional depth and force the practice of building the new society in the USSR and the fraternal countries on the basis of the theory of scientific communism. Defying common sense, Chinese propaganda has in its attacks on the Programme of the CPSU gone to the length of absurd and monstrous slander, alleging that it is "aimed against the revolutions of the peoples which are still dominated by imperialism and capitalism", that it is "aimed against the completion of the revolutions by the peoples which have already embarked on the path of socialism" and, of all things, that is it aimed at "preserving and restoring capitalism" (article in *Jenminjihpao* and the journal *Hungchi,* September 6, 1963).

In opposing the CPSU Programme, the Chinese leaders are trying to discredit the theory and practice of proletarian socialism, which has been victorious in the working class movement after a long struggle against petty-bourgeois socialism, anarchism and other anti-scientific trends. Whether they admit it or not, the leaders of the CPC are reviving the concepts of petty-bourgeois socialism and trying to criticise the international experience of the building of new society from these positions.

The Chinese leaders are attacking the CPSU because it is pursuing a policy of improving the people's standard of living. They say that the improvement of the living standard of the Soviet people is "embourgeoisement", and that the principle of material incentives "results in people seeking personal gain and enrichment, inducing the itch for profit and a growth of bourgeois individualism, and injuring socialist economics... and even corrupting it" (*Jenminjihpao,* December 26, 1963).

Is there not deep-seated contempt for the vital requirement of man, for the principles and ideals of socialist society, behind these strident contentions?

It may be recalled what great importance Lenin attached to the principle of socialist distribution according to labour, to material incentives for the development of social production. He taught us that new society should not be built by enthusiasm alone, but with the help of enthusiasm roused by the great revolution, by a personal interest, by incentives, on a cost-accounting basis.

The Chinese leaders ferociously attack the conclusions in the Programme of the CPSU concerning the political organisation of socialist society as it advances to Communism. They claim that the propositions of the Programme of the CPSU on the state of the whole people and the party of the whole people all but substitute bourgeois theories for the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state, that they are tantamount to disarming the working class.

The Chinese leaders do not even try to analyse the actual processes operating in the socialist countries. Instead, they juggle with quotations snatched out of context from the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics, and interpret them incorrectly. They try to impose quasi-theoretical discussions on the world Communist movement concerning matters that have long since been settled by the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

One of these issues concerns their dogmatic contentions about the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese leaders stubbornly reiterate that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be preserved "until the entry into the highest phase of communist society". In doing so they refer to a quotation from Marx which says that "between the capitalist and communist society lies a period of the revolutionary transformation of the first into the second. This period conforms also with the political transitional period, and the state of this period cannot be anything but *a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works,* 2nd ed., Vol. 19, p. 27, Russ. ed.).

This quotation, snatched out of the context of Marx's exposition, is being exploited as the theoretical basis for the "criticism" of the Programme of the CPSU.

But the Chinese leaders have clipped Marx's exposition, and do not quote the next two lines from the same work by Marx, which says with respect to the Gotha Programme: "But the programme does not concern itself with either this last (that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat—*M. S.*) or the future statehood in communist society". To follow the logic of the Chinese theorists, Marx should be declared an anti-Marxist for saying this. Indeed, the Chinese theorists proceed from what they call Marxist ideas to say that "the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also the withering away of the state". Yet Marx speaks about the "statehood in communist society", which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is just the point. When speaking of the transitional period from capitalism to communism, Marx has in mind the first phase of communism, that is, socialism.

Surely, the Chinese leaders know that Marx and Engels have spoken more than once about the two phases of communism and about the dictatorship of the proletariat being a state of the transitional period, whose aim—the building of socialism—is the aim of the first phase of communism. Pointing to the inevitably long and persistent struggle for the socialist rearrangement of society, Lenin wrote about "a whole

period of dictatorship by the proletariat as a period of transition from capitalism to socialism" (*Works,* Vol. 29, p. 358, Russ. ed.).

The Peking theorists go out of their way to hush up the proposition emphasised by Lenin. What he said was that the dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary "for the purpose of the final building and consolidation of socialism" (Vol. 29, p. 351, Russ. ed.), and that, once the danger that capitalist relations may be restored disappears, there comes "an end to the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Vol. 33, p. 75, Russ. Ed.).

That was how Lenin put it.

The facts have confirmed the correctness of Lenin's propositions. If the Chinese leaders had really been concerned about the truth, they could have turned to our every-day practice and seen how the economic basis and social structure of Soviet society have changed. Lenin considered that the suppression of the overthrown exploiting classes was a most important function of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist society in the USSR, as we know, long since consists of friendly classes—the workers and peasants, and the social group of the people's intelligentsia. They are welded by common basic interests, by the Marxist-Leninist ideology and by their identical goal—the building of communism.

Against whom do the Chinese theorists suggest that we enforce dictatorship? What are they leading up to, and how to interpret their demand that the CPSU should carry through a "policy of class struggle" inside the country?

We know what the theory put forward by Stalin about the inevitable aggravation of the class struggle as the successes of socialist construction accumulate led to. It may be recalled that this theory served as a vindication for gross violations of socialist legality. The CPSU has put an end to it and will never allow anything like it to happen again. It has pursued and will continue to pursue a policy of strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasants, of uniting all working people in a single collective of builders of communism.

The ideas of a state of the whole people and the party of the whole people are not the fruit of arm-chair rumination. They were generated by reality and reflect the high maturity which social relations have attained in the USSR. In view of the fact that the exploiting classes have long since been abolished in the USSR, the Soviet state, having lost the character of a body suppressing the overthrown exploiters, now expresses the interests and the will of the whole people, while the party of the working class has become a party of the whole people.

After the complete and final victory of socialism the working class no longer effects its leading role through the dictatorship of the proletariat. It remains the foremost class of society also in the period of full-scale communist construction. Its leading role stems from both its economic position, the fact that it is connected directly with

the highest form of socialist property, and the fact that it possesses the greatest steeling acquired through decades of class struggle and revolutionary experience.

All these propositions of the CPSU Programme are not by any means only of theoretical importance. They define the practical policy of our Party, the policy of drawing the whole people into the administration of the affairs of society, of increasing the people's activity in the building of communism, of extending socialist democracy. Yet the Chinese leaders ignore Lenin's precept that "socialism is impossible without democracy" (Vol. 23, p. 62, Russ. ed.). It is indicative that there is not the slightest mention of socialist democracy and the need to develop it while advancing to communism, in the Letter of the CC, CPC, of June 14, 1963, and in the other statements of the Chinese leadership.

Does idealisation of methods of violence and suppression during the entire period of transition from capitalism to communism have anything in common with the Marxist-Leninist approach to the matter?

While noting that the proletariat could not have won without employing revolutionary violence against the landed proprietors and capitalists, Lenin wrote that "revolutionary violence was a necessary and lawful method of revolution only in certain periods of its development and only in certain and special circumstances, while organisation of the proletarian masses, organisation of the working people, was and remains a much more deep-rooted, permanent feature of this revolution and the requisite for its victories" (Vol. 29, p. 70, Russ. ed.).

The Chinese theorists maintain: "Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism can understand that the so-called state of the whole people is nothing new. Representative bourgeois figures have always called the bourgeois state a 'state of the whole people' or a 'state in which power belongs to all the people'."

A strong argument, indeed! To follow this train of thought, the Communists would also have to abandon the realisation of such slogans as freedom, equality, fraternity and democracy for the sole reason that they were put forward in the bourgeois revolution and subsequently perverted and debased by the bourgeoisie on coming to power. We, on the contrary, think that the true meaning of these slogans should be revived, that these slogans should be carried into practice, and that this is possible only under socialism and communism.

So much for the concept of the state of the whole people.

When Lassalle spoke of such a state, or when imperialist ideologists speak of it today, the Marxists say rightly that their theory is nothing but deception of the people. For what these people have in mind is a state of the whole people in a class society, while such a state cannot exist in a society split into hostile classes. A state that develops out of the dictatorship of the proletariat that has completed its historic mission of building socialism within the country is an entirely dif-

ferent matter. Such a state can be nothing but a body expressing the interests and the will of the whole people.

The Soviet state of the whole people, in which the working class retains its leading role, is continuing the cause begun by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It performs faithfully its internationalist duty to the international working class and all the peoples of the world. The state of the whole people struggles consistently against imperialism. It ensures reliably the defences of its country and contributes to the defence of the whole socialist camp. It develops fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries.

It is typical of the methods of the Chinese leaders in the polemics falsely to depict the conclusion drawn in the Programme of the CPSU about the growing over of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people under certain historical conditions as a rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of socialist construction. The Chinese theorists have even gone to the length of saying that the CPSU has "completely flung overboard the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism—the teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat".

That is a dirty and shameless lie! The Programme of the CPSU clearly states that "Soviet experience has shown that the peoples can achieve socialism only as a result of the *socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.*"

The Chinese leaders do not bother to examine the matter in substance and also attempt to malign the conclusion of the Programme of the CPSU *on the transformation of the Communist Party of the working class in our country into a party of the whole people.* They describe this conclusion as "organisational and moral disarmament of the proletariat", and even as "helping restore capitalism".

Have the Chinese leaders at all tried to substantiate their monstrous accusations against the Party that heads the building of communism? Nothing of the sort! They have merely, without reason and argument, hitched this question to the question of the state. If the state cannot be of the whole people until the complete victory of communism, they say, then the Party cannot be of the whole people either. That is the only argument they adduce.

The working-class party, without which the dictatorship of that class is impracticable, retains its proletarian class character, both formally and in substance, until the final victory of socialism. That is an indisputable fact.

But it is also indisputable that as a political organisation the Party also reflects the changes occurring in the class structure of society. The CPSU has stressed in its Programme that until the complete victory of communism the working class remains the leading force of Soviet society. In the period of full-scale communist construction, too, the Party is the spokesman of the communist ideals and goals of the working class, and of its basic interests .At the same time, it becomes a party of the whole people. This does not happen just because someone wishes

it subjectively, but because the working-class goals and ideals become the goals and ideals of all the classes and strata of the people that has built socialism.

While attacking the propositions of the CPSU Programme concerning the historical destiny of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the nature of the state and the working-class party in the Soviet Union, the Chinese theorists ignore the new phenomena of social life and refuse stubbornly to see that the new conclusions and propositions of the CPSU Programme were not framed arbitrarily but express what has become part of life. As they attack the course charted by the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the CPSU, they go to the length of questioning the very right of our Party and people to build communism.

The transition of a society that has built socialism to the full-scale building of communism is a historically inevitable and objectively necessary process. It is a vital task for the Soviet people, a task put forward by life. We have all the necessary economic, political and other prerequisites, created thanks to the victory of the socialist system, for its practical implementation. To obstruct this process is to try and stop social progress. The facts have confirmed over and over again that attempts to by-pass historically inevitable stages in social development and attempts to retard and slow down social development are equally wrong and harmful.

The men in Peking are evidently so badly blinded by the factional struggle that they have, in the heat of the fray, unconsciously come into conflict with themselves. Just a few years ago, while proclaiming the "big leap" and "people's communes" policy, the CC, CPC, maintained that "apparently the realisation of communism in our country is not something remote" (Decision of the CC, CPC, August 29, 1958). Consequently, at that time the Chinese leaders thought it quite possible to go over to communist construction in their own country, although the building of socialism was then only beginning in China. Yet today they question communist construction in the USSR, where the final and complete victory of socialism has been achieved.

How can one fail to see the fact that the building of communism in countries that have built socialism accords with the interests of the peoples of all the socialist countries, all the revolutionary forces of our time? Is it not clear that it adds immensely to socialism's force of attraction, that it adds to the economic and defence potential of the socialist camp, and that it creates increasingly more favourably opportunities for greater effective economic, technical, cultural and other assistance and support to all the peoples fighting for socialist construction, for national independence and peace, against imperialism.

How can it be denied that the country marching first to communism is making the advance to communism easier and faster for the world socialist system as a whole, since its peoples are blazing untrodden paths for all mankind, checking how correct they are by their own experience, revealing the difficulties, finding ways and means of com-

bating them, and choosing the best forms and methods of communist construction. It is this course that we consider correct, because it is the only course along which the peoples of the socialist countries can render the most effective support to the working peoples' struggle against imperialism, while cementing the unity and might of the socialist community and carrying into practice the communist ideals.

The Chinese leaders are attacking our Party for having worked out a scientifically reasoned plan of communist construction, for laying the accent in the creative activities of the whole Soviet people on the building of the material and technical basis of communism, and for showing constant care for the improvement of the living and cultural standards of all working people in the country. That is truly monstrous and strange. It appears that the Chinese leaders' conception of socialism and communism, that their practice of building new society, are very far removed from the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific communism. Neither Marx nor Lenin had anywhere even remotely hinted that the rockbottom tasks of socialist construction may be realised by the method of "leaps" and cavalry charges, overlooking the degree to which the socio-economic and spiritual premises of the advance have matured and ignoring the task of improving the living standard of the people.

If the Chinese leaders want to impose their practice on us as a "universal truth", if they want us to accept for a "model" a society in which violence is idealised and democracy restricted, in which the personality cult thrives and care for the working people is neglected, we will say bluntly: such a "universal truth" and such a "model" do not suit the Soviet people, and, we are sure, will not suit other peoples either.

Socialism, communism, which brings peace, labour, freedom, equality, fraternity and happiness for all the peoples has always been the goal of the communist movement, and will remain so. We follow the theory and practice of scientific communism. We are marching and will always march along the road shown us by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Chinese leaders have embarked on the dangerous course of undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and, naturally, we denounce their wrong actions most strongly. The present attitude of the Chinese leaders is having an unfavourable effect on the whole socialist camp and on the communist movement. It does great harm to China as well.

As regards the CPSU and the Soviet Union, we remain true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and will undeviatingly perform our internationalist duty. We have taken and will continue to take all the necessary measures aimed at normalising Soviet-Chinese relations and strengthening the friendship of our peoples.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to work for a normalisation of the situation and for a strengthening of friendship between the CPSU and the Communist Party of China. Our Party is deeply convinced that this friendship will exist, grow and flourish.

VI

The Splitting Activities of the Chinese Leaders within the World Communist Movement

The Chinese leaders have lately stepped up very noticeably their subversive activities aimed at splitting the world Communist movement as well as a number of Marxist-Leninist parties. These activities of theirs have acquired an open character; developing on a wide front, they have become particularly insidious and are unprecedented as to the methods used. The CPC leaders have turned the controversy started by them within the world Communist movement into a weapon of direct political struggle against fraternal parties.

The Chinese leaders have apparently decided to carry through to the end their subversive activity against the Leninist unity of the world Communist movement. In recent days they have openly alleged a split to have become "inevitable". In other words, they have now fully revealed their real aims, which they have had in view for a number of years with regard to the world Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have pushed their factional struggle to a point where they are severing relations with certain Marxist-Leninist parties, which they arbitrarily describe as "non-existent", while giving the name of "parties" to the little groups of splitters they have formed. They have announced for all to hear that they support the factional groups of splitters which they themselves have set up in a number of countries to fight the Marxist-Leninist parties. In other words, the CPC leaders have openly assumed the responsibility for the infamous activities of all those groups and for their struggle against fraternal parties.

The CPC leadership is plainly out to form under its own aegis a sort of separate international bloc and to set it up against the world Communist movement as an instrument for intensifying the struggle against this movement.

The Chinese representatives on international democratic associations have greatly increased their splitting activity and have openly set out to create separate organisations and disrupt the links between the progressive, democratic forces of different countries and different areas of the globe.

The result is that although the Chinese leaders still utter once in a while hypocritical phrases about unity and solidarity, all their practical steps are in fact aimed at shaking and splitting the world Communist movement. Today the policy and activity of the Chinese leaders are the main danger to the unity of the world Communist movement.

It is in this light that we should appraise the publication in two organs of the CC, CPC, *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi,* on February 4th last, of a factional article directed against the CPSU and the world Com-

munist movement as a whole, an article which is a kind of platform for splitting the revolutionary movement of the working class.

In that article the Chinese leaders allege that the development of the Communist movement proceeds according to the formula: "Unity —struggle, or even a split—a new unity on a new basis." In so doing, they refer to the laws of dialectics. But any Marxist-Leninist will see that these so-called dialectics are no more than a fresh attempt to mask a splitting policy with pseudo-theoretical talk.

Who can speak of an "inevitable" split today? Only those who are breaking with Marxism-Leninism, with the principles of proletarian internationalism. By contrast, those who have the interests of the great cause of the international working class at heart see no objective reasons for a split in the present-day Communist movement. That movement has a political line tested by the experience of struggle over a long period, a line which has brought the working class and the socialist cause outstanding victories and which enjoys tremendous prestige among the people.

What would a split in the world Communist movement mean in present-day conditions? In our day, such a split would inevitably lead to undermining the unity of the main forces of the world anti-imperialist front—the socialist community, the international working-class movement, the national-liberation movement, and the general democratic movements of the peoples. All that would only benefit the aggressive forces of imperialism and would make it easier for them to attack the positions of the world-wide liberation movement. Obviously, anyone who seeks a split is assuming a tremendous, a frightful historical responsibility.

Ever since the world Communist movement came into being the reactionaries all over the world have been making frantic efforts to split its ranks. Today the Chinese leaders are trying to achieve what imperialist reaction has failed to do.

In the light of the present splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, it is now clearer than ever why, at the Meeting of 1960, the CPC delegates insisted so vehemently on excluding from the Statement the passage regarding the impermissibility of factional activity within the world Communist movement. At that time the fraternal parties unanimously rejected that demand of the Chinese delegation. The Meeting of 1960 said in its Statement that one of the necessary conditions for the Communists achieving their goals is the prevention of all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement.

Shortly after the Meeting the Chinese leaders violated that commitment, which they had made together with the other fraternal parties. They even tried—specifically in the article "Workers of All Countries, Unite! Fight Against Our Common Enemy!" (December 1962)—to put on a "theoretical" basis their refusal to carry out a common decision. They put forward the concept of "majority and minority", which claims that the minority has a right not to comply with collectively adopted

decisions and to combat the common line approved. This is nothing but a revision of the fundamental organisational principle of Leninism, for Lenin taught that "only the submission of the minority to the majority can be a principle of the working-class movement" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 20, p. 354, Russ. ed.).

The majority to which the Peking leaders are now opposed is a majority comprising Communist parties that have brought the working class of their countries to power and are achieving epoch-making victories for socialism. It is a majority which includes Communist parties of every single continent and is marching in the van of the revolutionary struggle.

The Chinese leaders are so blinded by their factionalism that they do not hesitate to describe the Marxist-Leninist parties as nothing more or less than a "fictitious" majority.

That device is by no means new. It was first used by splitters against Lenin; they declared boastfully that some day the majority would follow their lead and then they would recognise its will. Lenin wrote about such people that they "recognise the will of the majority of the class-conscious workers *not* at the present time but in the future, in that, and only in that, future when the workers will agree with them—the liquidators, Plekhanov and Trotsky" (*Coll Works,* Vol. 20, p. 451, Russ. ed.).

It follows that splitters at all times resort to the same kind of stratagems in opposing the will of the majority.

Lately, in fighting against the principle of submission of the minority to the majority, the CPC leaders have been the first among the opportunists and splitters whom the world Communist movement has ever encountered to put forward the thesis that the existence of several Communist parties in one and the same country is a "legitimate" thing. From what they say it follows that these parties should fight not so much against the enemies of the working class as among themselves. There is no need here to refute this thoroughly harmful concept at great length, for every politically-conscious worker realises that the unity of the class interests and will of the proletariat, and its ideology and class organisation are embodied in a single and solidly united Marxist-Leninist party. Still, it is worth pointing out once again the stratagems to which the present-day splitters have recourse to bring confusion into the working-class movement and undermine Communist unity.

For this they use a patently fraudulent device, deliberate misinterpretation of Lenin's statements. Here is a typical example.

In his well-known work "Violation of Unity Under Cover of Cries for Unity," Lenin condemns Trotsky's splitting activities, exposes his calumny against the Bolshevik Party and his attempts to disorganise the workers' movement with his propaganda of insubordination of the minority to the will of the majority of workers. Lenin wrote: "Where the *majority* of class conscious workers have rallied to precise and

definite decisions, there is *unity* of opinion and action, there is Party spirit and a Party ... Now by trying to persuade the workers *not to carry out the decisions* of that 'whole' which is recognised by the Marxists-*Pravda*ists, Trotsky *is trying* to disrupt the movement and cause a split." Lenin regarded Trotsky's activities as "splitting activity, in the sense that it is a most impudent violation of the will of the majority of the workers." (Vol. 20, pp. 310, 312).

The authors of the article published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* magazine on February 4, 1964, cite Lenin's article distorting the position of Lenin who always emphasized that the general proletarian discipline should be obligatory for all and demanded that the minority should submit to the will of the majority of workers. Trying to disorganize the Communist Parties, the Chinese splitters went as far as an outright forgery.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders obscure so obvious a point as the necessity for a definite international discipline within the Communist movement. They contend that such a discipline is out of the question since we no longer have a centralised organisation of the Comintern type.

But that is a statement by which the CPC betray themselves, probably unwittingly. They do not realise that international Communist discipline in the present conditions does not imply the execution of orders given by someone on top, but the assumption by the Communist parties—of their own free will and from a keen awareness of their internationalist duty—of definite obligations towards the world Communist movement as a whole and towards one another, as well as the consistent fulfilment of these obligations. This is what prompted the fraternal parties to pledge themselves in their Statement of 1960 to adhere strictly to the following principles: to cherish party unity as the apple of their eye; to abide in a spirit of solidarity by the jointly formulated appraisals and conclusions regarding the common tasks to be carried out in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism; to prevent all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement; to support one another and respect the independence and equality of all the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Consistent adherence to the collectively expressed will of the world Communist movement is an indication of the Marxist maturity of the party concerned, of its internationalism, for Marxism-Leninism and internationalism are inseparable.

The Chinese leaders' statements on this point are apparently influenced by their general view on discipline, which they regard not as politically conscious fulfilment of its duty by every contingent of the great alliance of like-minded Communists, but merely as compulsory execution of orders. They are evidently influenced by a practice which is so characteristic of the CPC leaders.

But how foreign that is to the Marxist-Leninist spirit! Lenin, speaking

of the Russian Bolsheviks, wrote: "We are proud of the fact that we decide the great questions of the workers' struggle for their emancipation submitting to the international discipline of the revolutionary proletariat, with due regard to the experience of the workers of different countries, to their knowledge and will, and in this way achieve—in deeds, and not in words as in the case of the Renners, Fritz Adlers and Otto Bauers—world-wide unity in the class struggle of the workers for communism" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 244, Russ. ed.).

What the Chinese leaders are particularly proud of today is their complete disregard for international Communist discipline, their truly anarchist behaviour both in polemics and in their relations with fraternal parties.

At present not only the underlying idea of the "theories" spread by the Chinese leaders with a view to justifying their splitting activities, but the main lines along which their activities are developing in practice, and their ways and methods, have become perfectly clear.

The CPC leaders aim their heaviest blows at the strongest and most authoritative contingents of the world communist movement, that is, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist parties of other socialist countries, and the French, Italian and other parties. They are out to discredit at all costs all the genuinely Marxist-Leninist parties, which enjoy well-earned respect in the world Communist movement and among the masses.

The attitude of the CC, CPC to the Communist parties functioning in the capitalist countries is particularly outrageous. The Chinese leaders are creating many additional difficulties for those parties, which have to work in difficult conditions as it is. They are doing their best to defame the Marxist-Leninist leaderships of those parties and to undermine their prestige. They fling at tried and tested leaders of the working class such insulting epithets as "as faint-hearted as mice", "parrots", "double-dealers", and so on.

They say those things about leaders of the parties which have set an example of heroic struggle against fascism, which today march at the head of the struggle against the monopolies and constitute a major national force. They say those things about militant and esteemed comrades who are fighting against heavy odds and are persecuted. Surely one cannot but resent it when they say that the leaders of the US Communist Party "co-operate with the most reckless of the US imperialists", that the Chilean Communists' position "meets the objectives of US imperialism, which wants to maintain its rule in Latin America", that the leadership of the Communist Party of India is no more than a "clique", and so on.

An idea of what Peking means by proletarian solidarity can be gained from the reaction of the CC CPC to the execution of Salam Adil and other leaders of the Communist Party of Iraq by the Baath nationalists. In their interviews with foreign delegations, the Chinese leaders frankly gloated over the atrocious assassination of the Iraqi comrades. Imme-

diately after the Baathist coup d'état they sought contact with the assassins. It is now clear that the Chinese representatives in Iraq wanted to take advantage of the fact that the Communist Party of Iraq found itself without a leadership and to form a splitter's group there.

The whole of the Chinese propaganda machine—the New China News Agency, information centres, various bulletins, and radio have now been turned against the Marxist-Leninist parties. The Chinese leaders have in effect opened a new ideological front against fraternal parties. Moreover, they do not mind directly borrowing any device, however base, from the anti-Communist arsenal. There is, for example, the falsehood, launched by Chinese propaganda, about the "baton of Moscow" at a wave of which Communist parties are supposed to "turn" one way or the other. This falsehood is an affront both to the fraternal parties which staunchly champion the national interests of their peoples and to the CPSU, to which all interference in the internal affairs of other parties is alien. It is nothing but a new version of that old fable of imperialist propaganda about the "hand of Moscow". In the past it was used against Lenin and the Comintern by Right Social-Democratic leaders. Today it has become a weapon of Peking.

A recent development which may be called the height of the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders is their recruitment of adherents in the ranks of fraternal parties, and the formation of factional groups composed of them. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CPC leadership already threatened fraternal parties that should they reject the propositions of Peking, they would be replaced by new people who "are or are not members of that party". Facts of recent date show that the Chinese leaders are now carrying out that threat by trying to saddle the working-class movement in some countries with leaders from among all sorts of renegades, turncoats and adventurers. The CPC leaders are trying to make the splitters' groups they form out of those renegades their main weapon in the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

To date anti-party groups of renegades and splitters have been set up, with help and support from Peking, in Belgium, Brazil, Australia, Ceylon, Britain and some other countries. Some of those groups number less than ten members and some others comprise a few dozen of people. This does not, however, embarrass the Chinese leaders, for, on orders from Peking, those groups shout loudly and in unison, pouring lies and slander upon the world Communist movement and the Marxist-Leninist parties. The ringleaders of those groups unexpectedly come into possession of large sums of money. They found newspapers and magazines and begin to publish all manner of slanderous writings, and often open shops of their own to sell Chinese propaganda productions.

The political complexion of the members of those groupings bespeaks the Chinese leaders' complete lack of principle. These as a rule are opportunists, unstable elements expelled from Communists parties for advocating anti-Marxist views, for factional activity or for immoral behaviour, or ambitious men seeking a career, political "weathercocks"

and the like. Members of anti-Party groupings in some countries have displayed rightist opportunist tendencies. There are people with a shady record and all kinds of adventurers acting in the splitters' groups in Austria, Chile and the United States.

It stands to reason that fraternal parties refuse to put up with factional groups and throw them out of their ranks. Whenever this happens, Peking "takes to task" the fraternal party concerned, which it accuses of nothing more or less than "using unlawful methods". The Chinese leaders declare expelled splitters to be "true revolutionaries" and "courageous fighters", although all that their "struggle" boils down to is the writing of high-sounding "manifestoes" against the Communist Party concerned. They make frequent trips to Peking, where they are received with great pomp and where their long articles peddling calumnies are published.

The meaning of the clamour raised in Peking over factional groups has become perfectly obvious in recent months. The Chinese leaders have revealed it themselves. A very short time ago they widely advertised a get-together of renegades in Belgium, which termed itself nothing more or less than a "national conference", and passed a ridiculous resolution to "re-establish (sic!) the Communist Party of Belgium" and "condemn the anti-Party behaviour of the former (sic!) Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium". As for the Chinese leaders, they base themselves on that fiction to describe the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium elected by the Party Congress as the "former" CC, as if it were Peking and not the working class of the country concerned that founded a Communist party. In the same way the CPC leaders "abolished" the central committees of certain other Communist parties, such as that of Ceylon.

We must say plainly that there has never been anything like that in the history of the communist movement. It has never occurred to a Communist party to declare wretched groups of splitters expelled from another Communist party to be the real Party and to describe the real Communist Party as a "has-been". The Chinese leaders, who talk so loudly about equality and non-interference by parties in one another's internal affairs, today lay claim to the role of "supreme judges" in the Communist movement who shall decide for the Communist parties concerned matters bearing on their internal life.

The splitters' groups set up by Peking have no roots in the working-class movement and in the general democratic struggle of the masses, nor can they have any. They are outside the world Communist movement and no politically-conscious worker will ever agree to have anything to do with them. They have been brought into existence in an absolutely artificial manner, being a product of the splitting activities of Peking. It should be noted that their rise has been very well received by the ruling circles of the capitalist countries, which see them as a gratuitous "fifth column" in the working-class movement.

At present the leaders of the CC, CPC, are carrying things further,

plainly intending to form, as a counterweight to the world Communist movement, a bloc of their supporters with its own platform and group discipline, and with headquarters in Peking. These plans were given away as early as the end of 1962 by Mehmet Shehu, who said that a bloc of parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism was being formed with the Chinese Party at the head.

Why is that bloc being set up? Anyone should realise that its aim is not to fight for the objectives of the working-class movement against world imperialism, for the very idea of the bloc contains the seeds of a split and, consequently, of a weakening of the working class. That bloc is being set up to fight against the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the world Communist movement, for the benefit of the special aims of the CC, CPC leadership.

The Chinese leaders have extended their policy of splitting the world Communist movement to the international front of the democratic forces. For several years now they have been using the congresses and conferences of peace fighters and of women's, youth and other international associations for disruptive sorties. This was the case at the conferences of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation, the Women's Congress in Moscow, the session of the World Peace Council in Warsaw, and at other international forums. Juggling with "revolutionary phrases", the Chinese leaders try to impose on all those organisations tasks and functions alien to them, to discredit and declare unnecessary the principal slogans and demands which gave rise to those democratic movements. Obviously, the Chinese representatives' sectarian position is directed towards alienating from those movements large sections of the population holding different views and towards narrowing the mass base of the general democratic struggle.

Comrades, the world Communist movement has become the most influential political force of today. In waging a grim struggle against imperialist reaction, for the interests of the working class and all working people, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, it has made great progress, considerably increased its membership and scored outstanding victories. The post-war period has seen the rise of dozens of new Communist parties and today there is not a corner on the globe where Communists are not carrying the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism to the people. The last decade has been particularly eventful for the world Communist movement. It is in this decade that the movement has, in eliminating the harmful effects of the personality cult, become much more active in its creative thought and practical work, which it has brought even closer to reality, to the needs and expectations of the mass of the people.

Against that historical background, the harm of the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, as well as the utter hopelessness of their attempts to lead world communism astray from its Leninist path and to make it subservient to their own designs, are particularly obvious.

It would be wrong, however, to underrate the danger of the factional

activities of the CC, CPC. The Chinese leaders pin their hopes on all sorts of immature and unstable elements, and also on those who are unaffected by the new spirit which has permeated the Communist movement during the last decade, and who cling to the practices of the personality cult and are still fettered by the dogmatic and doctrinaire patterns implanted by it.

The Chinese leadership's factional methods are also adopted by all manner of renegades and turncoats, who are willing to fight against communism under any flag.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders clearly want to profit by the real discontent of the people at the anti-popular, reactionary policies of the ruling classes of the capitalist countries. In our day, when hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people, including people who are at sea in politics and lack experience, are joining in an active political struggle, the "ultra-Left" revolutionary phrases in which the Chinese leaders couch their adventuristic concepts are likely to bring a certain response. This applies, above all, to those countries where there is no industrial proletariat or where it is small, and where petty-bourgeois ideology exercises considerable influence, while the theoretical maturity of revolutionary leaders is not always up to the mark.

To disguise their anti-Leninist line and their splitting activities, the Chinese leaders profess to be fighting "modern revisionism". They label as "revisionist" the Marxist-Leninist parties and exalt themselves as the "true" revolutionaries. They expect that they can in this way mislead people who are unfamiliar with the true history of the struggle of the world Communist movement against Right and "Left" opportunism, and are inclined to assimilate superficial patterns of revolutionary struggle rather than to master the substance of our great doctrine.

We know well from the history of the communist movement that irresponsible accusations of revisionism have repeatedly been levelled at the proponents of creative Marxism by all kinds of dogmatists and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. In the autumn of 1920, for example, G. Gorter, a Dutch "Left" Communist expelled from the Comintern, wrote in his Open Letter to Lenin, in reply to Lenin's book *"Left-wing Communism", an Infantile Disorder:* "You and the Third International are now doing what Social-Democrats did in the past... In accordance with the development of the working-class movement in Western Europe, there exist two trends: radical and opportunist. You, however, Comrade Lenin, support the opportunist trend... From a Marxist leader you are turning into an opportunist leader."

How many people recall today those wretched sallies against the greatest revolutionary in world history?

The methods used by the Chinese splitters cannot deceive the Marxists-Leninists of the world. The absolute majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties has openly condemned the anti-Leninist, adventuristic policy of the leaders of the CC, CPC. Numerous documents, statements by prominent leaders of the world Communist movement, and the

Party press have strongly criticised the harmful propositions and factional, disruptive actions of the Chinese leaders. All this means that, taken as a whole, the world Communist movement today adheres to the only position that is correct, namely, the Marxist-Leninist position.

Our Party, which was reared by Lenin, will continue, together with the other fraternal parties, to fight unrelentingly against all opportunist actions both from the Right and from the "Left", for the unity of the fraternal parties and all the contingents of the world revolutionary movement, and for the purity of the all-conquering Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

VII

The Danger of the Petty-Bourgeois, Nationalist, Neo-Trotskyite Deviation

Soviet Communists, as all other Marxists-Leninists in the world, cannot limit themselves to a criticism and political assessment of the erroneous, anti-Leninist views of the CPC leadership. Each of us inevitably asks the question: How has it happened that the leaders of a party like the CPC, which has considerable experience of revolutionary struggle and of building a new society, have taken the road of struggle against the world Communist movement? Who are we dealing with in the person of the CPC leadership?

The experience of our Party and of the whole international working-class movement shows that on many occasions Leninism had come to grips with views and propositions such as are now being trumpeted by the Chinese leadership. Naturally, the present advocates of these views do not simply repeat what their predecessors said. They adapt old ideas to new conditions and to their own requirements.

Lenin, as we know, pointed out that Bolshevism grew, gained strength and became steeled chiefly in the struggle against Right-wing opportunism. "This was," he wrote, "naturally, the principal enemy of Bolshevism within the working-class movement". At the same time he emphasised the importance of another aspect of the experience of Bolshevism, about which, he noted, much too little was known abroad. "Bolshevism," he wrote in *'Left-Wing Communism', an Infantile Disorder,* "grew up, took shape and became steeled in a drawn-out struggle against *petty-bourgeois revolutionism,* which smacks of anarchism or borrows something from it, which departs in all essentials from the conditions and requirements of a consistent proletarian class struggle" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31. pp. 15—16).

It is noteworthy that the Chinese leaders, who love to refer relevantly and irrelevantly, to examples of past ideological differences and draw historical parallels, pass over in complete silence this aspect of Bolshevik experience. That is not accidental, for each word that Lenin directed against representatives of petty-bourgeois revolutionism or, as he ironically called it, petty-bourgeois "revolutionarism", is di-

rected at the present ideological and political concepts and propositions of the CPC leadership.

A comprehensive characteristation is given of petty-bourgeois revolutionism in Lenin's numerous works, in the decisions of our Party and in the documents of the Communist International. Lenin saw its sources in the special position of the petty proprietor, who easily goes over to "extreme revolutionism" but is unable to display self-control, organisation, discipline and staunchness and is inclined to swing from one extreme to another,

Everybody knows of the struggle Bolshevism waged against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, a party "which more than any other," as Lenin noted, "showed a tendency to go over to petty-bourgeois revolutionism" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 16). We cannot help but recall that the Socialist-Revolutionaries rejected the idea that the working class plays the leading role and tried to prove that only the peasant movement is the true socialist movement.

From time to time, particularly at sharp turns in history, petty-bourgeois vacillation made itself felt in the ranks of the proletarian parties as well. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the proletariat was not insured against the penetration of petty-bourgeois ideology and prejudices into its ranks. Joining the proletarian parties the best of the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries re-educate themselves, seriously study Marxism and in the end become true revolutionaries. Others are either too slow or incapable of learning anything from the proletarian party "except a few words and 'striking' slogans learnt by rote..." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 16, pp. 44—45).

Our Party had to combat "leftist" petty-bourgeois vacillation most of all after taking over power, during the early years of the development of the Soviet state. We know the relentless struggle that Lenin waged against "Left-wing Communists", the "workers' opposition", Trotskyism and the "ultra-leftist" trend in the then young Communist movement.

Allow me to remind you of the struggle against the "Left-wing Communists" in the period the Brest Peace was concluded, when they attempted to foist upon the Soviet Republic the disastrous adventurist tactics of a "revolutionary war". Lenin held that despite their clamorous revolutionary talk, the "Left-wing Communists" based their views on stark pessimism and utter despair (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 51, Russ. ed.). As regards the objective role played by the "Left-wing Communists" at that time, Lenin, addressing them, said bluntly: "By your objective role you are the weapon of imperialist provocation. While your subjective 'psychology' is that of an infuriated petty bourgeois who swaggers and boasts and yet is fully aware that the proletariat is right..." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 297, Russ. ed.).

In the situation that has now arisen in the international Communist movement special mention must be made of the acute struggle that our Party waged against Trotskyism. Trotskyism was a clearly express-

ed petty-bourgeois deviation. It laid false claim to being a more "leftist", a more "revolutionary" trend than Bolshevism. While proclaiming themselves the "true" champions of the world revolution, Trotsky and his supporters in actual fact opposed Leninism. Moreover, Trotskyism was a negation of the Bolshevik Party, of the unity of its ranks. Factionalism comprised the "soul" of Trotskyism. The Trotskyites joined hands not only with the small factional groups within the Comintern but also with organisations, groups and individuals that had never belonged to Communist parties, and also with enemies and traitors expelled from their ranks.

Do we have to recall all these facts? Yes, comrades, we have to, in order to take into account the lessons of past struggles against Leninism.

Do the Chinese theoriticians' present concepts not remind us of many of the ideas of the petty-bourgeois trends that were defeated by Leninism long ago? Only a petty-bourgeois "ultra"-revolutionary can regard the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems as a "renunciation" of the struggle against imperialism, a "rejection" of the revolution. He alone welcomes the thesis of the "revolutionary war" being the "last, decisive means" of putting an end to the contradiction between the two social systems. Only a petty-bourgeois "arch"-revolutionary can demand that revolution be started "at once" and "everywhere" without taking into account concrete conditions and the balance of forces. He alone can oppose the utilisation of the peaceful road of revolution because his only criterion of "revolutionism" is the use of armed force regardless of whether circumstances require it or not.

It is quite understandable that having steered this course, the Chinese leaders have naturally come down to borrowing many of their ideas and concepts from the ideological arsenal of Trotskyism in the same way as they have inherited from it their factional, splitting methods of struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties.

Yes, comrades, it must be said openly that the entire range of the CPC leadership's theoretical and political views are in many ways a rehash of Trotskyism, which has long ago been thrown overboard by the international revolutionary movement.

What in actual fact are the views of the Chinese leaders on the questions of war and peace? Nothing but a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slogan of "neither war nor peace".

Or take the CC, CPC leadership's active opposition to economic competition with capitalism. Is there anything new in it? No, it is merely a repetition of the old Trotskyite line of rejecting peaceful economic development and going over to the tactics of "revolutionry war", of giving the world revolution a "push" by armed force.

That, of course, was the real meaning behind the Trotskyite theory of "permanent revolution". The struggle against Trotskyism on this issue was of historic significance. The future of the world's first

Land of Socialism, the future of the entire world revolutionary movement depended on the outcome of this struggle. What would have happened had our Party adopted that line? It would have found itself helpless in the face of world imperialism and would have fallen easy prey to it in the event of an armed attack.

Properly speaking, the dispute the Chinese leaders have started concerns the same question of whether to take the road of "revolutionary" adventures or to adhere to the Leninist policy of strengthening the economic and political might of the world system of socialism and developing the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples, taking full account of Lenin's theory of the revolution being the result of the aggravation of internal class contradictions in each country.

The kinship with Trotskyism is no less striking also in the Chinese theses on the danger of "bourgeois degeneration" in the socialist countries. In reply to these fabrications we can say that they are not new, that our Party has heard them before. They are a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slander about the "degeneration" of the USSR into a "Thermidor" state.

Besides, do we not find features of Trotskyism in the Chinese concepts which exaggerate the role of force, of coercion in the revolution and in the building of socialism?

Furthermore, compare the views of the CPC leaders with the "ideas" of modern Trotskyism. Perhaps some people think that the Chinese theory about the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America being the "storm-centres of the world revolution" is new? No, it is almost a word for word repetition of one of the basic theses of present-day Trotskyism. The decisions of the so-called IV (Trotskyite) International contain the words: "... As a result of the successive defeats of the two major revolutionary waves in 1919-23 and 1943-48 and the weaker wave of 1934-37, the focus of the world revolution has for the present shifted to the colonial world."

Here you have the source of the Chinese leadership's political wisdom.

In the writings of modern Trotskyites one can find other "ultra"-revolutionary phrases, which are reproduced almost word for word by the Chinese press and given out as so-called "revolutionary principles". Peaceful co-existence of countries with different social systems, the Trotskyites vociferate, "is not only impossible but also harmful to the working-class of all countries" because it helps "to strengthen the positions of capitalism and weakens the positions of socialism". They boastfully declare that "only the person who is fearlessly prepared to face the consequences of the nuclear war being hatched by capitalism" can be considered a true revolutionary, and so on and so forth.

After this is it surprising that in addressing the CPC leaders the ringleaders of modern Trotskyism say to them (as was said last July by Posadas, one of the heads of Trotskyism in Latin America): "Com-

rades Chinese, you have no right to maintain that all the questions you are putting forward as revolutionary conclusions are the result solely of your own theoretical and political works. They are the conclusions of the IV International."

Small wonder that the Trotskyites openly link up their hopes for a revival of their long-withered movement with the present political line of the Chinese leadership. "The political stand taken by the Communist Party of China," states the so-called "Manifesto" of the sixth congress of their "International", "indicates tremendous possibilities, which open a field of activity such as Trotskyism never had before."

The Chinese leaders pretend they do not notice all this. They have evidently reasoned along the following lines: "Present-day Trotskyism is a little-known trend and we can use its ideas by giving them a 'Sinified' form." But the truth will out. No matter how the Chinese leadership strive to conceal the real source of their ideas they cannot hide the coincidence of their views with those of the Trotskyites, past and present.

Like the Trotskyites, the Chinese leader are demanding freedom for factions and groupings in the Communist movement and using their methods for subversive activity in the movement, Does anyone think we cannot recognise in the malicious personal attacks of Chinese propaganda against leaders of the CPSU and the Communist parties of France, Italy, the USA, India and other countries the familiar "handwriting" of the Trotskyites, who dreamed of finding ways of casting still more vicious slander at popular leaders of the working class?

The modern Trotskyites do not hide their jubilation over these actions of the CPC leaders. In a statement published in Paris at the close of last year, the joint secretariat of the Trotskyite "International" assured the Chinese leaders that it "would support them" in the struggle against the CPSU and also against the Indian, US, French, Italian and other Communist parties. At a meeting in the summer of 1963 the Executive Committee of this "International" issued a special resolution approving the "historical mission of joining the Chinese and working for a united front between the IV International and the Chinese comrades".

These facts speak for themselves. The logic of their struggle with the CPSU and the world Communist movement is bringing the CPC leaders ever closer to Trotskyism, the bitterest enemy of Marxism-Leninism.

One must say that at one time the Chinese leaders themselves saw the danger of petty-bourgeois pressure on the Communist Party of China. "Our Party," Mao Tse-tung, for example, said, "is not only surrounded by this broad social stratum from without, but people with a petty-bourgeois background form a huge majority within it as well . . . Petty-bourgeois ideology of all shades frequently finds expression in our Party" (Mao Tse-tung, Vol. 4, pp. 386—387, Russ. ed.). In the CPC, he said elsewhere, petty-bourgeois ideology finds expression in "dashing

now to the left, now to the right, in a weakness for leftist revolutionary verbiage and slogans, in sectarian exclusiveness and adventurism".

The Chinese leaders used to be right in what they wrote. But now they have ceased talking about the danger of petty-bourgeois degeneration. Is it because petty-bourgeois ideology has taken the upper hand in their own views, in their political line, in the methods of their activity?

Yet in a country like China, as in tsarist Russia, with its huge preponderance of non-proletarian strata among the population, Communists must be especially vigilant with regard to the penetration of petty-bourgeois views and traditions into the ranks of the working class. Under Lenin's leadership our Party successfully coped with this task. From its very inception it was a party of the militant working class, which was linked up with large-scale industry and had extensive training in the proletarian class struggle. The fact that Lenin and the Bolsheviks drew on the experience of the entire international working-class movement and firmly adhered to the principles and ideals of the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was of fundamental importance.

The CPC leaders evidently lack sufficient Marxist-Leninist grounding to stand firm against the pressure of petty-bourgeois elements and uphold the line of proletarian socialism. This alone can explain the fact that petty-bourgeois ideology laid its imprint on both their internal and foreign policy.

We would not have liked to touch upon the question of the internal policy of the CPC leadership. But we are compelled to do so, because the adventurist line of the Chinese leaders in the international arena is linked up with their mistakes in domestic policy.

Marxists-Leninists of all countries now know the result of the so-called policy of the "big leap" and people's communes. One cannot fail to see in this policy "leftist" attemps to "leap" over necessary stages of social development.

Our Party has always given the Chinese Communists due credit for the democratic and socialist transformations effected after the triumph of the Revolution. In the period 1949—57, when it pursued a realistic line, utilized the experience of the other socialist countries and relied on their support, the Communist Party of China achieved considerable successes in promoting China's economic, social and political development. Soviet people sincerely rejoiced over these successes.

But in 1958 this line was suddenly revised and replaced with the so-called policy of three red banners—of the general line, the big leap and the people's communes. The Chinese leaders decided to accomplish in a few years the tasks for which back in 1956 it was felt three or more five-year plans were needed. It was decided to increase the gross industrial output 6.5 times (with an average annual increase rate of 45 per cent!) and the total agricultural output 2.5 times (with an average annual increase rate of 20 per cent!) in five years (1958-62).

These plans were drawn up without any economic substantiation whatsoever, without taking the country's real possibilities into account.

The people's communes that were set up in the countryside had the job of ensuring the "leap to communism" in 3—4 or 5—6 years.

Everybody knows what came of these experiments. The CPR's economy found itself hurled several years back. The line of the "three red banners" led to a serious disorganisation of the entire national economy, to a sharp retardation of the rate of industrialisation and affected the people's standard of living.

In saying this, we are, naturally, not gloating over the failures of the Chinese Communists. Like them, we are distressed by the difficulties that have fallen to the lot of the fraternal Chinese people. Our sole purpose in speaking of these facts is to show what a departure from tested Leninist principles of socialist construction leads to.

In analysing the present positions of the Chinese leadership one cannot fail to see that they also stem from the increasingly more open nationalistic, great-power aspirations that are particularly evident in the foreign policy of the CPC leaders. History knows of many cases when vociferous "revolutionarism" went hand in hand with the most blatant nationalism. Lenin pointed out time and again that the social and economic conditions giving rise to the petty proprietor impart especial stability to one of "the most deep-seated of petty-bourgeois prejudices, namely: prejudices of national egoism, of national narrow-mindedness" (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 128, Russ. ed.).

Facts show that nationalism is gaining the upper hand more and more in the entire policy of the Chinese leaders, that it is becoming the mainspring of their actions. This manifested itself during the period of the "big leap", which was obviously planned as an attempt to overtake all the socialist countries and occupy a dominating position in the world socialist system.

Later these tendencies became more and more pronounced. This found expression in such actions of the Chinese Government as the artificial fanning of nationalistic passions around frontier issues, the behaviour of the CPC leaders during the Caribbean crisis and the stand of the Chinese Government in the nuclear problem.

These and other facts reveal the complete discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and what they do. It is becoming increasingly clear that the "leftist" talk and prescriptions are intended solely for "export", for the Communist parties of other countries. As for themselves, when matters concern practical steps in the international arena, the CPC leaders prefer to act from anything but positions of revolutionary struggle against imperialism. It is extremely surprising why at present Chinese propaganda reduces the entire struggle against imperialism solely to a struggle with the US, by-passing its allies—the Japanese, West German and French imperialists. Are they, perhaps,

looking for partners among the monopolistic groups of these countries for the struggle against what they term as "modern revisionism"?

Great suspicion is evoked by the Chinese leaders' so-called theory of an "intermediate zone", which regards West Germany, Britain, France and Japan as countries held in thralldom by US imperialism, thereby embellishing the imperialists of Britain, France, Japan and, in particular, West Germany, glossing over their aggressive nature and the threat they constitute for the socialist countries, the national liberation movement and world peace. The 1960 Statement lays stress on the special threat to the cause of peace from West-German imperialism and sets the Communist parties the task of intensifying the struggle against its aggressive aspirations. From their own experience the Soviet people know how dangerous this imperialist vulture is. West-German imperialism is no longer a mere satellite of US imperialism. Relying on a huge economic potential, which considerably exceeds the potential possessed by the whole of nazi Germany, West-German imperialism has created a large war machine and is increasingly setting the tone in Nato.

British, French and Japanese imperialism are likewise exceedingly dangerous. This is seen from, say, the example of recent events in Cyprus, in East Africa, Gabon and South-east Asia, where the British and French imperialists are resorting to armed force to suppress the national-liberation movement.

The CPSU holds that side by side with a determined struggle against US imperialism, the major international exploiter and policeman, all anti-imperialist forces must also carry on a struggle against the aggressive, reactionary forces of British, French, West-German and Japanese imperialism. The Chinese theory of an "intermediate zone", on the other hand, objectively whitewashes the imperialists of Britain, France, West Germany and Japan, and is hence to their advantage.

It must be said that the ruling circles of the imperialist powers have "divined" the secret of Chinese policy. They have understood that the "revolutionary phrase-mongering" of the Chinese leaders is not at all directed against imperialism. In effect, the purpose of this phrase-mongering is to screen a savage struggle against the CPSU and the world Communist movement and in no way threatens the imperialists. That accounts for the change that has come about in the policy of the leading capitalist states with regard to China.

We shall not hide the fact that following all these manoeuvres of the Chinese leaders, we, like all other Marxists-Leninists in the world, are justifiably alarmed at the dangerous path onto which the Chinese leaders are dragging their great country. There is the danger that in pursuing their erroneous, anti-Leninist line, the Chinese leaders will virtually land themselves in the same boat with reactionary, bellicose elements of imperialism, as has already happened in connection with the CPR Government's refusal to sign the Moscow partial test-ban treaty.

The nationalist policy of the CPC leaders has nothing in common with the actual national interests of the fraternal Chinese nation. Most of all, it is the peoples of the socialist countries that can be sincere allies of the peoples of China. The peoples of China have a vested interest in the consolidation of the world socialist system, in an enduring alliance with all the anti-imperialist forces. In that lies the earnest of the rapid advance of People's China along the socialist road.

It is impossible to comprehend the present attitude of the CC, CPC, both in the country and internationally, unless it is viewed in the context of the situation within the Communist Party of China and in the country itself that has arisen due to the personality cult. It must not be overlooked that the Mao Tse-tung personality cult is having an increasingly negative effect on the activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

For many years Chinese propaganda has been drumming it into everybody's head that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the "supreme embodiment of Marxism-Leninism" and that our epoch is the "epoch of Mao Tse-tung". By asserting that the brunt of generalising the historical tasks of our time has fallen completely upon the shoulders of Mao Tse-tung alone, Chinese propaganda claims that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the Marxism-Leninism of our epoch, "the scientific theory of socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism".

It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leadership is striving to spread the Mao Tse-tung personality cult to the whole world communist movement, so that the leader of the CPC should, like Stalin in his day, sit aloft, God-like, above all the Marxist-Leninist parties and settle arbitrarily all matters of their policy and work. The ideology and practice of the personality cult largely explain the appearance of hegemonic ambitions among the Chinese leaders.

But history does not repeat itself. What was once a tragedy will be no more than a farce if it occurs a second time. The CPC leaders ought to know that the Communist movement will never allow the personality cult, which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, to recur, for it has paid too dearly for it in the past. The Communist movement and the personality cult are incompatible.

The Twentieth Congress of the CPSU has put an end to this alien phenomenon in our Party once and for all, and has created conditions in which the things that occurred in the personality cult period can never be repeated.

The Party has completely restored the Leninist principles in Party and state affairs. It has restored and developed the principles of socialist democracy. The course charted by the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU was fully supported in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings. It is clear, therefore, that denouncing the struggle against the personality cult ideology is tantamount to departing from the agreed line of the Communist movement, that it is tantamount to impelling the Communist movement deliberately towards an

incorrect path, a path foreign to Marxism-Leninism and the nature of the socialist system.

Yet that is exactly what the Chinese leaders are doing. They have undertaken the defence of the Stalin personality cult and have declared that fighting against it means "overthrowing Marxism-Leninism" and "stigmatising the dictatorship of the proletariat".

However, it is the personality cult that leads to perversions of important aspects in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the highest form of democracy, a democracy for the working people. In Lenin's time the democratic principles of party and state life and socialist legality were always strictly observed. He fought against anti-party groups and trends with Party methods, drawing on the support of the Party rank and file. A different method predominated during the Stalin personality cult period—the method of physical elimination of all Party workers whom Stalin suspected of disagreeing with his views. What is more, the abuses and repressions against tested and faithful Party and government workers were particularly intensified at a time when the struggle against the opposition was over and socialism had won. Stalin turned the "avenging sword" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, intended to strike at the enemies, against the cadres of the Communist Party and the socialist state.

But it is evidently this very aspect of Stalin's activities that the Chinese leaders like most—since they identify this incorrect method of leadership with the dictatorship of the proletariat. In spite of the now widely known facts testifying to Stalin's abuse of power during the personality cult period, in spite of Stalin's departure from Lenin's precepts on certain important issues, the Chinese leaders place Stalin on a pedestal, depicting him as the "great continuer" of Lenin's cause. The Chinese leaders speak and write about the wholesale repressions during the personality cult period as though they were no more than slight "excesses".

This policy of the Chinese leaders augurs no good to the people. It smacks of the ideology and ethics not of Marxists, not of Leninists, but of people who bank on methods of violence and suppression. The Chinese leaders ought to ask the Soviet Communists, the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia who experienced the evil consequences of the personality cult what they think of the attempts to vindicate the perversions and mistakes made by Stalin and of restoring the personality cult. They would get only one answer: never again!

Our Party has routed the Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov anti-Party group. This group resisted the abolition of the personality cult, not the least consideration being that many of its members were also responsible for the wholesale persecution of guiltless people at a time when they themselves stood at the country's helm together with Stalin.

The crimes perpetrated by Stalin and the subsequently exposed members of the anti-Party group against prominent leaders of the

Communist Party and the Soviet state, have now come to light. But that is not all. It has been learned that Molotov, together with Stalin, sanctioned the execution also of the wives of these leaders entered in the so-called "List No. 4 of the Wives of the Enemies of the People", listing the names of V. A. Dybenko-Sedyakina, E. S. Kosyor, A. I. Chubar, E. E. Eikhe-Rubtsova, and others. In many cases, Molotov tried, as the saying goes, to be "more papal than the Pope". In one of the documents endorsing long prison terms for a large group of wives of arrested functionaries, Molotov wrote "capital punishment" against one of the names in the list.

Do the Chinese leaders, perhaps, wish to restore these inhuman practices? Is that why they show such sympathy for people who have been expelled from our Party?

In the matter of the personality cult the Chinese leaders have departed not only from the conclusions and propositions of the world Communist movement, but also from their own previous declarations.

It may be recalled that in 1956 and 1957 Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi in their speeches and articles about the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat approved by the Political Bureau of the CC, CPC, highly commended the efforts of the CPSU to eliminate the consequences of the personality cult. At the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957, Mao Tse-tung said: "In the past four or five years since Stalin's death the situation has improved considerably in the Soviet Union in the sphere of both domestic policy and foreign policy. This shows that the line represented by Comrade Khrushchov is more correct and that the opposition to this line is incorrect." At that time the Chinese leaders rightly said that none but "the reactionaries of the whole world" could oppose the line of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU.

Yet now the Chinese leaders are defending the personality cult in pursuance of their own political designs. They are defending Stalin's distortions and mistakes largely because they are themselves implanting the Mao Tse-tung personality cult.

The present political line of the CPC leaders again shows the world Communist movement and the politically conscious workers of the whole world how pernicious are the practices of the personality cult, and what harm they inflict on the interests of the peoples, on the great struggle against imperialism, for socialism. Affirmation of the personality cult ideology in the Communist movement would lead it into a cul-de-sac and do grave harm to the socialist and communist cause.

Therefore, an examination of the sources of the present anti-Leninist disruptive policy of the CPC leadership leads to the conclusion that the world Communist movement faces the real danger of a petty-bourgeois nationalist deviation disguised by "Left" phraseology. The danger of this deviation is all the greater, since we are dealing with leaders

of a party in power which has at its disposal a large state machine and the means of ideological indoctrination.

It is clear that the CPSU, like all the other Marxist-Leninist parties, cannot but take measures in order to attenuate as much as possible the harm that this petty-bourgeois deviation may inflict on the world Communist movement.

VIII

For Unity of the World Communist Movement on the Basis of Marxist-Leninist Principles

Comrades, our Party has every right to say that we have done, and are still doing everything in our power to overcome the differences and to resorte co-operation between the CPC and the CPSU, to strengthen the friendship between the CRP and the Soviet Union and to cement the unity of the world Communist movement. In spite of the inadmissible methods of debate used by the leaders of the CPC, in spite of their open struggle against the CPSU and other fraternal parties, our Party has shown the maximum of restraint, the maximum sense of responsibility, and the maximum concern for the cohesion of the communist ranks.

In the last few years, acting on the initiative of Comrade Khrushchov, the CC CPSU and the Soviet Government undertook many practical measures aimed at uniting our parties and at preserving and expanding cooperation with the CPR in the political, economic, scientific, technical and cultural spheres. If these measures have failed to yield results, the blame rests entirely with the Chinese leaders.

When the Chinese leaders began their unveiled attacks on our Party, the CC CPSU addressed several letters to the CC CPC, pointing out that the fundamental interests of the Socialist and Communist cause require that our Parties should, as before, in spite of the existing differences, pursue an agreed policy in all matters of principle. We suggested stopping the needless controversy over questions on which opinions differ, and to cease making any public statements, which only tend to deepen the differences. The letters put forward concrete proposals envisaging coordinated actions in world affairs, greater exchange of foreign policy information and agreed action in the international democratic organisations, etc.

In October 1962, Comrade Khrushchov asked the Chinese Ambassador to the USSR, who was returning home, to tell the Chinese leaders that we proposed to "abandon all arguments and differences, to stop discussing who is right and who is wrong, not to rake up the past, and to begin our relations over again with a clean slate".

Although the Chinese press had by then published a whole series of articles containing gross attacks on the CPSU and other fraternal parties, Comrade Khrushchov declared in a conversation with the new Chinese Ambassador in January 1963 that "we want to return to our

previous fraternal relations and are ready to do everything for this purpose".

But the leaders of the CPC invariably responded to these acts of good will on the part of the Central Committee of our Party by deliberately doing everything possible to aggravate the differences, and mounted fresh attacks on the CPSU, the Soviet Government and the general line of the world Communist movement.

In the struggle against the CPSU and its Leninist policy, the Chinese leaders are concentrating their fire mainly against Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov. To be sure, they cannot fail to see that it is Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov who stands in the van of the remarkable developments that have taken place in our Party and country since the Twentieth Congress and which ensure the successful progress of the Soviet people to communism. That is why they would like to isolate Comrade Khrushchov from the Central Committee for their subversive ends and to oppose our Central Committee to the Party and the Soviet people.

But this foul plan is adventuristic and hopeless, and is doomed to complete and ignominious failure.

The Chinese leaders, and not they alone, should know once and for all that our Central Committee, headed by the loyal Leninist, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov, has never been so united and monolithic as now.

Comrade Khrushchov with his inexhaustible energy, his truly Bolshevik zeal and devotion to principle, is the recognised leader of our Party and our people. He expresses the most cherished thoughts and aspirations of the Soviet people. The Leninist line pursued by our Party cannot be separated from the Central Committee, from Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov. This line has elevated our country's world prestige to unprecedented heights, it has elevated its prestige in the eyes of the working people of the whole world. This Leninist line is supported wholeheartedly by all the Communists and all the people of our land.

Our Party has never feared ideological struggle. But it believes that ideological differences should be settled on the basis of Leninist principles and that the polemics be subordinated to the interests of the working-class movement.

The CC, CPSU, clearly foresaw the danger that the Chinese leaders would seek to use the open polemics not as a means of ironing out disputed questions but as an excuse for piling up absurd, slanderous charges, an instrument of ideological and political struggle against the Communist movement.

Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, our Party has exerted considerable effort to terminate the open polemics forced upon us by the CPC leaders. The CC, CPSU, has repeatedly taken the initiative to that end—notably in January 1963, in the speech of Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC, CPSU, at the Sixth Congress of

the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. This initiative was backed by the overwhelming majority of Marxist-Leninist parties. But the Chinese leadership refused to discuss this proposal and saw fit to extend the range of questions in dispute, to aggravate and provoke the polemics.

Last spring an agreement was reached on a bilateral meeting of CPSU and CPC representatives. We hoped that at this meeting the Chinese comrades would be ready to concentrate efforts not on what divides us, but on what unites the CPC with the CPSU and with other fraternal parties. The CPSU delegation suggested that all questions in dispute be thoroughly thrashed out, in order to clear the path for a normalisation of relations, to cement the unity of our Parties and of the world Communist movement as a whole. We submitted a concrete programme for the development of relations between the USSR and the CPR.

But the CPC delegation took advantage of the meeting to exacerbate the differences and to level violent and groundless attacks at the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. After reading prepared statements, which completely ignored our arguments and proposals, the Chinese delegates called for an adjournment of the bilateral talks.

All the measures taken by the CC CPSU were prompted by a sincere desire to strengthen the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the cohesion of the socialist countries. Our task was to utilize every available opportunity to remove the differences and prevent a split, and not be carried away by the heat of the struggle.

The Chinese leadership, however, apparently understood these measures of ours differently. It became clear that they took our restraint, our striving towards unity, for a sign of weakness. Lately they have begun saying that they will not agree to any improvement of relations with the CPSU, except on the basis of our "unconditional surrender". What do the Chinese leaders want?

In substance, they want the Communist movement to retreat from its positions on all the basic problems of our times.

The world Communist movement considers it vitally necessary to utilize the present situation to unite all the revolutionary forces of our time ever more closely and to develop the world revolutionary process further.

In contrast to this the Chinese leaders have set their sights on dividing the main revolutionary forces of our time — the socialist world system, the international working class, and the national-liberation movement. This can only act as a break on the development of the world revolutionary process.

Marxists-Leninists believe that it is the cardinal task of the Communist parties to marshal all the peace-loving forces for the defence of peace and the deliverance of mankind from a nuclear disaster. They consider peaceful coexistence to be the general principle of relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries.

The Chinese leaders scorn this task. What they are doing, in effect, is whipping up the nuclear arms race and calling for new powers to join it. They are pursuing a line that is liable to cause an atomic war, and consider the struggle for peace a secondary task, opposing it to the struggle for socialism.

The Marxists-Leninists consider it their duty to strengthen in every possible way the unity and cohesion of the socialist community on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and to concentrate the special attention of the socialist countries on economic development in order that socialism should win the peaceful economic competition with capitalism.

The actions of the Chinese leaders are subverting and undermining the unity of the socialist camp. They are isolating China more and more from the other socialist countries. The CC, CPC, underrates economic development and ignores the tasks confronting the socialist countries in their economic competition with the capitalist countries. This policy tends to weaken the might of the socialist countries and impedes their struggle against imperialism.

Marxists-Leninists, the working class of the capitalist countries see it as their task to step up the struggle against monopoly capital, in defence of the vital interests of the masses, to make maximum use of the now available opportunities to effect a peaceful socialist revolution not involving a civil war, and at the same time be ready to take the non-peaceful way, to suppress the resistance of the bourgeosie by armed force.

In contrast, the CPC leaders vilify in every way the struggle of the working class and its Communist vanguard for the vital interests of the working people, for peace and democracy, and reject the tactics of broad anti-monopoly alliances, the possibility of effecting social revolution peacefully. They call for reckless armed actions irrespective of the concrete situation.

Marxists-Leninists and the peoples fighting for national liberation consider it their duty to complete the anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, to create and consolidate the national front, and to work for the establishment of states of national democracy, for the non-capitalist way of development.

The Chinese leaders ignore the essence of the present stage of the national-liberation revolution. They are blind to the differences in the situation prevailing in the various countries and offer the peoples of all countries one and the same prescription—armed struggle and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such prescriptions may, if put into practice, undermine the national front and strengthen the positions of the colonialists and neo-colonialists.

Marxists-Leninists are eager to strengthen the unity and cohesion both of each individual Communist Party and the entire army of Communists in the world on the basis of the principles laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.

The Chinese leaders are disrupting the unity of the Communist movement and of the democratic organisations. They are founding factions and are striving to split our movement and its national contingents.

In brief, the CPC leaders are opposing the Communist movement in all the basic questions of strategy and tactics. Theirs is a course in which petty-bourgeois revolutionism and nationalistic, great-power aspirations merge.

In a malicious anti-Soviet article, slanderous from beginning to end, which appeared on February 4 in the CC CPC publications, the Chinese leaders declare for everybody to hear that they will step up their subversive activities against the world Communist movement. With nationalistic arrogance they boast that they will continue their attacks on the CPSU in order to disorganise the work of the Party founded by the great Lenin.

To the Soviet Communists, the sons and daughters of the October Revolution, the pioneers of the new, Communist world, who have withstood so many gruelling ordeals, such threats sound ridiculous.

The Soviet Communists will not keep silent while the Chinese leaders prosecute an unbridled offensive against our great cause of communist construction, against the Leninist course of our Party and the positions of the world Communist movement. We shall have to explain the substance of the anti-Marxist, neo-Trotskyite position of the Chinese leaders publicly.

The urgent task at present is to protect Marxism-Leninism from the distortions to which it is being subjected by the Chinese leaders. The interests of preserving the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the interests of the world Communist movement and, in the final analysis, the interests of the Chinese people itself, require that we come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the CPC leadership.

We stand for strengthening friendship with the Chinese people and are ready to develop co-operation with the CPR in all fields. The Soviet Communists have a sincere regard for the great people of China and a deep respect for the revolutionary traditions of the Communist Party of China. We are sure that nobody will ever succeed in undermining the foundations of the friendship of the great Soviet and Chinese peoples and that the present attitude of the CPC leadership does not reflect the true national interests of the Chinese people. We shall do everything in our power to bring the relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China back to a path that conforms with the fundamental interests of the working class and all the working people of our countries.

We are fully aware of the danger of the present attitude of the Chinese leaders. The facts show that a grim and, evidently, long struggle lies ahead for the strengthening of the unity of all the socialist forces, for friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leaders intend to persist

in their incorrect stand, that they intend to carry on with their factional activities in the world Communist movement. Together with the other fraternal parties, our Party will resolutely defend Marxism-Leninism; it will firmly defend the unity and cohesion of the Communist movement on the basis of the principles of the Declaration and Statement of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' parties. It will firmly defend the unity and cohesion of all the forces working for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Our Party favours convening another Meeting of fraternal parties to discuss the basic problems of our time and to hold the broadest possible exchange of opinions in the interest of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen in the Communist movement. These difficulties have been caused by the CPC leadership's differences with the world Communist movement. The joint efforts of all the fraternal parties are therefore perfectly justified in order to determine what must be done to preserve and strengthen the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Communist ranks. It is perfectly clear to the CPSU that the meeting should serve this very purpose.

The CC, CPSU, is certain that no matter how great the difficulties experienced by the world Communist movement, that movement will be strong enough to surmount them and to cement its ranks in the struggle for the great Communist cause.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to pursue the policy of promoting unity with all the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the Programme documents of the world Communist movement—the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The road followed by our Party, by the world Communist movement is the Leninist road and, therefore, the only true road. We have adopted a new Programme, in which we have charted our development twenty years ahead. Our Party and the whole Soviet people regard fulfilment of this Programme, resolute and purposeful progress to the heights of communism, as their supreme internationalist duty to the international working-class and Communist movement. As always, our Party will perform its internationalist duty honourably!

Under the invincible banner of the great Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue consistently and undeviatingly to pursue a line aimed at carrying out the CPSU Programme for the building in our country of the most just social system, communism.

■ ■ ■

Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement

Decision of Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU,
Adopted on February 15, 1964

Having heard and discussed the report of Comrade M. A. Suslov, Presidium Member, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, "On the Struggle of the CPSU for the unity of the World Communist Movement", the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, expresses its profound concern over the splitting activities of the leadership of the Communist Party of China which are causing great damage to the socialist community of nations, the whole of the world Communist and working-class movement.

Aware of the historical importance of the unity and solidarity of the Communist movement, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has lately taken new steps towards overcoming or, to begin with, at least diminishing the differences between the leadership of the CPC and the CPSU and other fraternal parties, towards strengthening economic and political cooperation between the USSR and the CPR. Moves to prevent the deepening of these differences have also been made by other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU notes with regret that the leadership of the CPC has not responded to this initiative, has not answered the letter of the CPSU, nor stopped the open polemics, on the contrary, it has intensified the campaign against the general line of the Communist movement defined by the Meetings of 1957 and 1960.

Under the cover of verbal assurances of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, under the banner of struggle against the imaginary revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the leaders of the CPC have assailed the basic theoretical and political principles by which the Communist movement is guided at the present stage.

The new appraisals and conclusions arrived at through collective efforts of the fraternal parties on the basis of the creative application of the Marxist-Leninist principles to the present-day conditions—on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the necessity of combating the ideology and practice of the personality cult,

on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist states and in the countries which have liberated themselves from colonialism—are all being distorted by the Chinese leaders.

Having departed on all basic questions of strategy and tactics from the Leninist line of the world Communist movement, the Chinese leaders have put forward a course of their own which is compounded of petty-bourgeois adventurism and great-power chauvinism. On a number of questions they, in effect, descend to Trotskyite positions, adopt Trotskyite methods of struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties, and set up factional groups of their supporters in various countries. The leadership of the CPC is seeking to impose its dissenting ideological platform on the whole of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement, and on the international democratic organisations.

The Chinese leaders have adopted a course aimed at worsening the Soviet-Chinese inter-state relations, undermining the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. Having rejected all the proposals of the CC, CPSU, on the normalisation of the Soviet-Chinese relations, they have intensified anti-Soviet propaganda inside the CPR and are grossly interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, holds that the vital interests of the world socialist system, of the Communist movement and the defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism call for an ideological exposure of the anti-Leninist position of the CPC leadership and for a resolute rebuff to their splitting activities.

Fully and unanimousiy approving the political and practical activities of the Presidium of the CC, CPSU, and of Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC, CPSU, aimed at building Communist society in the USSR, ensuring the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, and strengthening the solidarity of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, instructs the CC Presidium to continue firmly to uphold the general line of the world Communist movement, to work to strengthen the unity of all revolutionary forces of today.

Our Party is following, and will continue to follow, the tested Leninist road and nobody will ever succeed in diverting the CPSU from this course—the course of the Twentieth and Twenty-second Congresses.

In spite of the fact that the Chinese leaders have gone far in their splitting activities, the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, placing the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement above all else, expresses its readiness to exert further efforts toward the normalisation of relations between the CPSU and the CPC. If the CPC leaders have not lost all sense of their international responsibility, they must realise, at last, that by their actions they are diverting the forces and attention of the Communist and Workers' parties from the solution

of the urgent tasks of socialist construction, impeding the struggle against imperialism, and damaging the entire anti-imperialist front.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, is firmly confident that the world Communist movement will overcome the existing difficulties, rally still closer around the banner of Marx Engels-Lenin and achieve new successes in the struggle for the great cause of the working class, for the cause of peace and the peoples' security, for the victory of communism.

■ ■ ■

The Political Resolution of the Fifth Conference of the I. C. P.

In conclusion of its proceedings the Fifth Conference of the I.C.P. adopted the following political resolution:

1) The Fifth National Conference on Organization of the Italian Communists, which met in Naples at a grave moment of our national life, draws the attention of all Italians, with the authority of a great political, democratic and national force, to the serious deterioration of the economic, social and political situation of the country during the three months that have elapsed since the setting up of the Moro government. The big monopoly groups, after having exercised growing pressure in order to condition the action of the Centre-Left government, are today developing a great offensive in order to have their will and their interests prevail in full. Such an offensive, made possible by the agreement on the platform of the present government, has been more and more encouraged by the docility of the Centre-Left group. Thus, serious threats arise to the living conditions of the working masses and to the initiatives of the middle strata, as is clearly shown by the attack on wages and the demand for shorter working hours, wide-scale dismissals, the restriction of credit to the small and medium-size enterprises, the curtailment of public expenditure. At the same time, scandalous concessions have been made in favour of the tax evasions and an inadmissible tolerance has favoured the escape of capital abroad. The gaps, the contradictions, the traditional injustice of Italian society, above all the South Italian question—already sharper due to monopoly expansion during the years of the "economic miracle"—are now sharpening more and more. The striving for renewal on the part of the more advanced section of the Centre-Left group has been paralyzed by the prevalence of the conservative orientation, outside and inside the government. The confusion that has characterized the government actions in these months has worsened the economic situation, humiliated the Socialist Party and the most advanced forces of the Catholic world, struck a blow at the prestige of the democratic institutions and may create the conditions for reactionary chaos.

A resolute renovating action by the government can offset the pressure, the economic and political blackmail on the part of the big

Reprinted from *Foreign Bulletin* published periodically by the Foreign Section of the Central Committee of the I.C.P.

monopoly groups and the anxiety and demagogical campaign by means of which the Rights are trying to influence the middle strata. A revival of Italian economic development on a different basis, opposed to that indicated by the big employers, is possible if one has the will and the force to defeat the sabotage, manoeuvres and speculation of the big capitalists and make them pay the cost of that rebirth which is now weighing down on the shoulders of the working class and the middle strata. First of all it is necessary:

a) to stop the inflation process;

b) to prevent the consequences of the present difficulties being shifted to the shoulders of the popular masses.

For this, it is necessary to adopt immediate measures of public interference and public control capable of stopping the increase in the cost of living and of stimulating investments to meet the most urgent needs of the national economy and the working people.

Such measures should immediately start democratic economic planning, based on the essential structural reforms, subordinate the action of big capital to the interests of the collective and give the working masses a new role in society and in the state. These basic orientations should underlie all government action and also the utilization of the loan now given to Italy by the United States, rejecting all political conditions.

The policy and the solutions of the Centre-Left government have revealed their deep limitations due both to the composition of the majority and the programme and orientation that have been chosen. Today the P.S.I. is faced again with a dramatic dilemma between defence and development of its essential features or assumption of the role of a mere supporter of the capitalist system. More and more critical is also the position of those forces inside the Catholic movement that refuse to accept unconditionally the present capitalist set-up and the monopoly leadership of society.

It is essential and urgent that all the secular and Catholic forces understand the necessity not to remain subjected to the pressure of the monopoly groups and feel the urgency and the actual possibility of imposing today a decisive orientation of renewal of the national society and of drastically limiting big capital's power. The experience of the past two years shows that even the most timid and contradictory reforms come up against the harsh resistance of the ruling classes, resistance which cannot be faced and defeated without mobilizing the widest and most militant political forces expressing the interests and the will for progress of the working people and the middle strata. The confidence and support of these great social and political forces are decisive in order to emerge from the economic and political crisis, to give new impulse to the democratic institutions, to defeat the plans

of the Right inside and outside the government, to create the conditions and the premises for a Left-wing shift.

But appealing to these forces means creating a new majority characterized by an anti-monopolistic platform of economic planning and by a line of development towards a real democracy. The Communists are conscious that in this situation the possibility of and the conditions for closer ties between the Socialist and more advanced Catholic forces and the I.C.P. arise. Relying on the elaboration made in these years of major problems of unity of the international Communist movement with due regard for diversity and autonomy of the experience of every party, around the important problems of search for one's own perspective of democratic advance towards socialism and of new forms of participation by the working class in government, the Communists propose a discussion, open to all the Left forces, on the ways of democratic renewal of the nation.

2) Recent developments have again demonstrated how futile are the attempts to pursue a policy of democratic development in Italy against and without the Communist Party, and how absurd is the perspective of embarrassing our Party. In face of the stubbornness of the monopoly groups and the grave political weakness shown by the other sectors of the Left movement, the growing strength of the I.C.P.—so clearly evidenced in the organizational field by the successess gained in the re-registration campaign of 1964—represents a beacon for all the social strata aspiring to a deep-going transformation of national society.

It is the task of the Communists to make the most of this strength in the present, dramatic phase of the national economic and political situation.

The Fifth National Conference on Organization calls upon the Party to start immediately a campaign of orientation, propaganda and agitation aimed at defeating the insidious activities through which the monopoly groups try to repress the advancement of demands, deprive the working-class movement of autonomy, and isolate the middle strata from the working-class. At the same time the Conference calls upon all the party organizations to develop, on the basis of unity, the widest initiatives of struggle for peace, for disarmament and for an autonomous and independent development of the underdeveloped countries, for the immediate establishment of regional institutions, for land reform and for the rebirth of the South, against the rising cost of living and against every attack on the employment levels, for new town-planning legislation, for school reform and for a higher level of scientific research.

It is in the spirit of these renewed militant tasks of struggle that the organizations of the Party and of the Young Communist Federation are called upon to carry on the campaign of re-registration and registration towards new successes which—in the year since the big

victory of April 28th—indicate the constant and increasing popular support given to the I.C.P. and its policy.

The Fifth National Conference on Organization, the impulse coming from it as a result of the renewal of the organizational structure and further extension of democracy in the party, indicates that the I.C.P. is a virile and essential force of the Italian democracy, capable of making a new, decisive contribution to the common struggle of the Italian people for peace and socialism.

■ ■ ■

On the Situation in the International Communist Movement

Excerpts from a report on the sitution in the international Communist and working-class movement made by Raymond Guyot, member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, at a meeting of the Central Committee held on March 25—26 and published in l'Humanité.

Since the Central Committee meeting of October 6, Guyot said, a number of developments have taken place which make it necessary to inform the Central Committee of the situation which has arisen in the international Communist and working-class movement.

In the past few years the peoples have registered important successes in their struggle for peace and disarmament, for national independence and socialism. But it is also in this period that the leaders of the Communist Party of China—in opposition to the majority of the Communist parties and trampling underfoot the jointly agreed decisions — have made an attempt to divert the international Communist movement on the path of sectarianism and adventurism. They show complete lack of faith in the ability of the working class and the peoples to avert war and achieve disarmament in our epoch. Their attitude has already done grave harm to the cause of communism; it impedes the struggle for peace today when there exist great possibilities to deliver new blows at the aggressive forces of imperialism, when whole continents, as well as countries like Cuba and Algeria are actively fighting together with all the peace-loving forces of the world for peace and peaceful coexistence.

It is precisely in this period that the leaders of the Communist Party of China have been intensifying their campaign against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government, against the Communist parties which adhere to the positions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings. Their attacks against our Party and its leadership have become more numerous and more vicious.

They engage in large-scale splitting activity, the more recent manifestation of which was the behaviour of the Chinese delegate who tried to break up the united anti-imperialist and anti-colonial front at the meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Council in Algiers.

The article which appeared in the Chinese press on February 4, openly calling for a split, revealed the true intentions of the Chinese leaders: to create a factionalist bloc under their hegemony with a

programme of its own; to lay increasing claim to being the sole heirs of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, the supreme judges in the sphere of the theory and practice of communism; to dictate to all the parties—in the capitalist as well as in the socialist and newly-emergent countries--what they must or must not do, while they, the Chinese leaders, would decide who are the leading Marxists and who, the modern revisionists.

They have their own interpretation of history and philosophy: the centre of the revolution (meaning China) is shifting, and this is normal; everything is destined to split in two, for such is the law of nature, and this also holds true for the international Communist movement, etc.

In many countries factional groups are being formed inside the parties or parallel with the parties, with the participation of renegades and Trotskyites. Such, in particular, is the case in Switzerland, Australia and some of the Latin American countries; for example, such pseudo-parties have been formed recently in Belgium, and attempts have been made to replace Central Committees (Ceylon, Peru) with splinter groups.

Particularly unseemly practices are being used against the parties which are fighting fascist dictatorship. At the Central Committee meeting last October Waldeck Rochet branded the practice of Chinese documents being widely circulated in Spain while the Communists and anti-fascists of that country were subjected to persecution. We have recently received the following letter from our Spanish comrades:

"...The Franco political police have already utilized the differences in the international Communist movement to publish a fake issue of *Mundo Obrero* (organ of the Communist Party of Spain—*Ed.)* in an attempt to give the impression that our Party has been split.

"Our activists have established that this issue, a copy of which we are sending you, was distributed by police agents, and have vigorously rebuffed this fabrication. But this very fact demonstrates how dangerous for the whole Communist movement, and particularly for the parties working in illegal conditions, is the turn which the Communist Party of China has given to the polemics, and the splitting activity which it supports in the various countries."

Guyot also pointed to the use of government radio by the Chinese leaders for propaganda against the Soviet Union. Peking Radio systematically broadcasts materials violently attacking the Soviet Union, its Communist Party and its government. The calumny published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on February 4 was transmitted in Russian 125 times for 80 hours during the first two weeks.

In our Party, Guyot went on, the position adopted by the Chinese leaders has evoked indignation and unanimous condemnation. The few attempts to foster anti-Party groups made with the support of renegades and Trotskyites have failed. It is, nevertheless, necessary to draw the attention of the Central Committee to certain aspects of the situation which has arisen in the French-Chinese Friendship Asso-

ciation, whose aim is to promote friendly relations between the two peoples. Certain elements, notably in the Marseilles Committee of the Association, instead of working to foster the broadest unity in the interests of true friendship with the Chinese People's Republic, are doing their utmost to distribute Chinese materials directed against the international Communist movement and the French Communist Party, i. e., are engaging in activity which has nothing in common with the noble aims of this Association. These attempts will be thwarted by the vigilance of all Frenchmen who stand at once for both French-Chinese friendship and for peaceful coexistence, disarmament and peace.

It is also necessary to step up the ideological and political struggle against the attitude of the Chinese leaders vis-a-vis the de Gaulle government. De Gaulle, they assert, is the standard-bearer of national struggle against U.S. imperialism.

This anti-Marxist position of the Chinese leaders in regard to the Gaullist power has become even more strongly pronounced in connection with the recognition of People's China and the establishment of diplomatic relations with France (we have always fought for this recognition, just as we are now carrying on the fight for the admission of the Chineses People's Republic to U.N.O.).

In Peking they pretend to be unaware of the true aims of de Gaulle's foreign policy (the search for new markets for the capitalist monopolies, possession of atomic armaments, a bigger say in NATO and alliance with German militarism, the attempts of French imperialism to regain some of its positions in Asisa and Latin America, etc.). The recent statements made by Pompidou in the American Club and the interview given by Couve de Murville to the *U.S. News and World Report* throw light on the character of de Gaulle's policy. On its part, *La Nation* declares unashamedly that "France, which has long been active in Oceania, is preparing new installations there" (meaning nuclear bases, of course), and it asks: "Perhaps from this standpoint, too, it is believed desirable to maintain official relations with the principal power in this part of the globe?"

What Mao-Tse-tung said about the atom bomb during a meeting with the Gaullist M. P.s visiting China echo de Gaulle's own claims: "I know, you are ahead of us, but we shall have our own bomb. This is the way to be strong."

It should be noted that not a single word appeared in the Chinese press denouncing the Gaullist repressions in Gabon, the persecution of the youth on Martinique or of Comrade Paul Vergès on Réunion. Not a single voice of protest was raised against the establishment of a nuclear experimental centre in Polynesia at the time when protests are resounding in France, Australia, New Zealand, Chile and Peru.

In the meantime a "new theory" is being elaborated in Peking, the theory of the so-called "second intermediate zone" which should embrace Britain, West Germany, de Gaulle's France and Japan. "Ceasing

to be agents of the United States" these countries, along with China, will constitute a kind of "third world". For France and the other above-mentioned countries this anti-Leninist and grossly opportunist policy would mean the liquidation of the working-class struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Our Party is fighting against U.S. imperialism and its aggressive policy, against our own imperialism which is no different from that of the United States, and, as Comrade Maurice Thorez has stressed, we oppose everything in de Gaulle's policy which runs counter to the national interests, the independence of the peoples and the cause of peace.

The situation in the international Communist movement confirms the soundness of the attitude taken by our Party on a whole range of problems.

Limiting ourselves to the more recent decisions of our Party, we would like to stress the significance of the October meeting of the Central Committee, the documents of which were published (in the form of a pamphlet subsquently translated into German, Spanish and English and sent to the fraternal parties); Léon Feix's reply in *l'Humanité* to a Chinese article which slandered our Party and its leadership; the more lengthy reply given editorially in the February issue of *Cahiers du Communisme,* which also appeared in pamphlet form. Lastly, we would like to recall the section on these questions in the draft resolution for the Seventeenth Congress, which is now being widely discussed in the Party.

One cannot remain "neutral" in this struggle which is of exceptional significance for the unity of the Communist movement. For this is not a matter of differences between the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C., but of differences between the latter and the vast majority of the Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world. To avoid qualifying and denouncing the policy and the disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders, as is sometimes the case, means to refuse to ensure the future of our struggle for socialism and communism.

The grave threat which menaces the international Communist and working-class movement, and which cannot but alarm us, is a result of the attempts made by the C.P.C. leaders to impose their views on the world movement, a result of the campaign they are waging against the C.P.S.U. and other parties, a result of their subversive activity. These are the causes of the situation that has arisen in the international Communist and working-class movement. The C.P.C. leaders are wholly to blame for this situation which, in fact, plays into the hands of the imperialists.

At the October meeting of the Central Committee we came out for the convocation of a meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties at the earliest possible date. Today we feel that this need has become even more urgent.

We reaffirm at this meeting of the Central Committee the unequivocal positions of our Party clearly set forth in many documents, and notably the more recent ones (resolution of the C.C. meeting in October, draft resolution for the Seventeeth Congress).

The Central Committee maintains that the line elaborated by the Chinese leaders in opposition to the general line of the international Communist movement, their splitting activities in the various countries, the material and moral support they render to the splinter groups in the various parties, their slander of the leaders of the fraternal parties, cause grave harm to the movement as a whole, to the cause of peace and socialism. It holds that reconciliation with the Leftist and nationalist line of the Chinese leaders and their splitting activity would spell danger for the international movement, for the Chinese people themselves, for our Party and its broad policy of unity needed for the struggle against one-man rule.

The Central Committee would welcome the convocation at the earliest date of a meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties which would reaffirm, in the light of the changes that have occurred, the general line of the international Communist movement and adopt all the decisions which would be necessary to safeguard its unity. It is our earnest desire that the differences which oppose the C.P.C. to the other Communist parties will be overcome and that the Communist Party of China will again make its contribution to the unity of the international Communist movement, to our common struggle for peace and national independence, for democracy and socialism.

In the course of preparations for the Seventeenth Congress and during the discussion we must pay close attention to the ideological struggle on the fundamental points of the 1957 and 1960 meetings and our own earlier congresses. And we must be prepared to make another contribution to the ideological struggle in its various aspects on all the problems affecting the international Communist movement.

At the same time it is necessary to wage a struggle on two fronts in our own ranks, primarily against the main danger—dogmatism and sectarianism. Any conciliation with splitting activity is inadmissible.

Our struggle to put an end to the one-man rule and bring nearer the hour of the democratic alternative, for the unity of the working class and the alliance of all democrats in the fight for social progress, freedom, national independence, peace, disarmament and socialism, Guyot concluded, cannot be separated from our efforts to achieve the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement.

■ ■ ■

Against the Subversive Activities of the Chinese Splitters

Resolution of the Central Committee
of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

The open attacks by the Chinese leaders against many aspects of the joint policy of the international Communist movement are known to the members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Hungarian people. Thus, the Chinese leaders oppose the policy of peaceful co-existence, set at nought economic competition between the two social systems, deny the possibility of socialist revolution triumphing peacefully, without civil war. The Chinese leaders take the stand that there is no need to rectify the gross mistakes committed at the time of the cult of the individual, which caused incalculable harm to the international working-class movement. As we know the parties which uphold the purity of the Marxist-Leninist principles, including the H.S.W.P., most patiently discussed with the Chinese leaders their incorrect views. In this discussion the parties, adhering to a joint line, did not adopt the virulent tone of Chinese propaganda, its methods of abuse, but pointed out to the incorrect views and their harmful political consequences, rejecting fabrications.

After the overwhelming majority of fraternal parties came out against their wrong views, the Chinese leaders took the path of splitting activities. They have organized factional groups made up of Trotskyites and renegades who are prepared to go to all lengths, and they have the effrontery to call some of these groups Communist parties. They are doing this at a time when the forces of socialism and peace are multiplying throughout the world, when the national independence of the peoples of former colonies is growing stronger, when the internal contradictions in the capitalist world are intensifying, when imperialism is at a stage of profound crisis and the process of its disintegration is accelerating. The combined might, united action by the socialist world could accelerate this process still more, could render still greater assistance to the peoples battling against colonialism and neo-colonialism; the fight in defence of world peace would become still more effective were it not for the fact that the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders are dividing the international Communist movement, are hampering its common struggle.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China formulated the essence of its policy in a 25-point document published in June 1963, which was printed also by the Hungarian press. This document and the entire activity of the Chinese leaders show that their tactics are aimed

at splitting the international Communist movement, that the C.P.C. leaders want hegemony, want to impose their views on the international Communist movement. Actuated by this desire they oppose the Statements of the Communist and Workers' parties of 1957 and 1960.

In the autumn of 1963 the Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. supporting the initiative of the fraternal parties, including the C.P.S.U., ceased to publish materials concerning the differences in the international Communist movement. The purpose of this step was to create favourable conditions for a new internationl meeting of the fraternal parties to discuss the differences. The Chinese leaders, however, replied by continuing their open attacks, by becoming even more abusive and absolutely ignoring the position of the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties which insisted on ceasing the public debate.

In the February 4 issue of *Jenminjihpao,* the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese leaders published a long article in which they openly declared that they support and will help to organize factions against the Central Committees of the fraternal parties which oppose the views of the Chinese leaders, condemn their desire for hegemony and which are in solidarity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They call this undermining of unity "an internationalist obligation". They ignore the propositions of the Moscow Statement of 1960 regulating the relations between the fraternal parties, and by impermissible methods interfere in their internal affairs. They attack the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and Comrade Khrushchov personally with blind rancour, calling him "anti-Soviet", "the greatest of all revisionists", "the greatest splitter of our time". With the help of an extensive propaganda network they create big difficulties for the Communist parties, and first of all, for the fraternal parties battling in the capitalist countries.

It is characteristic of the Chinese leaders that instead of engaging in a theoretical discussion of fundamental ideological issues they are waging a political struggle against the C.P.S.U. and the other fraternal parties. The fabrications, distortions and abuse contained in the *Jenminjihpao* article of February 4 divert attention from the fundamental differences. This clearly is the purpose of the assertions that "the leaders of the C.P.S.U. are bent on seeking Soviet-U.S. cooperation for the domination of the world", that "the revisionism and splittism of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. are the product both of the lush growth of the bourgeois elements inside the Soviet Union and ... of the U.S. imperialist policies ..."

This policy of the Chinese leaders which they try to justify with assertions that are absolutely lacking in a sober assessment, is nothing but an adventurist policy which has as its purpose to mislead people; it is a policy which is doomed to failure.

The Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. has from the very outset condemned the sectarian, dogmatic views of the Chinese leaders and their splitting activity. The Central Committee emphatically rejects and de-

nounces their new attack of February 4, which is even more vicious than all previous attacks and which is directed against the entire international Communist movement and consequently against the H.S.W.P. By their splitting activities the Chinese leaders are assailing the unity of the socialist countries and the international Communist movement, are making things easier for imperialism in the face of the progress of the socialist world, are hampering the struggle of the Communist parties in individual countries and on the international arena.

Together with the other fraternal parties the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, firmly adhering to the Moscow Statements of 1957 and 1960, resolutely opposes the undermining activity of the Chinese leaders.

The Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. is in full solidarity with the C.P.S.U. and its Leninist Central Committee, and personally with Comrade Khrushchov. It is absolutely clear that the attacks of the Chinese leaders are directed first and foremost against the C.P.S.U. The steadfast Marxist-Leninist policy of the C.P.S.U., its great international prestige make impossible the Chinese policy of adventurism. Neither the old nor the new anti-Soviet attacks can alter this fact.

The Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. has decided that if the Chinese leaders do not stop their open attacks and splitting activities, they will have to be answered in public. We are not deceived by the tactics of the Chinese leaders in accordance with which they attack first one and then another fraternal party and its leaders. We shall oppose all attacks, and uphold the common cause and policy of our Party.

The Chinese leaders are trying to set off some countries of the socialist world system against each other. The Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. rejects and condemns these attempts and also interference in the affairs of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid.

The class enemies are trying to make the most of the differences caused by the leaders of the C.P.C. in the international Communist movement. With the help of diplomacy and other methods the imperialists are seeking to weaken the unity of the socialist world system. The imperialist press picks up and spreads the anti-Soviet slander circulated by the Chinese leaders in order to provoke differences and a split in the revolutionary working-class movement in the capitalist countries. Upholding the ideas of Marxism-Leninism the Communist parties are steadfastly combating the attempts to cause a split.

The Central Committee of the H.S.W.P. and the Hungarian people who have from the very outset unanimously rejected the harmful views of the Chinese leaders now more than ever before strongly condemn the intensified splitting activities of the Chinese leaders and their unbridled anti-Soviet slander.

In our fight against pseudo-Left views and against the splitting, undermining activities of the Chinese leaders we do not lose sight of the fact that there are still Right reactionary elements in Hungary who

will try to exploit the attacks made by the Chinese leaders to whip up dissatisfaction with the policy of our Party and the government.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party forged its ideological, political and organizational unity in a difficult period, in hard-fought battle, at the price of big sacrifices in the struggle against counter-revolutionaries, revisionists and dogmatists, and it has the necessary experience to repulse the attacks of both the Rights and the "Lefts". Those who will attempt undermining activities will learn to their cost that the Party is able to combat these attempts with vigour and determination.

At the same time it is necessary through patient explanatory work and persuasion to clear up the ideological confusion of those who have been misled on certain issues by the pseudo-revolutionary phrases of the Chinese leaders and those Right elements who are seeking to use the discussion with the Chinese leaders to bolster their revisionist position. One of the important tasks of our Party organizations is to raise still higher the ideological and political level of the members of the Party, to strengthen still further the unity of our ranks by exposing the anti-Marxist line and splitting activities of the Chinese leaders.

The political line of the H.S.W.P., which practice has shown to be a correct line, is based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism; it faithfully adheres to the Moscow Statements of 1957 and 1960, to the jointly elaborated general line of the international Communist movement, it draws on the experience of the working-class struggle and of our people. We consistently adhere to the political line of our Party, and will in the future, as heretofore, defend it against all Right and pseudo-Left attempts to distort it. The paramount task facing our Party and our working people today is to carry out the decisions of the Eighth Congress and to complete the building of a socialist society. Every new success along this road, every new achievement in our economic and cultural work is the best answer to all attacks against the policy of our Party, including the attacks of the Chinese leaders.

■ ■ ■

Statement of the Communist Party of Salvador on Differences in the International Communist Movement

INTRODUCTION

The Communist Party of Salvador has viewed with deep concern the differences that have appeared in the international Communist movement . . .

Unfortunately, the differences concern vitally important aspects of the strategic and tactical line of the international Communist movement. They affect all the basic issues of the struggle for peace, against imperialism and capitalism, the national-liberation struggle, the struggle for socialism and communism. They embrace also internal questions of the international Communist movement and the principles on which this movement rests, as well as the relations between the parties and questions of proletarian internationalism. Consequently, these are not superficial differences of opinion, but profound disagreements affecting the future of mankind . . .

Our Party, which cherishes the greatest respect and friendship for the Communist Party of China and the heroic Chinese people, hoped that the revolutionary maturity of the Chinese comrades would enable them to find the right way to settle their differences with the rest of the international Communist movement. Unfortunately, our hopes were disappointed. Indeed, the intransigence of the Chinese comrades increased and their relations with the rest of the international Communist movement steadily deteriorated to the point where they began rapidly to break away from the countries comprising the world socialist camp, and from the international Communist movement as a whole . . .

In this situation it is the duty of our Party, as of all other revolutionary detachments of the proletariat, clearly and unequivocally to define its own position in conformity with the principles of Marxism-Leninism in order to preserve the internal unity of our Party, to give

Abridged translation. This Statement, published in full in pamphlet form under the above title by the Ediciones Farabundo (organ of the Communist Party of Salvador), was adopted by an enlarged meeting of the C.C. of the Communist Party of Salvador held in December 1963 to discuss the differences in the international Communist movement. This question had been discussed previously in the Party branches.

our members the proper orientation, and to conduct the ideological struggle against incorrect, erroneous positions prejudicial to the unity and the development of the international Communist movement . . .

I. The Problem of World Peace and War

The first and cardinal issue of the ideological dispute between the Communist Party of China and the international Communist movement is that of peace or world war . . .

For us who live under imperialist rule in conditions of brutal exploitation and repression, who suffer from the effects of militarization, and who see our oppressed peoples living in hunger and want, the phraseology of the Chinese comrades might have a certain appeal when they say that the sacrifices, whatever they may be, are unimportant, so long as the peoples are delivered from imperialism; when they declare that on the debris of nuclear war mankind will build their socialist future even sooner; or when, by way of argument, they cite the fact that the result of the two past world wars has favoured socialism notwithstanding the suffering caused by these wars, then they are indeed striking a most responsive chord in our people's hearts—their earning for speedy liberation. Thus the way is cleared for counterposing the interests of the peoples fighting for their liberation to the policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in their relations with the capitalist countries . . .

Faced with arguments of this kind, we Communists of the whole world must study this problem in detail and ask ourselves the question: does the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems help or hinder the movement of the peoples for their liberation? This question cannot be answered by emotional or bombastic phrases. For us Communists, who are guided by the Marxist-Leninist teaching, there exists but one correct way, namely: to compare theory with practice; to analyze the problem concretely without resorting to polemical evasions. The truth is always concrete, and it must be sought in the concrete facts.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: is modern history reduced to the development and the results of the two world wars? Is it not true that there was a period of several decades between the two world wars and after the last war when there was no world war, and that the cause of world revolution was furthered and many nations liberated in the period of peaceful coexistence? Why then is this experience not examined, why are all the arguments concerned solely with the history of the two world wars?

There is no doubt that in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism (just as in past centuries in the transition from lower to higher social formations) wars, political conflicts between classes,

ideological struggles, etc. lead to the defeat of the old social order and to the victory of the new through a complex process in which temporary and partial retreats are by no means excluded.

Marxism-Leninism, drawing on the sum of historical experience, has proved that the replacement of the moribund social system by the new is bound to be effected through class struggle and through a process which develops not only in the period of wars, but at all times and in all spheres (ideological, political, economic, military, etc.); this is a cumulative process of change; when the accumulation of changes reaches a certain point a revolutionary leap takes place. The experience of our time shows that the world revolution is developing at an increasing pace from day to day in the conditions of peace between states with different social systems. Capitalism's tragedy lies in the fact that, having no prospect of winning a world war, it also has no possibility of avoiding its own destruction in conditions of peace; capitalism is doomed to disappear, and it will disappear.

In these circumstances only those who close their eyes to reality can fail to see that socialism came to our continent in the period of peaceful coexistence, a period marked by the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism in Asia and Africa and the emergence of many new independent states. All these states constitute a big force counteracting imperialism and war.

Had the Chinese comrades continued to adhere to the positions of dialectical materialism they would have had no difficulty in recognizing the dialectics of development. But they abandoned these positions and, in order to arrive at their conclusion concerning the present revolutionary process, they lay undue emphasis on the experience of the two past world wars, ignoring the historical experience of the other period, the period without wars and the tremendous difference between the destructive capacity of past wars and the destructive capacity of a nuclear war . . .

Every revolution has two principal stages: first the struggle to remove the ruling classes from power and hand over the power to the revolutionary class, and second, the building of the new socio-economic system after the power has been won. The working class fights against the bourgeoisie not out of a desire for revenge; it fights the bourgeoisie in order to destroy the capitalist system which is founded on the exploitation of man by man, and to build a socialist system in its place, a system without exploitation and in which man's dreams will be fully realized. The peoples of the colonies and dependent countries too are not fighting imperialism out of a thirst for vengeance; they are fighting imperialism in order to put an end to the imperialist regime of exploitation and colonial oppression, to open the way to an independent economy and cultural progress and to carry on in more favourable conditions the struggle against all forms of exploitation. The proletariat of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, like the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries, is carrying on

the struggle with its gaze fixed on the socialist and Communist future.

Hatred for the exploiters and a desire for revenge are transient emotions, and they can in no way be the cause and the objective of revolutionary struggle. But to listen to the Chinese comrades it would appear that the first stage of the revolution is the most important and that the entire problem of revolution consists in destroying the power of the enemy. We refer to the argument by means of which they seek to convince people that the destruction caused by nuclear war is not important inasmuch as imperialism would be destroyed.

Our science teaches us that every social system corresponds to the level of development of its productive forces, to the level of its material base. The complete victory of socialism and communism as societies superior to capitalism will come only when the level of their productive forces is higher than that under capitalism. Hence, when speaking of the second stage of the revolution, Communists should always bear in mind that the building of the new society will proceed the faster the more resources we have at our disposal and the better the conditions for the development of the productive forces and for expanding the material base of society. Yet the Chinese comrades wish to convince people that on the debris of nuclear destruction mankind would be able to build a "truly beautiful future"...

Today, when the world revolutionary process has made the victory of revolution possible without allowing the capitalist states to unleash war against the socialist states; when the advent of the atomic weapon has turned the prospect of world war into a prospect of colosal devastation of the most advanced material base in the world; when, thanks to the increased weight of the socialist system in the world balance of forces and the tremendous power accumulated by the world revolutionary movement, war has ceased to be inevitable and the victory of revolution can be achieved without necessary recourse to war — today, despite all, the Chinese comrades are trying to convince people that the path of nuclear war is not so bad and that, consequently, there is no particular need to warn the people about the catastrophe that would engulf the world in the event of a nuclear war.

When man created means of destruction capable of extinguishing all life on this planet, there emerged also the social forces capable of preventing war and putting an end to the exploitation of man by man. This is a dialectical contradiction of our time which makes it incumbent on the Communists, the vanguard of all mankind, to ensure the triumph of life over death, revolution over nuclear war.

Of course, nuclar war would bring about the destruction of the power of the bourgeoisie throughout the world. But in the event of nuclear war, vast masses of working people in the capitalist countries, entire cities, factories, means of transport, agriculture, etc., would be

wiped out; the destruction would be well-nigh total. In the countries of victorious socialism the destruction would also be very great. In that case it is in place to ask: would socialism, as a social system already built, be brought nearer after a nuclear war? Can socialism and communism be rapidly built on the ruins and on the corpses of hundreds of millions of workers, i. e., on the corpses of those who are destined by history to build the new society? And finally, assuming that a nuclear war would affect only the big nuclear powers and no one else, where would the peoples of the backward countries find the material support for the rapid building of the radiant future, the socialist future? This is not to speak of the difficulties of life and progress in an atmosphere contaminated by radio-active fallout. Undoubtedly socialism, despite all these obstacles, would eventually be built, but how long this would take and how much suffering and hardship this would entail it is impossible to predict.

Thus, if we as Marxists do not forget that the decisive stage of any revolution is the stage in which the new social system is being built, the conclusion is obvious, having in mind the present situation in the world: the path of nuclear war postpones the victory of revolution for all peoples; socialism is nearer today than it would be after a nuclear war.

Let us examine the given problem from a simpler and more direct point of view. If a nuclear war breaks out what would become of the revolution in each of our countries? Would a nuclear war accelerate or retard the revolution in each of these countries? What role in the event of war would each of our peoples play in the struggle for the victory of their revolutionary cause? It is enough to picture the conditions that would be created in the world in the event of a third world war to reply at once to these questions. The clash would occur without any preliminary warning being given the peoples and without their consent. Within the space of a few minutes vast areas would be swept by a destructive holocaust that would make no distinction between revolutionaries and reactionaries. Revolutionary plans, the gains and the successes won by the revolutionary forces would be wiped out and those who worked out these plans and who fought in the ranks of the revolution would perish. And even if by some miracle we should be saved from the immediate and subsequent destructive effects of a nuclear war, even so the revolutionary plans would be essentially frustrated by the consequences of the clash. The prospect of building socialism in a brief historical period, a prospect at present made tangible by the possibility of obtaining material assistance from the socialist camp, would be dealt a serious blow, inasmuch as the socialist camp itself would be subjected to frightful destruction.

Let us now examine another pespective, that of the development of the world revolution in conditions of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries. In the conditions of peaceful coexistence the class struggle is maturing in that part of the world still

dominated by imperialism. The peoples, led by their advanced parties, have outlined their plans, worked out their revolutionary programmes, set up their revolutionary organizations and are waging a struggle against their enemies. This struggle (peaceful or non-peaceful depending on what path one or another people is compelled to choose) is being crowned with victory now in one now in another country.

Hence it is the duty of the Soviet Union as a nuclear power and as the mightiest and most reliable bulwark of the world proletariat, to mobilize all its resources and efforts to prevent war from breaking out. By following this course the Soviet Union is fulfilling its duty not only to its own people but to the world revolution as well. This is also the duty of all other socialist states, of all Communist parties and progressive forces the world over. By virtue of our principles and our objectives, we Communists have a greater obligation than anyone else to fight for the preservation of world peace.

And finally, let us examine the given problem in the light of Marxist humanism. The Chinese comrades scoff at arguments in favour of peaceful coexistence based in the lofty postulates of Marxist humanism, seeking to depict them as nothing more than false sentimentality. It is a well-known fact that whenever our enemies wish to discredit the Communists in the eyes of the masses and undermine our prestige they accuse us of subscribing to the anti-humane and reactionary maxim which holds that "the end justifies the means". On the contrary, this infamous slogan was and remains the slogan of those classes which are unwilling to leave the stage of history. We Communists have always rejected this slogan. We are humanists. The whole of our theory, all our aims and all our practical activity is permeated with the loftiest striving for the perfection of all humanity in every field of endeavour. Violence is not our principle, although we do not hesitate to employ violence for the sake of the victory of the revolution should the enemy compel us to take such a course. Humanism and revolution are not contradictory. The end does not justify the means. On the contrary, the end and the means constitute an integral whole. Such is our Marxist-Leninist position, and we have no cause to revise it now when the world revolution has matured and is rapidly developing everywhere.

We Salvador Communists resolutely declare our firm adherence to the policy of peaceful coexistence, inasmuch as we regard the preservation of peace among states with different social systems, the prevention of nuclear war as *the most important condition in the present-day world* for the ripening and speedy consummation of the world revolution. Therefore we condemn the position of the Chinese comrades in this question as a position at variance with the interests of the world revolution. Notwithstanding our respect for the Communist Party of China, notwithstanding its great services and its victories which we acknowledge, and notwithstanding the fact that we are a small party, we nevertheless declare this without hesitation. This is

a problem affecting all peoples, big and small, all of mankind, and we Communists must all state our point of view.

II. The National-Liberation Movement

Another major problem involved in the ideological conflict between the Communist Party of China and some other parties, on the one hand, and the overwhelming majority of the international Communist movement, on the other, concerns the national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the link between this struggle and the struggle of the international working class . . .

It is obvious and incontestible that in our time the main contradiction is that between socialism and capitalism. This contradiction will be resolved with the world-wide victory of the working class, with the establishment of socialism and communism in all countries. At the same time our epoch is marked also by other important contradictions, outstanding among which is the contradiction between the colonial and the semi-colonial countries, on the one hand, and imperialism and colonial rule, on the other. This is a very sharp contradiction, and the prime role here is played by the oppressed countries and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The big victories won by the national-liberation movement since the Second World War have increased the number of independent countries and at the same time caused the ground on which imperialism stands, i. e., colonial and semi-colonial domination, to slip from under its feet. We are convinced that the struggle of the oppressed peoples could not have led from victory to victory and acquired its present gigantic scope had there not existed, alongside the indomitable resolve of the peoples to win national liberation, the steadily growing might of the socialist camp. Among all the forces constituting the irresistible revolutionary torrent of our day the peoples belonging to the camp of socialism and communism play the leading, vanguard role . . .

All the movements for democracy and peace, against capitalism and imperialism, and for national liberation and socialism should be closely and inseparably linked with one another as indivisible components of the world revolutionary process. Therefore we qualify as pernicious the efforts of the Chinese comrades to counterpose, by diverse means, crude and subtle, overt and covert, the national-liberation movement to the socialist world camp and the world peace movement. We likewise disagree with the Chinese comrades' claim that the international Communist movement ignores the struggle for national liberation. To claim this is to resort to fabrications. And this is dangerous indeed . . .

Marxism teaches us to analyze the struggles waged in class society from the standpoint of class interests, proceeding from the thesis that the history of class society is shaped in class struggle. Yet in this as in other questions the Chinese comrades prefer to depart from Marx-

ism and to speak of nations as of united entities without making any distinction between the classes within these nations or between the interests of these classes. For the Chinese comrades there exist only oppressor nations and countries and oppressed nations and countries. They seem to have forgotten that the proletariat of both types of nations and countries have common interests and are fighting against a common enemy and for common goals. True, in conducting the polemic the Chinese comrades point to these common interests and goals of the world proletariat, but only to the extent that this bolsters up their arguments on other points. When they speak of the connection between the struggle for national liberation, the struggle for socialism and the vanguard role of the socialist camp, they prefer to speak only about countries and not about classes. In other words, they incline towards the positions of bourgeois nationalism, departing from Marxist-Leninist positions.

III. The Paths of Revolution

On the question of the means the peoples should use to win power—both at the stage of national liberation and at the stage of transition to socialism—there is full clarity in the international Communist movement. This question was theoretically elucidated in the statements of the Communist and Workers' parties in a way which seemed to leave no loophole for sowing confusion . . .

The Chinese comrades, after categorically asserting in their June 14 Letter that they are for faithful and consistent pursuance of the line set forth in the documents of the Communist and Workers' parties, ridicule the opportunities for peaceful struggle against the oligarchy in the various countries and against imperialism which are opening before a number of peoples. Clearly the Chinese comrades' position is that of conservatives and dogmatists. Many peoples today have access to means of struggle which could hardly be envisaged when socialism was taking its first steps. The more the forces of socialism and progress become the decisive factor of social change, the more possibilities open up for the peoples for waging a successful struggle for power.

The Communist Party of Salvador, repudiating the position of the Chinese comrades and their attacks against other Communist and Workers' parties, once again reaffirms the Communique issued by its Central Committee in April 1963 which declares that our Party ". . . maintains that national independence may be won either by peaceful means or through armed struggle, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned, and that in each case it is up to the Marxist-Leninist party of the given country to determine the revolutionary tactics and the forms and means of struggle". The Communique states further: "Consequently, we maintain that it is dogmatic to claim that there is only one way to be followed and only one form

of struggle to be used in all cases. Underestimation of the possibilities opening up in the course of the struggle would only lead to defeat and unnecessary suffering for the peoples."

As regards our country, the Communist Party of Salvador holds that at present and in the foreseeable future the only possible form of struggle by which the people of Salvador can win power is the non-peaceful form. In other words, in order to win, the people must be prepared to take up arms against their enemies—imperialism and the oligarchy.

The people have worked hard to win democracy by peaceful means; but the broad masses have come to realize that the peaceful path of the revolution has been blocked by imperialism and the oligarchy. Long years of mass murders, terror, denial of democratic rights, refusal to allow the agricultural labourers to organize, constant trampling on the freedom of speech, and military coups against governments which sought to foster some democratic tendencies have shown that the ruling classes have placed their stakes on force, and this has convinced the people that they must prepare to counter force with force.

The foregoing does not mean that the Communist Party of Salvador excludes the possibility of changes taking place in the internal and the international balance of forces favouring the peaceful path of struggle for power. We would not be Marxists-Leninists if we associated the popular revolutionary process in Salvador with only one particular form of struggle, if we denied the possibility of new conditions and circumstances emering in the course of the development of the mass struggles giving rise to new methods of defence and attack, if we closed all but one door to a better life and insisted on using forms of struggle no longer according with the historically evolved conditions. We would have to be completely blind and certainly not Marxists-Leninists to fail to see that the balance of strength between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp in the international arena is steadily becoming more and more favourable to the camp of socialism.

Consequently, as regards the internal situation in our country, we do not rule out the possibility of a time coming when the organized forces of the people of Salvador, united in struggle against the tyranny and the interests it represents, will achieve such a preponderance of strength as to make the peaceful path to power possible. We do not underestimate the possibility of a government of national democracy coming into power—a government consistent with our political process which would launch out on the path of non-capitalist development. Nor do we rule out the possibility of a situation arising in which a transitional government respecting democratic freedoms, guaranteeing the free development of the political forces and enjoying the firm support of the people might be formed.

IV. Principles Governing Relations Between Parties

The differences between the Communist Party of China and the international Communist movement extend to the highly important question of relations between parties within the international Communist movement. All the fraternal parties which signed the 81-Party Statement solemnly undertook to observe the basic Marxist-Leninist principles governing relations between the various revolutionary detachments of the proletariat. These principles are: the equality and independence of the Communist and Workers' parties; non-interference in the internal affairs of other parties; mutual aid based on international working-class solidarity; fraternal relations between parties. These principles make for the maximum solidarity of the socialist camp and the international Communist movement in the struggle for the final victory of the working class and the peoples, in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and communism...

If the Communist parties did not cherish their independence, they would not be able correctly to elaborate their own political line according with the specific conditions prevailing in the country at the given moment; they could not effectively lead the struggles of their peoples.

The equality of the parties, the fact that there are no "superior" and "inferior" parties, is a guarantee of the observance of the principles of proletarian internationalism. Whenever there have been deviations in this respect, as, for instance, in the twenties (owing to Trotskyite influences) or in the period of the Stalin cult, they have had an adverse effect on the international Communist movement.

As regards the Communists Party of Salvador, it has strictly adhered to these principles in its relations with fraternal parties.

. Further, recognition of these principles and their correct implementation can in no way detract from the important relevant thesis that the vanguard role, the role of the bulwark in the fight against imperialism, is played and will continue to be played by the U.S.S.R and the C.P.S.U. ...

Recognition of this fact, far from harming, strengthens the international Communist movement. Recognition of this fact is an important element in the strategy and a vital factor of unity of the entire progressive world, while refusal to recognize it weakens the solidarity and the impact of the struggle waged by the Communist movement and the peoples of the world. This is an elementary truth recognized by the international Communist movement, a truth which even the Chinese comrades, with due modesty, always used to acknowledge ...

As regards the Communist Party of Salvador, we realize the importance of the equality and independance of the Communist parties; we also realize that these do not conflict with the positive fact that the C.P.S.U. plays a vanguard role in the international Communist move-

ment. Therefore our Party has clearly defined its stand on this question in its decisions . . .

Nothing would please the imperialist camp more than the weakening of the solidarity of the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement with the U.S.S.R., for the diffusion of their forces would enable the imperialists to deal with the various socialist countries, detachments of the working class, popular movements and national-liberation movements one by one. But these dreams of the imperialists will never come true, for nothing will ever make the international Communist movement forsake its main bulwark of strength.

We categorically declare that we shall always stand together with the parties which strictly and faithfully observe the principles adopted by the international Communist movement. We do not consider any fraternal Party infallible. Any Party may make one or another mistake in applying the general line of the international Communist movement, but this is not a valid reason for disrupting the unity of the movement.

In view of the situation that has developed, our Party urges that a conference of the parties be called to discuss concrete instances of mistakes which one or another fraternal Party has committed, or is presumed to have committed, in carrying out the general line.

V. Unity of the International Communist Movement

The unity of the international Communist movement is the basic condition for the final victory of the working class and the peoples over capitalism and imperialism.

The immortal slogan "Workers of all lands, unite!" is more timely than ever at the present stage when socialism is becoming the decisive factor of social development and the victory of the proletariat is on the order of the day. Yet it is precisely at this moment when all the forces of the proletariat and the peoples should be concentrated on ensuring maximum cohesion in the common struggle against imperialism, exploitation and war that the differences examined in the present document have arisen.

Differences as such, even on cardinal questions of strategy and tactics, are no cause for alarm or surprise in the international Communist movement. But using such differences to undermine or destroy the unity of the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement is alien to Marxism and extremely damaging to the international Communist movement and all humanity. And this is one of the gravest errors committed by the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Resorting to systematic actions which af first seemed inexplicable and caused surprise in other parties but which, as developments have shown, were part of a far-reaching plan elaborated in advance (and designated as the plan of "three great world-wide ideological cam-

paigns"), the Chinese comrades set to work to deepen the differences and to worsen relations with the entire international Communist movement to the extreme, and then launched a vigorous drive to split the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement as well as individual parties. This divisive struggle was launched on a scale and by means without precedent in the history of the international Communist movement.

No Communist Party can remain indifferent to this state of affairs. It is a matter of deep concern to every Communist, to every progressive throughout the world.

The Chinese leaders, departing from the general line of the international Communist movement, unleashed a campaign of slander and invective against the leadership of many Communist and Workers' parties. They sling mud at the leaders of the Communist parties of France, Italy, U.S.A., Brazil, Spain, Australia, Belgium, etc., calling them "modern revisionists" who are "in the service of imperialism", and accusing them of "betrayal", "cowardice", etc. It is symptomatic that all the scum thrown out of the various Communist parties are raising their heads and, holding up the basic theses of the Chinese comrades, waging a struggle against these parties. No wonder, then, that the leaders of the C.P.C. have been congratulated and warmly greeted even by the Trotskyite so-called Fourth International.

The international Communist movement has regarded with anxiety the disruptive activies of the Chinese comrades, but at the same time it has displayed great patience and forebearance in the hope that the Chinese comrades would ponder over the serious damage they have caused to the international Communist movement and would return to the correct positions. But the Chinese comrades gave a wrong interpretation to this fraternal attitude which was prompted by a sense of proletarian unity, and hardened their erroneous stand still more.

Ever since the differences came to light the Communist Party of Salvador has fervently hoped that they would be overcome in conformity with the standards of proletarian internationalism and that no actions damaging the unity of the international Communist movement would be taken. Regrettably, however, the disruptive actions of the C.P.C. have assumed such proportions that our Party cannot but condemn them; our Party once again confirms its resolve to uphold the unity of the international Communist movement based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

VI. Struggle Against Deviations from Marxism-Leninism

... Rarely has anyone pursued a sectarian line on the fundamental questions of the strategy and tactics of the international Communist movement in so glaring a form as the leaders of the C.P.C. today. If the international Communist movement were to take an attitude similar to that of the leaders of the C.P.C. towards the peace movement

and the international democratic organizations, we Communists would find ourselves isolated, both at home and on the international arena, from the broad progressive masses adhering to diverse religious faiths and political views. Such a loss of contact with the interests of the masses would inevitably postpone the final victory of the peoples in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

The Chinese comrades refused to admit that they had committed an error in creating a cult of the personality of Mao Tse-tung, and proceeded to misrepresent the efforts that were being made to combat the personality cult, which did so much harm to the international Communist movement.

A petty-bourgeois nationalist deviation is becoming ever more clearly evident in the position of the Chinese comrades on a number of questions; and this confirms the correctness of the recommendations contained in the 81-Party Statement that the Communist movement should regard struggle against "all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism" as one of its prime duties. It would be tragic if these deviations were to lead to manifestations of racism, which is utterly alien to the class outlook of Marxists; yet indications of this are already apparent in some of the statements issued by the Chinese comrades . . .

. . . In view of the foregoing, the Communist Party of Salvador declares:

that it firmly adheres to the principled positions of the international Communist movement; that it is guided by the principles laid down in the statements of the meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties of 1957 and 1960; it considers that these statements have fully demonstrated their historical correctness;

the Party considers that the practical realization of the principles of the international Communist movement by the Communist and Workers' parties has created better conditions and prospects for the struggle of the peoples;

it cannot regard as correct the line and ideological position adopted at the present time by the Chinese comrades; this position and line do not accord with the general line endorsed by the whole international Communist movement;

the Party recognizes the great Soviet Union and its Party, founded by the leader of the world proletariat Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, as the indomitable and invincible vanguard of the international Communist movement;

the Party believes that in the struggle for Marxist-Leninist principles these principles will inevitably prevail over revisionism, dogmatism and sectarianism; the Party holds that the public debate could even be continued provided the hostile tone is abandoned;

the Party is in favour of calling a conference of the Communist and Workers' parties to discuss concrete instances of mistakes which one

or another fraternal Party has committed, or is presumed to have committed, in carrying out the general line;

and lastly, the Communist Party of Salvador addresses to the Communist Party of China and to all the Communist and Workers' parties a fervent appeal for unity on the basis of the principles by which the international Communist movement is guided.

The cause of peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and communism will emerge from these grave trials stronger than ever before.

Under the banner of Lenin, forward to the final victory of the working class and the peoples of the whole world!

"Proletarians and oppressed peoples the world over, unite!"

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Salvador

San Salvador, December 1963.

■ ■ ■

Should the National-Liberation Movement Fear International Détente

LARBI BOUHALI

The underlying factor of the foreign policy of the Algerian People's Republic is the struggle against colonialism and imperialism, the friendship and solidarity with the peoples, particularly the peoples of the Arab, African and socialist countries, the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence. At the Addis Ababa conference of the heads of state and government of African countries held in May 1963 Algeria played a paramount role in intensifying the anti-colonialist struggle with a view to achieving the complete liberation of Africa from colonial oppression, building African unity and transforming the continent into a nuclear and missile free zone.

The people of Algeria like all the peoples of the world passionately strive for peace. And the foreign policy of the Ben Bella government is deeply coloured with this striving for peace on the part of our people.

Immediately after the announcement of the Moscow test-ban treaty presidents Ben Bella and Julius Nyerere welcomed it in a joint statement which said: "It is with great satisfaction that we learnt about the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests. We are convinced that this treaty expresses the legitimate aspirations of all peoples and that it will largely contribute to the strengthening of world peace and security."

In an interview with the newspaper *Izvestia* Hadj Ben Alla, President of the National Assembly of the Algerian Republic, declared: "I maintain that the Moscow test-ban treaty is the outstanding event of the year for all countries and, notably, for Algeria."

The Algerians rejoice over the fact that the overwhelming majority of the states in the world have adopted the same attitude to the Moscow Treaty as our own government inasmuch as the treaty expresses the profound will of all the peoples, and notably the peoples who have won their freedom or are still fighting against the colonial yoke.

Who Speaks on Behalf of the National-Liberation Movement?

We understand very well why the de Gaulle government, the West German militarists and the Pentagon brass hats are hostile to the

Abridged, reprinted from *Démocratie Nouvelle*, December 1963.

Moscow treaty. But it is difficult for us to understand a similar attitude on the part of the Chinese leadres, who claim that the treaty is directed against their country. While they have feelings of admiration for the great Chinese people, the Algerians categorically reject the standpoint of the Chinese leaders according to which the Moscow treaty is a "betrayal" of the interests of the peoples. This is not only gross calumny against the Soviet Union and the glorious Party of Lenin but also an insolent challenge to all the peoples who support the actions of their governments in this direction and, consequently, a challenge to the Algerian people. The betrayal of the interests of the peoples consists in the fact that a struggle is being waged against the cause dear to all the peoples under the pretext that the imperialists were compelled to support it. In fact, however, the opposition of the Chinese leaders to the Moscow test-ban treaty derives from their erroneous attitude to the general line of the international Communist and working-class movement and, in particular, to the struggle against war, for the strengthening of world peace.

The Chinese leaders maintain that the policy of peaceful coexistence, which they themselves earlier supported, is demobilizing the peoples and retarding their struggle for national and social emancipation. In order to push through their adventurist standpoint they are trying to counterpose the national-liberation movement to the international working class and its principal gain, the socialist world system. But, in effect, what right do they have to speak on behalf of the national-liberation movement after they have refused to honour their commitments in the international democratic organizations and launched a violent campaign against one of the deepest aspirations of the peoples which compose this national-liberation movement? Why did they ignore the Addis Ababa conference which gave a clear expression to the opinion of the African peoples on the question of war and peace? Or perhaps they consider all the heads of state and government who attended that conference to be traitors to their peoples?

Is it necessary to remind that peaceful coexistence has never meant, nor will it ever mean, renouncing the struggle of the oppressed countries against the oppressors, of the exploited against the exploiters, the struggle between the two diametrically opposed ideologies, as the Chinese leaders would like us to believe? When it is a question of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-economic systems, the revolutionaries have in mind the peaceful coexistence of the socialist and the capitalist countries. The peaceful coexistence imposed by the peoples on the imperialists creates a real possibility for humanity as a whole to avoid a terrible nuclear catastrophe. No nation, no forward-looking person, can remain indifferent to this perspective. But if it is true that peaceful coexistence rids the people of a nuclear holocaust, it is equally true that it cannot either arrest or retard the national-liberation movement and the class struggle. On the contrary, it presupposes their continued development. Moreover, it creates even

more favourable conditions for this development as can be seen from the experience of the postwar years.

Before the Second World War imperialism dominated the majority of the population and reigned on most of the territory of the world. And after the end of the war, i. e., in the conditions of peaceful co-existence, over 50 countries with a population of 1,500 million won political independence.

Why did not these countries win their national independence before or during the Second World War? Did not they want it or did not they fight for it? To think so would mean to abuse them. It is common knowledge that each people subjected to colonial oppression has not for a moment ceased to fight against it. On the other hand, it is not of their free will that the imperialists granted independence to the peoples. This means that the peoples won their independence in struggle and that this struggle proceeded in far more favourable conditions.

No Adventurism!

The liberation from colonialism requires above all that the peoples concerned fight against it, and this is the principal condition of success. But the peoples are not waging this struggle in one and the same form. Some of them had to have recourse to armed struggle, to partisan warfare combined with various forms of mass political action—and all this over a span of many years. This, for example, was the case with the peoples of Vietnam and Algeria. For others it was enough to take political action to obtain independence. An example of this is Guinea and many other territories of former French Africa south of the Sahara. This means that an insurrection which can be indispensable for one people is not absolutely necessary in all cases, as claimed by the Chinese leaders who brand as counter-revolutionaries all those who do not favour armed insurrection in all cases. Had the Algerian people had a chance to achieve independence in a peaceful way, it would never have agreed to sacrifice more than a million of its sons and daughters whom it needs alive for national construction. But when imperialism confronted it with violence, it did not hesitate to use the same means and stopped at no sacrifices.

For true Marxists-Leninists an armed insurrection is not a game of chance. It is imperative that it should have the maximum of chances of success, and for this it is necessary to take cognizance of the sum-total of objective and subjective conditions. To fail to do so and seek to impose on the people an armed uprising as the sole means of their liberation means to plunge them into an adventure.

As a matter of fact, the Algerians have already seen for themselves the workings of this adventurist policy of the Chinese leaders. During a meeting with a delegation of the Algerian Communist Party in October 1959 in Peking the latter criticized the decision of the Algerian Party

to disband its armed groups and merge them with the National-Liberation Army. They suggested that the A.C.P. should do everything to re-establish these armed units as soon as possible, saying that a Party without its own armed forces was nothing. Our delegation rejected this "suggestion" as harmful both for the Communist Party and the Algerian people as a whole.

In order to shake off the chains of colonialism our people made enormous sacrifices and engaged in glorious struggle, which was undoubtedly the decisive factor of our victory. But every Algerian realizes that, no matter how heroic this struggle was, alone it could not have defeated the most powerful colonial army ever known to history. If the people of Algeria won, this was because their struggle developed in a favourable international situation.

The imperialist countries, with the exception of the U.S.A., were weakened by the Second World War. This circumstance encouraged the struggle of the colonial peoples which began to shatter the colonial system of imperialism. Every nation that won its freedom made new breaches in the flanks of imperialism and rendered active support to the struggle of other peoples. That was how the national-liberation movement grew. At the same time a movement and struggle for democracy and peace got under way in the capitalist countries and began to render political and moral support to the national-liberation movement.

But these two movements could not have reached their scope without the emergence and strengthening of the socialist countries which formed a world system of socialism. It is the joint efforts of these three mutually complimentary world forces that are steadily sapping the foundations of imperialism and will ultimately vanquish it.

To try to isolate the national-liberation movement and counterpose it to other progressive forces, as the Chinese leaders are doing, means to harm the interests of all peoples and objectively play into the hands of the imperialists.

All peoples know full well that without the socialist countries, without the Soviet Union and its great economic, scientific and technological achievements, the image of the world would be different today. The stronger the socialist system the greater the political, moral and material aid it is rendering to all peoples, both those which are fighting for their liberation and those building their independent states.

All peoples know that it was thanks to the vigorous actions of the Soviet Union that the imperialist aggressors had to retreat in many countries such as Cuba, Egypt, Syria and Iraq.

In defiance of the indisputable historical facts, the Chinese leaders accuse the Soviet Union of not supporting the struggle of the peoples against colonialism. They claim that it did not want to support Algeria in the liberation war against French colonialism. As for the Algerian people, they know and highly appreciate the aid rendered them by the U.S.S.R. in the political and diplomatic fields as well as the material

aid, including arms and munitions. The Algerian leaders, be it said, often recall this aid, as did President Ben Bella in an interview with the Soviet journalists during the Third World Meeting of Journalists in Algiers: "We," he said, "are much obliged to the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the aid they have given us and for the great material aid we are receiving at present, at the time when we are launching out on the building of a highly developed and independent socialist economy."

In the future we shall be able to receive the ever-growing aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as these countries develop their economy and go from success to success. And for this there must be peaceful coexistence and further international détente. The aggression unleashed by the Moroccan monarchy against our borders has shown that had our people been forced to wage a prolonged war to protect our territorial integrity, this would have caused grave damage to the building of our national economy and to the development of our revolution.

Such are the additional reasons explaining why the Algerian Communists resolutely support the consistent policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as the struggle for peaceful coexistence, for general and controlled disarmament.

■ ■ ■

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

9

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

in this issue

REPORT ON STRUGGLE FOR UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
M. A. Suslov — **3**

SITUATION IN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
R. Guyot — **76**

HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY
Resolution — **81**

STATEMENT OF CP OF SALVADOR — 85

NATIONAL LIBERATION AND INTERNATIONAL DETENTE — 98

RESOLUTION OF ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY — 103

Published by PROGRESS BOOKS,
42-48 Stafford St.,
Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada,
as a supplement to
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North
American edition of the
monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF
PEACE AND SOCIALISM,
published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
April 30, 1964

STRUGGLE OF THE CPSU FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

REPORT AT THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE FEBRUARY 14, 1964, CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION.

M. A. Suslov

Comrades, this Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has examined basic questions of agricultural development, questions that are of the utmost importance to our country, to the Soviet people. This Plenary Meeting is working in an atmosphere of complete unanimity of the Central Committee, the entire Party, the whole Soviet people. Its decisions will open up broad vistas for the Soviet economy and vast opportunities for a steady rise of socialist agriculture, for the flourishing of our country's production forces, for the creation of the material and technical basis of communism and for the fullest satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of the Soviet people.

In showing constant concern for the development of the country's economy, our Party is fulfilling its internationalist duty to the working people of the whole world. The greater our economic successes, the better the life of the Soviet people, the higher the prestige of the world's first socialist state and the greater the attractive force of the ideas of socialism and communism. By their tireless labor the Soviet people are making their contribution towards strengthening the world socialist system and rendering increasing aid and support to the struggle of the peoples of all countries for social and national liberation, against imperialism and colonialism.

The revolutionary process, which has embraced all the continents of the world, continues to develop in breadth and depth. New successes have been scored in the development of the world socialist system. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries is gaining strength. The national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America is broadening out. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace over the forces of imperialism and war is becoming ever clearer. Through the joint efforts of the world socialist system and all other peace-loving forces it has become possible to achieve a certain relaxation of international tension and to take further important steps towards consolidating peace and foiling the attempts of the most aggressive imperialist circles to start a thermonuclear war. The course of world development fully

bears out the correctness of the general line worked out for the international Communist movement at the 1957 and 1960 meetings of the fraternal parties, and the vitality of the conclusion and propositions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of our Party and of the Leninist Program of the CPSU.

The achievements of the socialist countries, of the entire world Communist movement, are obvious. But our success could have been much more far-reaching had it not been for the serious difficulties that arose in the socialist camp and the Communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The Central Committee members have been repeatedly informed of the differences between the CPS leadership and the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. However, the Presidium of the CC considered it necessary to raise this question once again at this Plenary Meeting because the Chinese leaders have gone even further in their factional activities and created a direct threat of a split in the world Communist movement.

If we analyze the evolution of the views and actions of the CPC leadership, beginning with the 1960 Moscow meeting, we shall see that during all these years, instead of trying to eliminate the differences, the Chinese leaders have been making them more acute. Starting out with a revision of certain tactical propositions of the world Communist movement, they have, step by step, widened their rift with the CPSU and other fraternal Parties on cardinal problems of modern times and, in the end, have opposed to the general policy of the world Communist movement their own special line, in which the fundamental theses of the Declaration and Statement are revised from the standpoint of great-power chauvinism and petty-bourgeois adventurism.

The new assessments and conclusions made collectively by the fraternal parties on the basis of a creative application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions obtaining in our epoch —on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the need for combating the personality cult ideology and practices, and on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and in the newly-free countries — are distorted and to all intents and purposes thrown overboard by the Chinese leadership.

Having to all intents and purposes rejected the Declaration and Statement collectively drawn up by the Communist and Workers' Parties, the CPC leaders offer the fraternal parties their own notorious "25-point program". Essentially, this program boils down to the renunciation of the ever-growing influence of the socialist system on the course of world development, a disparaging attitude to the struggles of the working class of the capitalist countries, the setting of the national liberation movement against the world system of socialism and the international working-class movement, adventurism in foreign policy and the preservation of the state of

cold war. It involves sectarianism and putschism in questions of revolution, the defense and preservation of the personality cult methods and practices, which have been condemned by the Communist movement, and justification of the factional struggle in the Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have thus brought their disagreements with the Communist movement to such a stage where they have virtually developed into differences on all basic questions.

The participants in this Plenary Meeting know that the CC, CPSU, has on many occasions shown initiative in an effort to create the conditions for surmounting these differences, for normalizing the relations of the CPC with the CPSU and other parties.

Like other Marxist-Leninist parties, we have repeatedly proposed to the CPC leadership that public polemics be stopped. Such a proposal, in particular, was made in N. S. Khrushchov's speeches on October 25 and November 7, 1963. At the end of November 1963 the Central Committee of the CPSU sent the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China a letter in which a number of concrete proposals were made for eliminating differences and strengthening economic, scientific, technical and cultural co-operation between the USSR and the CPR. In that letter the CC, CPSU, once again proposed stopping the open polemics. You know, comrades that during the past few months, acting in conformity with that proposal, the Soviet press has refrained from publishing any polemical material.

How did the Chinese leaders react to these steps? Blinded by nationalist arrogance, they paid no heed to the opinions and appeals of the fraternal parties. They rejected our initiative and took the road of open political struggle against the collectively worked out line of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Chinese press continuously publishes material containing the most flagrant attacks against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. Just in the period after October 25, 1963, the *Jenminjihpao*, organ of the CC, CPC, carried more than 200 articles of this nature. Slanderous articles are circulated throughout the world by Chinese organizations and broadcast over the radio in foreign languages; moreover, many anti-Soviet articles are broadcast several scores of times. Strange as it may seem, the indoctrination of the Chinese people in a spirit of hostility towards the USSR and the CPSU has now become almost the main aspect of the activity of the CC, CPC. A huge propaganda machine is now actively engaged in preparing material slurring the CPSU and the Soviet Union.

The general trend of Chinese propaganda and the brazenness of its attacks against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties are increasingly bringing it in line with the anti-Soviet, anti-communist organs of the reactionary imperialist circles.

As an example, let us take the articles of a series of so-called "answers" to the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU, of July 14, 1963, published on February 4 by the newspaper *Jenminjihpao* and the magazine *Hungchi*. From first to last, this article, beginning with the heading, *The CPSU Leaders Are the Greatest Splitters of Our*

Times, consists of foul anti-Soviet thrusts and slanders against the CC CPSU and its leadership. It has nothing in common with the most elementary norms governing relations between Communists and is an insult to our entire Party and whole Soviet people. This article contains such wild allegations as that our Party "in collusion with U.S. imperialism, world reaction, the Tito clique of renegades and Right-wing Social-Democrats is waging a struggle against fraternal socialist countries, against fraternal parties, against all Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary peoples of the world."

Not very long ago Chinese propaganda aimed its attacks mainly at the CPSU's foreign policy, but now it openly attacks our home policy as well. The CPC leaders are doing their level best to discredit the line adopted at the 20th Congress of the CPSU on all questions, proclaim the struggle against the Stalin cult a mistake and cast aspersions on the Program of the CPSU.

Reviving the practices and methods used by Trotskyites, the Chinese leaders are trying to drive a wedge between the Soviet people, the Soviet Communists, on the one hand, and the Party leaders, the leadership of the country, on the other. Matters have reached a stage where the Chinese press and radio are calling upon Soviet people to oppose the CC, CPSU, and the Soviet government.

What is this? A struggle for the "purity" of Marxism-Leninism? No. It signifies a complete renunciation of elementary norms of relations between Communist parties, a renunciation of Marxist-Leninist principles of relations between socialist countries, a transition to positions of undisguised anti-Sovietism.

The leaders of the CPC no longer limit themselves to action in the sphere of ideology. They have transferred ideological differences to inter-state relations, to the sphere of the practical political line of the socialist countries and the Communist parties. Seeking to weaken the unity and solidarity of the socialist commonwealth, the CPC leaders are resorting to all sorts of manoeuvres and dodges in order to undermine the economic and political relations between the socialist countries and disorganize their actions in the international arena. Recently the Chinese leaders have sharply intensified their splitting, undermining activities in the world Communist movement. There is now no longer any doubt that Peking is steering a course towards splitting the Communist parties, towards setting up factions and groups hostile to Marxism-Leninism.

Such, comrades, is the actual situation that has taken shape in the Communist movement as a result of the splitting activities of the CPC leadership.

In an effort to screen their departure from Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese leaders have recently become more active in their manoeuvres, masking their objectives and designs and harping importunately on their "revolutionism", "courage", "determination" and so forth. But the further events develop, the more hysterical is the tone of Chinese propaganda and the more evident it becomes that the real plans of the Chinese leadership have nothing to do with Marxism-Leninism, with the interests of world socialism. It is becoming increasingly clear that behind the mask of ultra-revolution-

ary phrases and slogans, the CPC leadership are now savagely attacking the gains of world socialism, concentrating their main fire not against the imperialists but primarily against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

True, the Chinese leaders continue to talk a lot about their striving for unity and solidarity in the socialist commonwealth. But their deeds completely diverge from these words.

They harp on unity, but all their actions have a different purpose, that of disorganizing and splitting the socialist camp, undermining the ideological foundations and organizational and political principles that rally and unite the peoples of the socialist commonwealth. They want to impose upon the socialist countries a "Sinified socialism", an adventurist line in foreign and domestic policy, and the personality cult ideology and practices.

The Chinese leaders keep harping on their desire to "strengthen" the international Communist movement, to "purge" it of "modern revisionism" and unite it on a "new foundation". But the real aim of the CPC leadership is to split the united Communist front, oppose the Communist movement with a bloc of pro-Chinese factions and groups, and subordinate the Communist parties to their influence, using all sorts of political apostates — renegades of communism, anarchists, Trotskyites and so on.

The Chinese leaders prattle about their being the most reliable and tested friends of the national liberation movement. But whoever believes this will be sadly disillusioned. The aim of the CPC leadership is to impose their adventurist concepts and methods upon the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, to counterpose the peoples on racial grounds, and disrupt the alliance between the national liberation and the working-class movement, which can only disorganize and weaken the national liberation movement.

Lately the Chinese leaders have been claiming that they are the true champions of peace and consistent advocates of peaceful coexistence between states with different social and economic systems. But who will believe them? Their provocatory stand during the Caribbean crisis, their refusal to sign the Moscow partial test-ban treaty, and their ceaseless efforts to slander the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union have shown the whole world their reluctance to work for relaxation of world tensions and their desire to preserve the cold war as a suitable background for an adventurist policy.

All the arguments that the leaders of the CC, CPC, so eagerly put forward about the interests of the world revolution and about the liberation struggle of the peoples are, in effect, designed to screen from world public opinion, from Communists, the principal strategic line of subordinating at all costs the Communist and national-liberation movement to their great-power, egoistical interests. For the sake of this the principles of proletarian internationalism are being flagrantly trampled. To this end the Marxist-Leninist teaching is reshaped and distorted and use is made of the worst traditions of petty-bourgeois nationalism and the most unscrupulous demagogy and slander.

I

TWO APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEM OF THE ROLE OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

The radical changes that took place in the world after the Second World War are linked up chiefly with the rise and development of a world system of socialism. The countries of the socialist commonwealth are the main bulwark of all the revolutionary forces of modern times, a reliable champion of world peace. The struggle between world socialism and world imperialism is the principal content of our epoch, the pivot of the class struggle on a world scale.

There was a time when the Chinese leaders subscribed to this major proposition of Marxism-Leninism. Lately, however, the CPC leadership have been setting the national-liberation movement off against the socialist system and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, proclaiming it as the main force in the struggle against imperialism and undermining the unity of the revolutionary forces of our time. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CC, CPC, makes the claim that the"vast regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America" are the centre of the contradictions of the modern world, the "storm-centre of the world revolution".

An editorial carried by *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on October 22, 1963, states: "The national-liberation revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is now becoming the most important force that is dealing a direct blow at imperialism."

This clearly revises the Marxist teaching on the historical role of the working class and belittles the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries. As regards the world socialist system, the Chinese theoreticians apportion to it only the role of a "strong point" to support and develop the revolution of the oppressed nations and peoples of the whole world. It goes without saying that this stand can only harm both the socialist system and the national liberation movement, the great cause of the struggle of the international proletariat.

According to the views of the Chinese theoreticians, the world socialist system not only fails to exert an increasingly decisive influence on the entire course of world development but does not even play an independent role in the revolutionary struggle of the masses against imperialism.

This interpretation of the role and significance of the world socialist system does not conform with the actual balance of forces in the world and runs counter to the conclusions drawn by the fraternal parties in their Statement of 1960.

The idea that modern world development is based on the contradiction between socialism and capitalism belongs to Lenin. He wrote: ". . . the relations between peoples, the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. If we lose sight of that we shall be unable correctly to formulate a single national or colonial question, even if

it concerned the most remote corner of the world. Only by proceeding from this standpoint can the Communist parties correctly formulate and resolve political problems both in the civilized and in the backward countries." *(Collected Works,* Vol. 31, p. 216, Russ. ed.)

This was written during the early years of Soviet power. In our day, when instead of only one socialist country there is a mighty socialist camp, its influence on "the relations between peoples," on "the entire world system of states" and, in the final analysis, on the world revolutionary process has grown tremendously.

Attaching the utmost significance to the national liberation movement, Marxist-Leninists at the same time hold that the main content, the main trend and the main features of the historical development of human society in the modern epoch are determined by the world socialist system, by the forces struggling against imperialism, and for the socialist reorganization of society. The most organized class forces, primarily the bulk of the working class, the most advanced class of modern society which, as our teachers Marx, Engels and Lenin pointed out, is the grave-digger of capitalism, are concentrated precisely this bridgehead.

The prime role in the world revolutionary process is played by the socialist countries. This is seen firstly in the fact that the working class, the working people of these countries, are successfully resolving social problems and building a new society where oppression and exploitation are unknown and for which the peoples are taking the road of revolution. By creating the material and technical basis of socialism and communism, the socialist countries are inflicting one blow after another on imperialism in the decisive sphere of human activity, in the sphere of material production. When the workers and peasants in the capitalist countries see the achievements of the socialist states in economic development, in raising the standard of living, in promoting democracy and in drawing the masses into state administration they become convinced in practice that the basic requirements of working people can be satisfied only on the road of socialism. All this infuses the masses with a revolutionary spirit and helps to draw them into an active struggle against the capitalist system, for social and national liberation.

Secondly, the farther we progress the greater becomes the role of the socialist states as a force directly opposing the aggressive counter-revolutionary designs of imperialism. Under conditions where the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth holds the main forces of international reaction and aggression in check the working masses and peoples of the colonial countries have the most favorable opportunity for waging a struggle against imperialism and internal reaction. Anyone who followed the development of international events in the post-war years could not fail to see that there is an extremely close link between the successes of the revolutionary struggle in the capitalist countries, the victories of the national liberation movement and the growth of the might of the world socialist system.

Victory over capitalism on a world scale can be achieved solely through the joint efforts of the world socialist system the working-class movement and the national liberation struggle. Each of these forces makes its own contribution to the anti-imperialist struggle. However, one cannot fail to see that the struggle of the world socialist system against imperialism is the focal point of world policy, of the whole of social development.

The Marxist-Leninists can have no doubt as to the primary, increasingly decisive role which the world socialist system plays, and has to play, in bringing about the triumph of the new social system all over the globe. The historical mission of the socialist countries is determined by the objective laws of social development, by the irrefutable fact that the countries in which socialism has triumphed are today in the vanguard not only of the socialist forces, but of the progressive forces of the world. They are not only a beacon lighting up mankind's road to social progress but a powerful material force embodying Marxist-Leninist ideas, a force which is fighting capitalism and is bound to defeat it in the decisive sphere of human activity, the sphere of material production.

All the facts indicate that the socialist countries can within a historically short time surpass the capitalist countries economically. Let us recall that total industrial output in the socialist countries in 1962 was roughly eight times as great as it had been on their territory in 1937, whereas the capitalist countries registered only a 2.6-fold increase. The world socialist system has now attained a new stage in economic competition with capitalism. In 1950 the socialist countries' share in world industrial production was about one-fifth; today it exceeds one-third.

It is the internationalist duty of the Communists of the socialist countries to continue effectively building the new society, promoting their economy and strengthening their defenses, consolidating the socialist community, and striving to ensure that socialist ideas exercise an increasing appeal to the working people as they are translated into reality. Nowadays the merits of socialism are judged not only by theoretical writings, but, above all, by what is done in practice, by the way in which Communists actually solve the problems of building the new society. If we accomplish this task properly, we shall greatly promote the struggle for socialism in other countries, and if we don't, it will be a blow to that struggle.

What is the attitude of the CPC leadership towards Lenin's conclusion that socialist countries influence the development of the world revolution mainly by their economic achievements? Do the CPC leaders stand for peaceful economic competition?

The CPC leadership, misrepresenting the issue, argues that economic competition means that "the oppressed peoples and nations have no need at all to fight and to rise in revolt" and that "they have merely to wait quietly until the Soviet Union outstrips the most developed capitalist country in level of production and standard of living . . ."

It would never occur to a Marxist-Leninist, however, to affirm that peaceful economic competition "can take the place of the strug-

gle of the peoples of different countries for their emancipation," or that the achievements of socialism in economic competition will lead to the "automatic" collapse of capitalism and release the peoples from the necessity of waging class and national liberation struggles. Peking is putting forward these false ideas with the express aim of discrediting the idea of economic competition between the two systems. The fact is that the Marxist-Leninists see the revolutionizing effect of the victories of socialism in economic competition precisely in the fact that these victories stimulate the class struggle of the working people and make them politically conscious fighters for socialism. Peaceful economic competition, far from dooming the people to waiting passively, arouses their revolutionary activity. This is fully realized by the imperialists, who dread progress in the socialist countries and try to hinder that progress.

You will observe, comrades, that the issue of peaceful economic competition is far from being merely an economic issue. It also has profound political significance, for to defeat capitalism economically means making it much easier for all revolutionary forces to fight against imperialism. And this is a political issue.

Our Party regards it as its chief task to build up the economic and defense potential of the Soviet Union and the world socialist commonwealth as a whole, and to increase its influence on the entire revolutionary process. We shall continue steadily and consistently to press forward our policy of carrying out the Program of the CPSU for the construction of communism, the most just of social systems, in our country. Communist construction is a tremendous contribution to the fulfilment of the Soviet people's internationalist duty. This road was charted by the great Lenin. Nothing and no one can ever divert us from this Leninist road.

To win out in economic competition with capitalism, the socialist countries must make proper use of the advantages of socialism, both in each country and throughout the world socialist system. In practice, this implies a considerable expansion of political as well as mutually beneficial economic relations between socialist countries, and the promotion of cultural, scientific and technical cooperation among them. It is in this direction that the activities of the CPSU and other fraternal parties have been developing.

By contrast, the Chinese leaders have in recent years shown that they have no interest in strengthening the unity of the world socialist system. The CPR has not only stopped co-ordinating its actions with other socialist countries, but is openly combating the agreed line of the socialist countries in the world arena. The Chinese leadership has openly set out to shake the foundations of the socialist community and to abolish economic relations with socialist countries, particularly with the countries affiliated with the Council for Mutual Economic Aid and above all the Soviet Union. In 1962 the CPR's trade with the Council countries decreased by 65 per cent compared with 1959, and in 1963 it dropped by almost another 20 per cent.

The Chinese leaders' propaganda shows that they are frankly bent on discrediting economic relations between the socialist countries

belonging to CMEA; this evidently meets their disruptive aims. Trying to sow discord among the socialist countries, the Chinese leaders do not stop at using lies and slander spread by imperialist propaganda. No sooner does the bourgeois press carry a falsehood about the Soviet Union or some other socialist country than Chinese propaganda seizes on the calumny.

The Communist parties of the socialist countries, in doing away with the consequences of the personality cult, have cleared the ground for closer relations between fraternal countries on the basis of the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism. It is well known that a necessary condition for the development of the socialist system as a whole is to promote the independence and sovereignty of each socialist country. Failing this there can be no truly voluntary and solid union of nations. Fraternal parties reacted to the line adopted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU as the only correct, Leninist direction in which to develop relations between the socialist countries.

The Chinese leaders do not like that line, however. All indications as that they would like to be able to give orders in the socialist commonwealth as in their own estate, to impose their will on other countries, and to dictate the terms on which they would either admit whole parties and peoples into the socialist system or "excommunicate" them from it at will.

Take, for example, the CPC leaders' attitude towards Yugoslavia. As late as 1955-56 the Chinese leadership spoke highly of the progress of socialist construction there. In the autumn of 1957, *Jenminjihpao* wrote in an article devoted to Chinese-Yugoslav friendship: "The peoples of our countries are advancing along the socialist road." The same newspaper stated: ". . . Yugoslavia has made great progress in socialist construction." This was how people in China spoke of the nature of the socio-political system in Yugoslavia a mere five or six years ago. Today they say and write something entirely different about Yugoslavia. *Jenminjihpao* now alleges that in Yugoslavia "there exists a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; indeed, it not only exists but is the most barbarous fascist dictatorship" and that Yugoslavia is a "counter-revolutionary special force of U.S. imperialism . . ."

The question arises what has happened in Yugoslavia? What facts, what actual developments in the socio-economic and political life of that country, have entitled Chinese theoreticians to reverse their estimations so abruptly? There are no such facts or developments, and there haven't been any. Anyone who proceeds not from a subjective standpoint, but from objective laws, from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, must admit that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that, moreover, the positions of socialism are growing stronger in Yugoslavia. Indeed, while in 1958 the socialist sector comprised 100 per cent in industry, 6 per cent in agriculture and 97 per cent in trade, today, a few years after the Chinese press praised Yugoslavia's achievements in socialist construction, the socialist sector is still 100 per cent in the country's industry, as much as 15 per cent (instead of 6 per cent in agriculture and 100 per cent (instead of 97

per cent in trade. All these facts go to show that the Yugoslav economy is developing as a socialist economy.

Anyone who does not take white for black but looks at things objectively, is bound to see that Yugoslavia supports the socialist countries' fight for world peace and peaceful coexistence, general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the CPR in the UN, and so on.

Why, then, do the Chinese leaders shut their eyes to all these facts? Why do they now insult the heroic Yugoslav people by calling Yugoslavia a fascist country? We have put this question to the Chinese leaders on more than one occasion but have never received from them anything like a coherent answer.

The Chinese leaders quote the 1960 Statement of fraternal parties, which said that the revolutionary gains in Yugoslavia were imperilled by the errors of the LCY. Let us note, however, that from what the Statement says, it did not deny even then but, on the contrary, confirmed the existence of definite revolutionary, socialist achievements in Yugoslavia and that, secondly, later years have shown the positions of socialism to have become much stronger in Yugoslavia, a development which we certainly welcome.

While striving to improve relations with Yugoslavia, and being firmly convinced that this meets the interests of the socialist cause, we Soviet Communists do not at all conceal the ideological differences which persist between the Communist movement and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. We have said as much to the Yugoslav comrades. But we maintain that the existence of differences is by no means a reason for "excommunicating" Yugoslavia from socialism. One cannot arbitrarily, acting on a subjective impulse and, furthermore, doctoring and distorting the facts, permit or forbid this or that people to build socialism. And yet this is precisely what the Chinese leaders are trying to do.

The Yugoslav example brings out with particular clarity the Chinese leaders' claim to the role of "supreme arbiters" of relations between the socialist countries who should judge which country is socialist and which isn't. Today they have, in defiance of the facts, "excommunicated" Yugoslavia from socialism. Tomorrow it may occur to the CPC leadership to do the same with regard to other socialist countries. But what has this subjectivist and arbitrary approach to do with Marxism-Leninism? This is a method fit only for those who set at nothing the interests of the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries.

Or take the so-called Albanian question, about which the CC membership and our Party as a whole have been repeatedly informed. It is well known that from 1960 on, the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labor abruptly changed their political line, although we did not give them any cause to do so, and embarked on hostile actions against the CPSU and other fraternal parties. The government of the People's Republic of Albania has virtually broken off political, economic and military co-operation wtih the Soviet Union and most of the other socialist countries.

It was hard to see at first what had prompted Hoxha's and Shehu's anti-Soviet moves. But as time went on it became more and more obvious that the Albanian leaders were taking their cue from someone else, for they repeated word for word what was said or written in Peking.

The Sino-Albanian alliance is no accidental development. It arose on the basis of opposition to the Leninist line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, on the basis of a hostile attitude towards the elimination of the consequences of the Stalin personality cult. Just as in the case of China, the Albanian leaders' defense of the personality cult is due to the fact that over many years they have themselves been implanting the personality cult and using pernicious methods of leadership in Party and country.

At the Third Congress of the APL, in 1956, the Albanian leaders, finding themselves under pressure from the Party membership, who after the 20th Congress of the CPSU had demanded that the suffocating atmosphere of the personality cult be removed and the Leninist standards of Party life re-established in the APL, had to admit publicly that the personality cult in the APL had become "sharply pronounced." But this "admission" and the promise to end the personality cult were no more than a stratagem. As a matter of fact, the Albanian leaders had no intention at all of renouncing their harmful practices. Just when Hoxha was participating in "self-criticism" from the rostrum of the Third Congress, the Albanian police was busy putting in jail or sending into exile members of the Tirana Party organization who at the city Party conference had criticized the Albanian leaders for violating the Leninist standards of Party life, for arbitrary practices and for the persecution of honest Communists.

Hoxha and Shehu combated the line of the 20th Congress because they were afraid of losing their posts, because the establishment of the Leninist standards of Party life in the APL would have ended their arbitrary rule. The Albanian leaders, in taking an anti-Soviet road, put their people in a trying position. They created in Albania difficulties that would not have been present if given normal co-operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Soviet people are confident that in spite of the present difficulties in Soviet-Albanian relations, caused by the policy of the Albanian top leaders, the peoples of our two countries will advance together to the common goal, the triumph of socialism and communism. As far as the CPSU is concerned, we are willing, as in the past, to take all necessary steps in this direction.

The CPSU regards it as one of its major tasks to work for the close unity of the world socialist system, for close fraternal relations with all the socialist countries on the basis of complete equality and voluntary co-operation, for the increased solidarity of the socialist countries with the aim of waging a joint struggle against the imperialist aggressors, for world peace, for the complete triumph of communism.

II

QUESTIONS OF WAR, PEACE AND REVOLUTION

Comrades, the fortunes of our great cause, and of the peoples, depend in decisive measure on the Communist movement employing the correct strategy and tactics on questions of war, peace and revolution. It is particularly important to take account of the interconnection and interdependence of these questions today, for never before have the revolutionary achievements of each particular country been so directly bound up with the development of the international situation as a whole, with the world revolutionary process.

The Marxist-Leninist parties see their consistent struggle for peace as fulfilment of their historical responsibility to mankind, which is to prevent the extermination of peoples in the flames of a thermonuclear war. Furthermore, they see it as a most important condition for the successful construction of socialism and communism and for the expansion of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat of the capitalist countries and of the liberation movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

An all-round analysis of the balance of world forces enabled the Communist and Workers' Parties to draw the cardinal conclusion that world war can be averted even before socialism triumphs throughout the world, and to re-emphasize that the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is the unshakable basis for the foreign policy of the socialist countries.

As we know, these propositions were laid down in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement adopted in Moscow. The experience of recent years, far from shaking belief in the vital necessity of the policy of peaceful coexistence, has, in fact, fully borne it out. It is due to the socialist countries' consistent implementation of this policy, which is supported by hundreds of millions of people all over the world, that we have been able to foil the imperialist reactionaries' schemes against peace. The blessings of peace which mankind enjoys today do not come from the gods. They are a concrete result of the staunch resistance of the peace force, to attempts to unleash a thermonuclear war, a result of the growing power of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as of the correct policy of the Communist parties, which have raised aloft the banner of the struggle for peace and rallied the whole of progressive mankind to this banner.

The Chinese leaders, who engaged first in a controversy with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and then in a political fight against them, showed especial zeal in attacking the conclusions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the theses of the Moscow meetings of fraternal parties on questions of war, peace and revolution. They imagined that it was on these points that they would be able to make political capital, and with this aim in view they accused the entire Communist movement of "losing sight of revolutionary perspective" and "surrendering to imperialism."

To impart at least a semblance of veracity to their infamous

charges, the Chinese theoreticians resort to a device that is neither clever nor new. Artificially separating two aspects of a single social process from each other, they contrast the fight for peace to the revolutionary movement, and claim that these two highly important tasks are mutually exclusive. From that they allege it follows that those who fight to maintain peace and ward off world war are against revolution and hamper the revolutionary struggle.

One does not require a special Marxist education to see that the CPC leaders, who pose as grandmasters of dialectics, have in fact killed dialectics, which Lenin described as the "living soul" of Marxism. The Communist parties, which hold aloft the banner of the struggle for peace, are with increasing energy stepping up the class struggle of the proletariat and all working people, and the national liberation movement against imperialism.

In their fight against the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, which they counter with the idea of giving revolution a "push" by means of war, the CPC leaders have gone as far as to assert that war is an acceptable and, in fact, the only means of settling the contradictions between capitalism and socialism. They ignore the experience of the world Communist movement and exalt the road of the victorious revolution in China as something absolute, trying to make it an incontrovertible truth for all countries and peoples. On every occasion, whether suitable or not, Chinese propaganda quotes what Mao Tse-tung said about war and peace in the thirties, during the civil war in China.

Among the widely popularized statements of Mao Tse-tung are the following: "the war to be waged by the overwhelming majority of mankind . . . will become a bridge over which mankind will pass into a new era in history," "the world can only be reorganized by means of the rifle;" "we stand for abolishing war, we have no use for it, but war can only be abolished through war. If you want rifles to go out of existence, take to the rifle."

Almost three decades have passed since those statements were made. Radical changes have occurred in the world. The world socialist system has been formed and has become a mighty force, the revolutionary movement of the working class has assumed a mass scale, and the national liberation movement has scored historic victories. Today the alliance of the peace forces can, as the documents of the Communist parties point out, overcome the forces of imperialism and prevent them from launching a new war. The prevention of war has become a particularly pressing task because the most destructive weapon recorded in history has been created and has been stockpiled in quantities that can bring untold calamities to all nations.

The Chinese leaders refuse to take all that into consideration. Plainly showing off their irresponsible attitude, they affirm that the nuclear bomb is a "paper tiger" and in no way affects the issue of war and peace. In keeping with this logic, which runs counter to elementary commonsense, Mao Tse-tung, speaking at the Moscow meeting in 1957, argued that the struggle for socialism even stood to gain from a world thermonuclear war. "Can one foresee," he said,

"the number of human lives that the future war may take? It may be one-third of the 2,700 million inhabitants of the world, that is, a mere 900 million people. . . I had an argument over this matter with Nehru. He is more pessimistic in this respect than I. I told him that should half of mankind be destroyed, the other half would survive; in return, imperialism would be wiped out completely and there would be only socialism in the world. In half a century or a whole century the population would grow again, even by more than half."

This concept is even more lucidly expressed in the collection of articles *Long Live Leninism!*, which the CC, CPC, has approved and is circulating. "On the ruins of fallen imperialism," it says, "the victorious people will build a thousand times more wonderful future at an extremely rapid rate." That is the kind of ultra-revolutionary verbiage, complete political irresponsibility that is particularly dangerous because it is being demonstrated by people standing at the helm of a large socialist country.

It is common knowledge that Lenin pointed out as far back as 1918 that a world war in which mighty achievements of technology are used with such great energy for the mass extermination of human life, apart from being a major crime can also lead "to the undermining of the very foundations of human society" (*Works*, vol. 27, p. 386). In our days, with the production and the development of nuclear missile weapons, this danger has increased still more. How can people, particularly the adherents of Communist teachings, ignore this fact?

Neither the socialist countries nor the working people want a world war, it cannot serve the cause of the triumph of socialism. The conclusions drawn by specialists on the possible consequences of another world war are quite unambiguous. For example, the progressive American scientist Linus Pauling gives figures to show that within 60 days after the outbreak of a nuclear war out of 190 million Americans 170 million would perish, 15 million would suffer greatly and only five million would remain relatively unharmed. The situation in other regions drawn directly into the sphere of military operations would evidently be the same. Moreover, account must also be taken of such delayed consequences of a nuclear war as the disorganization of society due to the destruction of key industrial centres and of the means of transport and communication, and increasing radioactive pollution. Without mincing words, one can say that if a world thermonuclear conflict breaks out it would be the greatest tragedy for humanity and would, of course, deal the cause of communism a heavy blow.

No party that really cherishes the interests of the people can fail to appreciate its responsibility in the struggle for averting another world war. Yet the Chinese leaders, as we have seen, even boast that, allegedly for "the sake of the revolution", they are prepared to agree to the destruction of half of mankind. It does not worry them in the least that the losses in densely-populated countries that would find themselves in the centre of military operations would be so great that for entire peoples there would no longer be any question

of the triumph of socialism because they would have disappeared from the face of the earth.

Here it would be appropriate to recall certain facts. When in a conversation with Tao Chu, member of the CC CPC, a Czechoslovak journalist mentioned that in the event of a thermonuclear war the whole of Czechoslovakia, where 14 million people live, might be destroyed, the answer he received was: "In the event of a war of annihilation the small countries in the socialist camp will have to subordinate their interests to the common interests of the camp as a whole." Another well-known CPR official told Soviet representatives that Comrade Togliatti, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, was wrong when, expressing anxiety for the fate of his people, he said that if a thermonuclear war broke out the whole of Italy would be destroyed. "Other people will remain," declared this official, "and imperialism will be wiped out . . ."

In an effort to disprove the conclusions of the international Communist movement concerning the possibility of averting war, Peking alleges that in pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence the CPSU and other fraternal parties proceed from the assumption that the nature of imperialism has changed, base all their calculations on the "peace-loving and humane nature of the imperialists," and "appeal and beg for" peace for them. On the other hand, the CPC leaders, it is claimed, are waging a determined and relentless struggle against imperialism and exposing its aggressive nature.

But these crude falsifications and distortions can fool no one. The attempts to portray Marxist-Leninists as some kind of pacifists are simply ludicrous. In the 1957 Declaration it is recorded that as long as imperialism exists there will be always be the soil for aggressive wars. From this, however, the Communist parties did not draw the conclusion that world war is fatally inevitable. They showed that while the nature of imperialism, its rapacious essence, remains unchanged, there has been a change in the balance of forces in the world, that the place and role of imperialism in world economy policies are not what they were, and that its influence on the course of events is diminishing. All this forces the imperialists to accept peaceful coexistence.

Consequently, it is not that the imperialists have become "peace-loving" or more "tractable" but that they have no alternative but to take the growing strength of socialism into account. They are aware that the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, possess a formidable weapon and are able to deal any aggressor a crushing blow. They cannot help but take into account the strength of the mighty working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist countries, and the huge scale of the national liberation struggle of the peoples. The fact that capitalism will be wiped out and buried if the imperialist madmen unleash a world war is being more and more clearly apprehended in the camp of our class enemies.

The possibility of averting war, the threat of which remains as long as imperialism exists, does not arise of itself. It requires that the peace-loving forces display the greatest energy in the struggle for peace and show the greatest vigilance with regard to the intri-

gues of its enemies. It depends to a vast extent on the policy of the socialist countries, on their defensive might, on the unswerving implementation of the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence. This is exactly the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries that firmly adhere to the positions proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement of the fraternal parties.

However, it is precisely against this, the only sensible policy that the Chinese leaders have declared war. Having their own special objectives in mind, they are trying to discredit the principles of peaceful coexistence, assuring the peoples that their efforts to preserve peace are futile. Strange as it may seem, the Chinese leaders have proclaimed this point of view optimistic.

In *Long Live Leninism!* it is asserted: "Wars of one kind or another may break out as long as an end is not put to the imperialist system and the exploiter classes." "Naturally, whether or not the imperialists in the end start a war does not depend upon us for we are not the chiefs of their general staffs." At the Peking session of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC, CPC, said: "The assertions about the possibility of peaceful coexistence only make the imperialists happy." At the World Peace Council session in Stockholm in December 1961, the same Liu Ning-yi made himself more plain: "Those who think agreement can be reached with the imperialists and peaceful coexistence ensured, only delude themselves." It is not difficult to notice that one and the same importunate and gloomy refrain that "war cannot be averted" is repeated in all these statements.

The opposition of the Chinese leaders to the policy of peaceful coexistence is closely tied up with their stand on the question of disarmament, on international negotiations between the socialist countries and the Western powers. They regard disarmament as an illusion, an unrealizable slogan" that can only mislead the people. For example, speaking at the Peking session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in 1960 Liu Chang-sheng, member of the CC, CPC, declared: "Some people think that the disarmament proposals can be carried into effect while imperialism exists. That is an illusion that has nothing to do with reality . . . A world without wars and without arms is possible only in an epoch when socialism triumphs throughout the world."

It is not hard to see in these statements the desire of the Chinese leaders to distort the clear stand of the CPSU and of all the Marxist-Leninist Parties and at the same time to undermine the policy of disarmament which is an important condition in the struggle for the prevention of a new world war and for a relaxation of international tensions.

It is absurd to assert that our Party entertains any illusions concerning the military policy of the imperialist powers and their readiness to agree to general and complete disarmament. As long as imperialism exists, the reactionary forces will clutch at armaments as a last resort to retain their domination, and will use these armaments in wars, if they manage to unleash them. All this is quite obvious.

Does this, however, mean that the Communists should drop the struggle for disarmament and admit the inevitability of the arms race and of a new world war? No, such a passive stand would be contradictory to the entire revolutionary spirit of our teaching and to the vital interests of the people.

We are convinced that the revolutionary struggle of the working people, the general democratic upsurge, the growing might of socialism and the resolute actions of all the peace-loving forces can and should force the imperialists to comply, contrary to their desire, with the peoples' demands for disarmament. We are not fatalists. We believe in the tremendous capacities of the popular masses. Already 70 years ago Frederick Engels called upon the Communists to fight for disarmament, and this at a time when capitalism held undivided sway in the world.

"It is 25 years already that Europe has been arming on an unprecedented scale. Each great power endeavours to outstrip the other in military might and preparedness for war. Germany, France and Russia are doing their utmost to surpass one another," wrote Engels in a series of articles entitled "Can Europe Disarm?" "Is it not foolish to talk of disarmament under such circumstances?" he asked, and replied " I maintain: *disarmament, and hence a guarantee for peace, is possible.*" (*Works*, Ed. 2, Vol. 22, p. 387. Russ Ed.)

That is how Engels put the question! Already in those days he saw the vast social forces rising against war. How, then, can one speak of disarmament as of an "unrealizable illusion" today when all progressive mankind is coming out for disarmament and when the forces of peace have the mighty support of the socialist countries?

The slogan "A World Without Arms, A World Without Wars", is for the Communist parties a mighty means of uniting and mobilizing the popular masses for an active struggle against the inveterate militarist imperialist circles. This slogan is clear to everyone, regardless of political convictions. Disarmament means ending the arms race and, consequently, reducing the tax burden. It conforms to the vital interests of the broadest sections of the population. Not only the Communists, but many other social forces actively support and propagate this slogan. Then why should we, Communists, discard it? Is it not clear that rejecting this slogan could only weaken the influence of the Communists among the masses, and that this would play into the hands of the reactionary forces?

Are the Chinese leaders so naive as not to realize where their strange logic leads them and how grave a responsibility they are assuming before the peoples of the world by advancing such reckless theses fraught with the direst consequences?

The Chinese leaders not only take a negative stand on such vitally important questions of international policy as disarmament, termination of nuclear weapon tests and relaxation of international tension, but also try to paralyze the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries fighting against the threat of world war.

The facts show that time and again the CPR Government has acted in the world arena as a force opposing the peaceful foreign

policy of the socialist countries and disorganizing the common anti-war front. Time and again when the world was faced with an acute situation in which unity of action among the socialist countries and all peace-loving forces was particularly imperative, the Chinese leaders became active. But against whom? Against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries seeking a relaxation of tension. Moreover, it has been noted that Peking could not conceal its chagrin and annoyance every time the situation was normalized and a military conflict avoided. That was the case, for example, during the Caribbean crisis. The CPR leadership did nothing to help avert a world war and effectively support revolutionary Cuba. They did nothing to support the defensive measures of the Warsaw Treaty powers, adopted to meet possible imperialist aggression, and said nothing about China siding with the socialist countries in the event of a U.S. attack against Cuba. It was quite evident that at a time when the Soviet Union was prepared to defend the Cuban revolution with all the means at its disposal, the Chinese leaders strove to benefit from the crisis on the Caribbean region.

It is a fact that when the Caribbean crisis was at its height the CPR Government extended the armed conflict on the Sino-Indian frontier. No matter how hard the Chinese leaders try belatedly to justify their behaviour at the time they cannot escape the responsibility for the fact that by their actions they essentially helped the extreme reactionary circles of imperialism, thereby aggravating an already complicated and dangerous situation in the world.

The Sino-Indian conflict arose over the possession of frontier territories in the Himalayas which had not been disputed either by China or India in the course of many centuries. However, inasmuch as this problem did arise everything should have been done to settle it peacefully, by negotiation. The Government of the USSR repeatedly advocated such a settlement of this frontier dispute. Hostilities broke out in the region of the Himalayas. The disastrous consequences of this conflict are now fully evident. It has rendered a great service to imperialism and inflicted grave harm to the national liberation movement, the progressive forces of India and the entire front of the anti-imperialist struggle. Utilizing the Sino-Indian conflict for their own purposes, the imperialists and their supporters are seeking to undermine the trust of the peoples of the young national states in the socialist countries, to draw India into military blocs and strengthen the positions of the ultra-reactionary forces in that country.

While allowing relations with India, which as everybody knows is not a member of military blocs, to deteriorate sharply, the Chinese leadership at the same time actually acted in league with Pakistan, a member of SEATO and CENTO, which threaten the peace and security of the Asian peoples. It is a fact that having discarded their "revolutionary phrase-mongering", the Chinese leaders have in effect adopted a line that can hardly be dove-tailed with the principled position of the countries of the socialist commonwealth with regard to imperialist blocs.

The approach of the Chinese leaders to the choice of friends and

allies is strange, to say the least. How is it possible, it may be asked, to fling mud at the socialist countries, at the Communist partie and, at the same time, with the whole world watching, shower compliments on the reactionary regime in Pakistan? It is simply incomprehensible.

Can anyone believe that the rapprochement with Pakistan has been dictated by the interests of the development of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples of Asia against imperialism that the Chinese leaders talk so much about?

The dangerous, adventurist views and propositions on questions of war and peace that the CPC leaders seek to impose upon the fraternal parties have quite understandably been categorically rejected by the international Communist movement and broad circles of progressive world opinion.

Not only Marxist-Leninists but also all friends of socialism and peace noted with alarm that the "bellicose' outpourings from Peking practically border on direct justification and even lauding of war as a means of settling social conflicts.

Hysterically attacking the Moscow partial test-ban treaty of July 31, 1963 and thereby finding themselves aligned with the most aggressive circles of imperialism, the Chinese leaders still further exposed themselves as opponents of the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Enemies rejoiced over their actions and friends could not but condemn them.

The Chinese leaders realized that they had gone too far and in order to extricate themselves from this situation they made a complete turn in their propaganda. Lately a stream of "peace-loving" statements have suddenly gushed from Peking, while representatives of the Chinese government are hastening to sign documents concerning the struggle for peace and fidelity to the policy of peaceful coexistence. Such was the tenor of many of the statements made by Chou En-lai during his tour in Africa and Asia.

"World war cannot be averted,' they were saying plainly in Peking only yesterday. Today they are trying to persuade people to believe that the thesis that war can be averted was put forward by none other than the leaders of the CPC. Yesterday they abused peaceful coexistence, today they are posing as practically its only and most zealous supporters. Yesterday they declared that disarmament was a deception of the peoples, today they sign statements in which they undertake to work for disarmament.

This about-turn could only be welcomed if there were signs that the CPC leadership really realizes its mistakes and is taking a correct stand. Unfortunately everything points to the fact that the aims and objectives of the Chinese leaders have not changed. Their "love of peace" is nothing but a screen to mask their real intentions, which have received a rebuff and been censured by world public opinion. One cannot fail to see that the "love of peace" now emanating from Peking is in glaring contrast to their actual deeds, to the concrete policy of the Government of the CPR.

The obviously adventurist position of the CPC leaders makes itself felt in their attitude to the question of nuclear weapons.

The CC, CPSU, and the Soviet Government have already explained why we consider it inexpedient to help China produce nuclear weapons. The inevitable reaction to this would be the nuclear arming of powers of the imperialist camp, in particular, West Germany and Japan. Having a higher level of economic, scientific and technological development they could undoubtedly produce more bombs than China and build up a nuclear potential much faster. It should be borne in mind that revanchist aspirations are particularly strong in these countries. These are the countries which in the past were the main hotbeds of military threats and militarism.

The Soviet Union's atomic weapon is a reliable guarantee of the defense not only of our country but also of the entire socialist camp, including China. The leaders of the CPR are well aware of this fact. Nonetheless, they want to acquire the nuclear weapon at all costs. Very indicative in this respect is the interview given to Japanese journalists in October 1963 by Chen Yi, member of the Politbureau of the CC, CPC, and Deputy Premier of the CPR. Saying that China would create her own nuclear weapon whatever the price, he declared, as was reported in the Japanese press, that possibly it would take China several years and perhaps even longer than that to begin the mass production of the bombs. But China, he said, would produce the most modern weapon even if it would cost them their last shirt. And several days later a statement by a Chinese government spokesman, published in *Jemninjihpao* stated that China woud adhere to this line "even if the Chinese people will not be able to create the atom bomb in a hundred years. . . ." .

It thus turns out that possession of the atom bomb, which the Chinese leaders call a "paper tiger", is their cherished goal.

In a fit of anger, the CPC leaders went so far as to say that the threat of a nuclear war comes not from imperialism but from the "modern revisionists", unambiguously hinting at the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In a speech in Pyongyang on September 18, 1963, Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the CPR, stated: "Imperialism did not use the nuclear weapon everywhere and at will and would not dare to do so." He followed this up with the wild assertion that "in agreement with the imperialists" the Soviet Union "has monopolized the nuclear weapon" and organizes "nuclear blackmail with regard to the peoples of the socialist countries and the revolutionary peoples of the whole world." If the "modern revisionists," he pathetically exclaimed, "go so far as to use the nuclear weapon first and will thereby provoke a nuclear world war they will earn the stern condemnation of the peoples of the whole world."

What touching concern Liu Shoa-chi shows to lull suspicion that the imperialists have any intention of unleashing a nuclear war. After this, is it not hypocrisy on the part of the CPC leadership to call for an "adherence to the class approach", for "distinguishing friend from foe", for a struggle against U.S. imperialism as the chief enemy of peace? In this connection one cannot help but recall the treacherous rule of bourgeois diplomacy, which Palmerston expounded as "we have neither eternal allies nor eternal friends. Only our interests are eternal." All this shows how little significance the Chinese leaders at-

tach to their own statements concerning the aggressive nature of imperialism and their uncompromising attitude to class enemies.

The following example of the discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and do must also be pointed out. This concerns the relations between the socialist countries and the countries of the capitalist world. Here the Chinese leaders have two yardsticks, one for appraising the policy of the USSR and other socialist countries and the other for assessing China's foreign policy. Everyone knows the sharply negative reaction of the Chinese leaders to the efforts the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are making to normalize and improve economic and other relations with the capitalist countries, including the United States of America. Why, one involuntarily asks, does any normalization of relations between the USSR and USA, the two great nuclear powers on whose efforts a relaxation of international tension largely depends, evoke such opposition from the Chinese government? With a persistence worthy of better application, the Chinese leaders are doing their utmost to hinder an improvement of U.S.-Soviet relations, portraying it as a "conspiracy with the imperialists." At the same time the CPR Government is making feverish efforts to establish relations with Britain, France, Japan, West Germany and Italy. All the indications are that they would not be averse to an improvement in relations with the USA if the opportunity presented itself.

Never before has Peking received so many businessmen, political leaders and statesmen from the capitalist countries as now. CPR representatives have talks with them and sign agreements on trade, credits, scientific and technical aid and even on political issues.

Do we want to reproach the CPC leaders for this activity? Of course not. It is a normal and intrinsic element of the policy of peaceful coexistence. All socialist countries ultimately have to have contacts with people from the bourgeois states and not only with friends but also with representatives of the ruling imperialist circles. But the thing is that the Chinese leaders consider that when they themselves develop such activity it is an expression of the policy of real "revolutionaries", but when other socialist states do the same thing it is "revisionism" and "treachery."

But the attempts to slander our peace-loving foreign policy will inevitably collapse. Our Party shall continue to wage a struggle to avert a world thermonuclear war, secure lasting world peace and steadfastly pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. Our peaceful policy, Lenin said, is approved by the overwhelming majority of the world's population. Peace helps to strengthen socialism. The working people of all countries, of all continents desire peace. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has won deserved glory as the banner-bearer of peace and shall always remain faithful to this banner.

The course of events has shown that the program of struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism drawn up by the Moscow Meetings is the program which closely links up the immediate and ultimate goals of the working class and ensures the advance of the world revolution.

At the same time, far from facilitating the development of the world revolutionary process, the theoretical platform and, chiefly, the practical activity of the CPC leadership create additional difficulties for the realization of the age-old aspirations of the people, who are hungering for peace and social progress.

It is absurd to oppose the struggle for peace, for the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, to the revolutionary class struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the people. For Marxist-Leninists there neither is nor can there be a dilemma of whether to wage a struggle for peace or a revolutionary struggle. The two are inter-related and are, in the final analysis, spearheaded against imperialism. The struggle for peace is one of the main forms of the struggle of the people against imperialism, against the new wars being prepared by it, against the aggressive acts of the imperialists in the colonial countries, against the military bases of the imperialists on the territory of other countries, against the arms race, and so on. Surely this struggle expresses the vital interests of the working class and all working people.

We know that peace is a true ally of socialism. The situation created by peaceful coexistence also favourably influences the development of the national liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries.

The scale of the working-class movement made particularly great headway in recent years. Experience shows that in many countries the struggle of the working class for democratic and social rights is closely interwined with the struggle for peace and against the forces of militarism. In the struggle against militarism a political complexion is imparted even to the economic actions of the working class. The efforts of the working class and all working people to avert the threat of another world war help to educate the peoples in a spirit of international solidarity because under present-day conditions the struggle for peace as never before is essentially an international struggle.

What, for example, does it mean to work for peace in a country like the Federal Republic of Germany? It means, first and foremost, active opposition to the big monopolies, which are hatching ideas of revenge, opposition to their offensive against the vital rights and political freedoms of the working people. By participating in this struggle, the working class, far from "dissolving" in the mass democratic movement, as the Chinese leaders maintain, gets a schooling in revolutionary organization and discipline, unites its ranks and wins greater influence among the masses.

Naturally, being a general democratic movement the struggle for peace neither sets itself nor can set itself the task of effecting socialist changes. This incidentally, is what the CPC leaders, who are trying to foist on the peace movement tasks alien to it, fail to understand. But the struggle for peace is furthering the cause of socialism inasmuch as it is waged against imperialism, the source of the war threat, inasmuch as it is helping the masses secure a better understanding of what their vital interests are.

The repudiation of this extremely close bond between the struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism reveals in effect the utter lack of confidence of the CPC leaders in the popular masses, in their ability to take organized action in the class struggle. The essence of the CPC leadership's present concepts regarding revolution lies in rejection of the Leninist precept that the socialist revolution is the result of the mass struggle, and in relying solely on armed uprising everywhere and in all cases without taking into account the sentiments of the masses, their preparedness for revolution, without taking into account the internal and external situation.

The immense harm of this line lies in the fact that it rejects painstaking and patient work with the masses and reliance on the maturing of the objective and subjective conditions for a socialist revolution, in favor of revolutionary phrase-mongering, or, what is still worse, in favor of adventurist actions by a handful of men who have no ties with the people. What has this kind of action in common with Marxism-Leninism? Is this not propagation of Blanquist and Trotskyite ideas that have been rejected long ago?

No matter what the CPC leaders say to the contrary, one of the pivotal points in the polemics in the Communist movement is the problem of "the ways of carrying out the revolution" and not the dilemma of "whether to carry or not to carry on the revolution." If the Communist parties pin all their hopes solely on an armed struggle without taking into consideration whether the masses are prepared to support that struggle, it will inevitably lead only to bitter failures.

In other words, the Chinese leaders have forgotten one of the prime propositions of Marxist-Leninist theory, namely that the revolution cannot be accelerated or made to order, that it cannot be given a push from without. "Some people," Lenin said, "think that the revolution in a foreign country can be made to order. People who think so are either madmen or provocateurs." (*Collected Work*, Vol. 27, p. 441, Russ. ed.). Revolution is made by the masses headed by the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard. Naturally, this does not in any way imply that Marxist-Leninists must passively wait for a favourable situation to arise. The experience of the CPSU shows that even a relatively small, steeled party that has the support of the proletariat and the advanced section of the peasantry can head the revolution and lead the people. But for this, as Lenin repeatedly emphasizes, there must be a revolutionary situation in which the "upper strata are no longer able to rule and the "lower strata" no longer willing to live in the old way.

Realistically assessing the present situation, the fraternal parties allow for the possibility of transition from capitalism to socialism either by peaceful or non-peaceful means.

However, no matter how the transition from capitalism to socialism is achieved, it is possible only through a socialist revolution, through a dictatorship of the proletariat in its varous forms. In each given country the actual possibility for peaceful or non-peaceful transition

to socialism is determined by concrete historical conditions. The fraternal parties in the capitalist countries are invariably guided by Lenin's proposition that the working class must be able to master all forms and means of revolutionary struggle without exception, that it must be ready to pass from one form of struggle to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner and to utilize it in conformity with the concrete situation. But the Chinese leaders oppose this creative approach to questions of tactics by the fraternal parties and attempt to instruct them from Peking on how and when to carry out a revolution in their countries. Quite understandably these "instructions" are meeting with unanimous rebuff from Marxist-Leninists.

Our Party has always unswervingly adhered to positions of proletarian internationalism. No slander and no foul fabrications can smear the banner of proletarian internationalism which is sacred to us. Our Party will continue tirelessly to strengthen its solidarity with the working class, with the working masses of the capitalist countries who are fighting to destroy the capitalist system and to reshape society on socialist lines. This road was charted for us by Lenin and we shall steadfastly follow it.

III

THE CPC LEADERS' POLICY OF ISOLATING THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING CLASS

The Chinese leaders pin special hopes on using the national liberation movement for their own ends.

The collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and the tasks and prospects of the newly-free countries constitute one of the cardinal problems of the social progress of all mankind. Imperialism and internal reaction are trying to stop the development of national liberation revolutions and to push the newly-free countries into the trap of neo-colonialism. The progressive democratic force are fighting for complete national freedom, for the transition to the non-capitalist path of development. The historical destinies of hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people depend on the outcome of this struggle.

The Communist parties of the world, after generalizing at their international conferences the vast experiences of the anti-imperialist movement, put forward a clear-cut program of action to promote the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for complete national and social liberation.

The Chinese leaders countered this Marxist-Leninist program with a policy of their own, and are trying to impose upon the national liberation movement principles which may push it on to a perilous path and endanger the achievements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is particularly typical of the Chinese leaders that they completely

ignore the immense variety of conditions in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is well known that these countries are at different levels of socio-economic and political development. One group of countries has already taken the socialist road. Another group has won political independence and set about effecting radical social reforms. A third group of countries, where the national bourgeoisie has come to power, adheres on the whole to an anti-imperialist position. Then there are the countries which, although they have formally won political independence, actually are not independent because of the puppet regimes set up in them or because of their participation in imperialist blocs. Lastly, there are countries where colonial regimes remain and whose peoples are waging a heroic struggle for their freedom.

It is obvious to Marxist-Leninists that the peoples of each of these groups of countries are faced with different tasks. The Chinese leaders, however, are trying to impose the same stereotyped patterns and methods of struggle on the Communist parties and all progressive forces. This is particularly evident from what they contend to be the main tasks of the national liberation movement at the present stage.

Marxist-Leninists consider that the main tasks of the former colonies where an end has been put to the political rule of the imperialists, and those countries constitute the overwhelming majority, are to strengthen the independence achieved, uproot colonial practices in their economy and develop it at a fast rate, achieve economic sovereignty, and to advance along the road of social and economic progress. Among the primary general national problems are the expulsion of foreign monopolies, the implementation of agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasants, the promotion of national industry, above all by setting up a state sector, and the democratization of social and political life. In a number of countries, conditions are already being created, as these tasks are being accomplished, for development along non-capitalist lines, for taking the socialist road.

In their interviews with delegations from the Communist parties of newly-free countries, and in their statements at world conferences, Chinese representatives speak of nothing but the necessity of waging an armed struggle in those countries. At the Stockholm session of the World Peace Council, for example, Liu Ning-yi, member of the CC CPC, claimed that "the road of armed struggle is the road to the complete liberation of the oppressed nations."

Marxist-Leninists have always supported armed risings against the colonialists, against tyrannical regimes; they have supported the liberation wars of oppressed peoples. But they have always opposed stereotyped tactics based on the dogmatic use of some one form of struggle, irrespective of the actual conditions. Such tactics are particularly harmful now that in most of the Asian, African and Latin American countries national governments have come to power that are pursuing an anti-imperialist policy. In these circumstances, to advance the slogan of armed struggle as a universal method means causing double harm, disorienting the forces of national liberation and diverting them from the struggle against imperialism.

After all, it is absurd to say that the working people of Algeria, Ghana, Mali and certain other countries are faced with the task of starting an armed revolt. Such an idea amounts to an appeal to back the reactionaries, who are intent on overthrowing the governments of those countries. And what else but harm can one expect from an attempt to put this idea into effect in such countries as, for example, Indonesia or Ceylon?

The "Leftist" recommendations of the Chinese leaders for an armed struggle everywhere are nothing but an attempt to push the Communist and all democratic forces in the newly-free countries on to a path of adventurism. Experience shows that those who blindly follow such recommendations, refusing to take account of the actual conditions, doom themselves to isolation, to making useless sacrifices and, far from promoting social progress in their countries, handicap it.

On the question of the prospects of the historical development of the newly-free countries the Chinese leaders come out against such cardinal principles of the Communist movement as Lenin's thesis on the possibility of the non-capitalist way of development of the newly-free countries.

Speaking at the Moscow bilateral meeting in July 1963, Teng Hsiao-ping, General Secretary of the CC, CPC, said outright that the thesis of the non-capitalist path was "meaningless talk," although every Communist knows that this thesis was put forward by Lenin and has been borne out by the experience of a number of former colonial peoples.

The idea of the non-capitalist path is gaining ground among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and for a number of the peoples it has become a call for practical action. This is a tremendous victory for socialism. Capitalism has discredited itself in the eyes of these peoples, and the appeal of socialist ideas in the newly-free countries is so strong that the advanced forces and national leaders of many countries advocate taking the socialist path, and are actually taking steps in this direction, counting with good reason on support from the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Except for "Leftist" phrases about the armed struggle, the Chinese leaders have nothing to say to the peoples of the newly-free countries concerning the lines along which they should wage their struggle for a better future. They have, in fact, no positive ideas that would help the progressive forces in the one-time colonies to fight for socialism.

The Chinese leaders pretend that the interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin Amrica are particularly near and dear to them and that they are concerned above all else with the further progress of the national liberation movement. The facts, however, give them the lie. It is becoming increasingly evident that they are prompted by other considerations. The CPC leadership is clearly trying to establish control over the national liberation struggle in order to make it an instrument for the implementation of its hegemonic plans. The arguments contained in the *Jenminjihpao* article of October 22, 1963, already mentioned, are typical in this respect. This newspaper tries

hard to prove that "true" Marxist-Leninists are to be found in Peking only, and makes it perfectly clear that the national liberation movement should take its leadership from them. The Chinese leaders call on the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to follow Peking's lead in everything. The article clearly expresses the CPC leadership's claim to hegemony in the national liberation movement, and their desire to subordinate it to their own special aims.

That perhaps more than anything else sheds light on the true object of the Chinese leaders' policy of dissociating the national liberation movement from the world socialist system and from the international working class.

It is with that object in view that the CPC leaders have spread the outrageous falsehood that the CPSU "underestimates" the historical role of the national liberation movement and that the Soviet Union "refuses to help" the national liberation movement on the pretext of fighting for peaceful coexistence. We need not refute this ill-intentioned slander. Whatever "strong language" the Chinese leaders may use against the CPSU, they cannot cite a single fact bearing out their lying contentions.

But the CPC leaders do not confine themselves to slander. In their official actions and also in their activities in various world democratic organizations, they concentrate not on furthering the unity of the anti-imperialist forces, but on the struggle against the USSR and other socialist countries. That was what they did, in particular, at the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Moshi.

At that Conference Liu Ning-yi, head of the Chinese delegation, said in an interview with our delegates: "East European countries should not interfere in Asian and African affairs. We regret the fact that you have come here at all. Who wants you here? It is an insult to the solidarity movement of the Afro-Asian countries. . . . You may do as you will, but we shall be against you." The Chinese delegates at that Conference suggested to Asian and African delegates that since the Russians, Czechs and Poles are whites, "they cannot be trusted," that they would "always be able to come to terms with the American whites," and that the peoples of Asia and Africa had interests of their own and should form their separate associations.

Lately, the Chinese leaders have actually begun to form separate organizations (trade union, journalistic, writers, student, sports, etc.) for Asian, African and Latin American countries, which they plan to set up against the World Federation of Trade Unions and other international associations.

In the light of the practical activities of the Chinese leaders in recent years, the true political meaning of their slogan, "The wind from the East is beginning to prevail over the wind from the West," has become all the clearer. It will be recalled that at the Meeting of 1960 that slogan was sharply criticized as a nationalist slogan substituting the geographic, and even the racial, approach for the class approach. It is clearly an attempt to minimize the role of the world socialist system, the working class and the peoples of Western Europe and America.

The Chinese theoreticians would like to substitute the call for setting the Eastern peoples apart on a nationalist and even racial basis for the Leninist idea of uniting the anti-imperialist forces of all countries and continents, expressed in the slogan "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" Their slogan about the supposedly magic power of the wind from the East is plainly designed to foment nationalist and even racial sentiments among the peoples fighting against colonialism.

Long years of enslavement and exploitation by the imperialists, who mocked at the honor and national dignity of the oppressed peoples, have aroused distrust of people of the white race in a section of the population of the former colonies and semi-colonies, and still nourish that sentiment. It is this sentiment that the Chinese leaders are trying to fan in the hope of setting the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonies against the socialist countries and the working people of the developed capitalist countries, and of representing themselves as the sole defenders of the interests of those peoples. For, if we are to lay bare what lies behind the Chinese slogan and reveal the long-range aim of the CPC leaders, we see the following: China, according to them, is the biggest country of the East, it embodies the interests of the East, and it is here that the "winds of history" spring up that are to "prevail over" the winds from the "West."

In other words, that slogan is nothing but an ideological and political expression of the hegemonic aspirations of the Chinese leadership.

It is natural that the Chinese leaders, who are hatching these sorts of plans, regard close ties between the national liberation movement, on the one hand, and the world socialist system and the international working-class movement, on the other, as a most serious obstacle to the realization of their schemes. Hence the CPC leaders' policy of separating the Asian, African and Latin American countries from the USSR and other socialist countries and from the working class of the capitalist countries. Needless to say that policy is in crying conflict with the vital interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As the facts show, it is meeting with growing resistance on their part.

And that is understandable, because the policy of the CPC leaders, which is aimed at undermining the alliance of the newly-free countries and the socialist countries, may cause great damage primarily to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In effect, that policy dooms the peoples of those countries to insularity and isolation, tends to perpetuate national narrow-mindedness, shuts them off from the international experience of the revolutionary movement and the construction of the new society, and thereby facilitates the imperialist struggle against the national liberation movement.

The tremendous progress which the national liberation movement has made in our day was made possible by its close links with the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and with the revolutionary movement of the international working class. The

Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Marxist-Leninist parties regard the national liberation movement as a major revolutionary force of today, one which makes a historic contribution to the struggle against imperialism for peace and socialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution for the first time in history showed all the enslaved people the real way to liberation from national oppression. It initiated the great revolutionary process which today has culminated in the collapse of the colonial system, an event of history-making significance.

The national liberation revolutions triumphed in new historical conditions. First of all, there arose, and has been developing and gaining strength, the world socialist system, which is becoming the decisive factor in the progress of society. Secondly, the defeat in the Second World War of the spearhead forces of imperialism, Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan, resulted in a considerable weakening of world reaction. Thirdly, the working class and all working people of the colonial powers stepped up their fight against the colonial policies of the imperialists.

All these factors provided an exceptionally favorable situation for the victories of the national liberation movement and enabled it to encompass the colonial and semi-colonial periphery of imperialism on three continents: Asia, Africa and Latin America. We greatly appreciate the assistance which the national liberation struggle is rendering to the socialist countries and to all revolutionary forces.

Unity of all the revolutionary forces is an earnest of victory in the anti-imperialist struggle. The fundamental national interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fully coincide with those of the socialist commonwealth, and of the working class and all working people in all countries. This is the objective basis of the growing solidarity of the revolutionary forces fighting against imperialism.

When our country was the only socialist state in the world Lenin wrote that "the revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop successfully, and can come to a culmination, only in direct connection with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 30, p. 130, Russ. ed.) Lenin's words sound with particular force now that there exists the world socialist system.

What, specifically, does support for the national liberation movement on the part of the socialist countries mean today?

The internationalist duty of the socialist countries is to foil imperialist attempts to re-establish colonial regimes in the newly-free countries and prevent the realization of the national aspirations of the peoples who have thrown off colonial tyranny. In all such cases, the duty of the socialist countries is to give those countries political and diplomatic support, and when necessary, to curb the imperialist aggressors by bringing to bear the whole might of the world socialist system.

Our policy, which is aimed at assisting the peoples fighting for

their freedom, is based on the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism, on the behests of the great Lenin.

Our Party and Government have time and again stated, clearly and comprehensively, their views on the question of the national liberation movement. The answers which Comrade Khrushchov gave to the questions of a number of African and Asian newspapers and which were published not long ago, say in no uncertain terms: "Every people fighting against the colonialists has been firmly supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Today we declare once again, for all to hear, that the peoples fighting for their liberation can continue to count firmly on our support."

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America know full well that the Soviet Union actively supports the just wars of national liberation which the people wage against their enslavers. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, is doing everything to help the national liberation movement, economically, politically and, if necessary, militarily, and prevent the imperialists from unleashing local wars and exporting counter-revolution by force of arms.

We have only to refer to such facts as the support given to Egypt during the Suez venture of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggressors, the assistance extended to Indonesia in its struggle to consolidate its independence and recover West Irian, not to mention many other examples. No people who have asked our support have ever met with a refusal. The soldiers of the heroic national liberation army of Algeria and the armed forces of Indonesia, Yemen and other countries know well whose arms helped them in the struggle against the colonialists for freedom and independence.

In the recent period the Soviet Government has repeatedly and resolutely come out in defense of peoples fighting for their national independence. It has supported the peoples of Panama and Cyprus in their anti-imperialist struggle, voiced its solidarity with the courageous resistance offered by the Vietnamese people to U.S. aggression, warned the British and U.S. imperialists against interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Zanzibar, and exposed colonialist intrigue in East Africa.

Now that the achievement of economic sovereignty and social progress have become the chief direction in which the anti-imperialist struggle of the newly-free countries is developing, it is particularly important to expand economic co-operation between them and the socialist countries, and to render them fraternal economic assistance.

The Soviet Union unfailingly fulfils its duty. Soviet credits to newly-free countries on favorable terms add up to a total exceeding 3,000 million rubles. The Soviet Union is helping to build about 500 industrial and other establishments in many of the newly-free countries. It is rendering disinterested assistance to the newly-free countries in setting up a national industry, the backbone of economic independence. The Bhilai Iron and Steel Works and the Aswan High Dam will always be remembered by the peoples as symbols of fraternal co-operation between socialist countries and the countries that have freed themselves from colonial tyranny.

Thousands of students from newly-sovereign states are studying in our country. Growing economic relations between the USSR and other socialist countries, on the one hand, and Asian, African and Latin American countries, on the other, have ended the monopoly which the imperialist powers had on deliveries of plant and the granting of credits. These powers are forced to make concessions to under-developed countries with regard to loan terms, in the field of trade, and so on. Economic blockade, a weapon which in the past never failed, has been knocked out of the hands of the imperialists.

The peoples of the newly-free countries know that they can win the battle against the domination of international monopolies if they draw on the economic power of socialism. The growing economic potential of the socialist countries is in their best interest. Today the achievements of the socialist countries in the economic competition with capitalism, and their expanding economic relations with newly-sovereign states constitute one of the most important forms in which socialism gives the peoples of the newly-free countries effective support.

The Chinese leaders, however, suggest to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America that the socialist countries' policy of peaceful economic competition allegedly runs counter to their interests. They do all they can to smear the economic assistance which the USSR and other socialist countries render to the under-developed countries, and try to induce them to question the purpose of that assistance. But the peoples of the newly-free countries, who have gained considerable political experience, see for themselves what the Chinese leaders are driving at and what they really want, and will reject a policy aimed at subordinating them to the selfish plans of the Chinese leaders.

Soviet people are confident that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who are well familiar with the actual facts concerning Soviet assistance, will themselves draw the right conclusions as to the worth of the slanderous fabrications of the Chinese leaders. They can do this all the more easily because they can compare the deeds of the Soviet Union with the Chinese leaders' actions in recent years.

We are firmly convinced that the national liberation movement, which has become one of the greatest progressive factors of our time will, despite all difficulties, and in close alliance with the world socialist system and all the anti-imperialist forces, march on along its own path towards final victory over the imperialist forces, and will bring the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America deliverance from age-long backwardness, will lead them to national and social prosperity.

The Soviet Union has invariably advocated the abolition of every form of colonial oppression. It considers fraternal alliance with the peoples that have cast off colonial and semi-colonial tyranny as a corner-stone of its foreign policy.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always helped the peoples fighting against imperialism, for their freedom and national

independence, and will continue to do so. No amount of slander and no falsehoods can hinder the growing friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the peoples of the countries which have freed themselves from colonial dependence.

IV

ON SOVIET-CHINESE RELATIONS

Comrades:

The CC, CPSU, and the Soviet government have always attached great importance to the development of friendship and co-operation with the Chinese People's Republic. We have never sought any advantage or profit, and have always been internationalist in our attitude towards the CPC and the Chinese people.

For many years we have supported the working people of China, their Communist vanguard, in the struggle for independence, for the victory of the socialist revolution .We considered it our duty to help the Chinese people fraternally in the building of socialism, the strengthening of the international position of the CPR and in the defense of its socialist gains.

Our Party, the Soviet people know the scale and the nature of the economic assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to China. In a short period of time the USSR helped the Chinese People's Republic build over 200 large industrial enterprises, shops and other projects, equipped with modern machinery. The CPR has built with Soviet aid whole branches of industry which China did not have before: aircraft, automobile and tractor-building industries, power-producing, heavy machine-building and precision machine-building industries, instrument-making and radio-engineering and various branches of the chemical industry.

The factories built and reconstructed with Soviet assistance enabled China to produce annually 8,700,000 tons of iron, 8,400,000 tons of steel, and 32,200,000 tons of coal and shale. Enterprises built with the help of our country account for 70 per cent of China's tin output, 100 per cent of its synthetic rubber output, 25 to 30 per cent of its electric power output, and 80 per cent of the lorries and tractors produced annually. The defense factories built with the technical assistance of the Soviet Union constituted the basis for the building of China's defense industry.

More than 10,000 Soviet specialists were sent to the People's Republic of China for varying terms between 1950 and 1960. Some 10,000 Chinese enginers, technicians and skilled workers, and about 1,000 scientists, were taught and trained in the USSR between 1951 and 1962. More than 11,000 students and post-graduates graduated from Soviet higher educational establishments in this period.

Soviet-Chinese co-operation reached its peak after 1953, when the elements of inequality in the relations between our countries imposed during the Stalin personality cult were removed on the initiative of

the CC, CPSU, and Comrade N. S. Khrushchov. "In the Chinese question," Mao Tse-tung said in 1957, "the credit for removing the disagreeable and the extraneous belongs to N.S. Khrushchov."

In 1959 the proportions of Soviet-Chinese economic contacts were nearly double those of 1953, while deliveries for the building projects increased in that period as much as eight-fold. Between 1954 and 1963 the Soviet Union turned over to China more than 24,000 sets of scientific and technical documents, including 1,400 projects of large industrial enterprises. These documents embodied the vast experience accumulated by the Soviet people, by Soviet scientists and technicians. In effect, all these scientific and technical documents were turned over to China gratuitously.

The Soviet Union granted the Chinese People's Republic long-term credits totalling 1,816 million rubles on favorable terms.

The CC, CPSU, and the Soviet government spared no effort to enable China firmly to assume its place on the international scene as a great socialist power, and worked perseveringly for the restoration of the rights of the CPR in the United Nations. We regularly informed the leadership of the CPR of all the key political actions of the Soviet Union and strove to co-ordinate the foreign policies of our two countries.

It should be said that, while assisting People's China, the CC, CPSU, for its part always highly appreciated the support of the CPR. We refer not only to the various valuable Chinese export items received by the USSR and the experience made available to us by the Chinese scientists, but also to the common struggle for the consolidation of peace, against imperialism and colonialism.

In 1950, the Soviet Union and the CPR concluded a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which became an important factor not only in the all-round development of versatile relations between our two countries, but also in the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

The Soviet Union has always faithfully abided by all the commitments under this Treaty. Every time a threat arose to the security of the CPR, the USSR demonstrated its readiness to perform its allied duty to the end. In the autumn of 1958, for example, Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, head of the Soviet government, declared in a message to U.S. President Eisenhower that "an attack on the People's Republic of China, the great friend, ally and neighbor of our country, would be tantamount to an attack on the Soviet Union." This declaration was re-affirmed in all earnest in July 1962. The above shows how earnestly the Soviet government approached the strengthening of Soviet-Chinese friendship.

However, to our regret, ever since 1958 the government of the CPR increasingly resorted to measures undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and unilateral actions creating difficulties on the world scene not only for the Soviet Union, but also for other socialist countries.

Soviet-Chinese relations deteriorated most markedly after the CPC leaders went over from isolated unfriendly acts to a sharp curtail-

ment of economic and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Already on the eve of the 1960 Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties, the Chinese government insisted on the revision of all earlier agreements and protocols concluded with the Soviet Union on economic, scientific and technical co-operation. Besides, the Chinese government turned down a considerable part of the planned deliveries of Soviet equipment, reducing to a minimum the volume of Soviet-Chinese trade.

Although the Soviet government was aware that this course of the Chinese leaders would harm Soviet-Chinese friendship and co-operation, it had no choice but to consent to it. As a result, the total volume of economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and the CPR (including trade and technical assistance) dropped in 1962 to 36.5 per cent of what it was in 1959, while deliveries of sets of equipment and materials decreased 40-fold. In 1963 economic co-operation and trade continued to drop.

It stands to reason that we could not look on indifferently while Soviet-Chinese co-operation was sharply curtailed. Time and again the CC, CPSU, called on the CC, CPC, to avert this process. We suggested a number of concrete measures, but the Chinese leaders did not respond to our suggestions. In pursuance of their special aims, they worsened China's relations with the Soviet Union step by step and began to spread the ideological differences to the sphere of inter-state relations.

Having set their course on curtailing economic contacts with the USSR and other socialist countries, the CPC leaders at first explained this as follows:

"Firstly, thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union the primary foundations of modern industry and technology have been laid in China and, therefore, the building and designing of most projects will in future be done with our own forces. We want to ease the efforts of the Soviet Union with respect to its assistance to China. However, in the future, too, we shall have to ask for Soviet assistance in relation to projects that we shall not be able to design, build and equip on our own.

"Secondly, the CC, CPC, and the Chinese government consider it necessary to concentrate their efforts on the building of the most important projects, while reducing the total number of capital projects and non-urgent projects in order to put into practice the 'better, greater, faster and more economical' principle of socialist construction in the CPR. The scale of building in the country will continue to be big and the rates high.

"Thirdly, due to the natural calamities in the last two years, certain difficulties have arisen in agriculture affecting the balance of payments and, therefore, by reducing the number of projects built with the help of the Soviet Union we hope to create conditions for more favorable co-operation between our countries." (Quoted from the statement by Ku Cho-hsin, head of the CPR government delegation at the Soviet-Chinese negotiations on February 10, 1961.)

Yet today, having evidently "forgotten" its previous explanations,

the CPR government maintains that Soviet-Chinese contacts were reduced on the initiative of the Soviet Union and that this is the cause for China's difficult economic situation in the last few years.

Today, Chinese propagandists go out of their way to prove that there has never been any Soviet assistance to China and that there have been no more than ordinary commercial operations. Bent on erasing the memory of Soviet assistance among the people, the Chinese have gone so far as to remove trade marks from Soviet lathes and other machinery, and to allege that the Soviet Union delivered obsolete equipment to China. This is said in spite of the fact that the Chinese themselves, and the foreign press as well, noted that enterprises built with Soviet assistance, such as the Changchun Automobile Works, the Harbin Electrical Engineering Works, the Loyang Tractor Works and many others, are splendid examples of modern industry.

Such actions have little in common with any concept of common decency. While leaving them to the conscience of the Chinese leadership, we cannot help noting the obvious discrepancies in their charges against the Soviet Union. On the one hand, they try to blame the USSR for reducing its assistance and creating serious difficulties for China's economy. On the other, they spread rumors that Soviet assistance was ineffective and insignificant. But if our assistance really was "ineffective and insignificant," how could its cessation harm China's economy?

To use the favorite expression of the Chinese leaders, where is the truth and where the untruth on this score? The facts show that it is nothing but untruth all round.

In spite of the candidly hostile actions of the CPC leadership, our country is faithfully living up to earlier commitments and continuing to assist China in the building of 80 industrial enterprises. Engineers, technicians, scientists and students from the CPR are being trained in the Soviet Union as before. The Soviet Union responded fraternally to the economic difficulties that arose in China in 1960 and 1961. At a time when particularly acute food shortages occurred in the CPR, the CC, CPSU, and the Soviet government offered the CPC leadership a loan of 1,000,000 tons of grain and 500,000 tons of sugar. At the same time, the Soviet Union granted the CPR five years' deferment on payments due for commercial transactions to the amount of 288 million rubles.

If, as the Chinese leadership claims, the Soviet Union sought to curtail its economic relations with China, why did it have to take all these steps, why continue its assistance in building industrial enterprises, and why make repeated offers for greater mutually advantageous trade and economic co-operation? The CPC leadership gives no reply to this question. Nor can it do so, because it was none other than the Chinese leadership that sought the curtailment of co-operation between our countries.

Seeking to justify, to some extent at least, the economic failures of the CPR, brought about by the "big leap" policy, the CPC leaders lay a particular accent on the question of Soviet specialists. So,

although this has been repeatedly dealt with in our party's official documents, we are compelled to dwell upon it once more.

The government of the USSR sent specialists to China in the belief that they were needed to assist in the development of China's national economy, which did not have qualified personnel in sufficient numbers. It was by no means a commercial transaction, but an act of genuine fraternal assistance to the Chinese people.

Seeing that the demand for foreign specialists is temporary in nature and that qualified personnel of their own was rapidly growing in the fraternal socialist countries, the Soviet government broached the question of recalling our specialists first in 1956, and once again in 1958. Similar offers were also made at the time to the other People's Democracies where Soviet specialists were still working then. Since the specialists were not needed any longer these offers were accepted by all the countries, excluding the CPR, whose government requested that the Soviet specialists stay on for a certain time.

While insisting that the Soviet specialists remain, the Chinese authorities deliberately treated them worse than before, and created intolerable conditions for their work.

The last years of our specialists' stay in the CPR coincided with the "big leap" policy, which unbalanced the proportions of economic development and caused departures from accepted technical standards. The Soviet specialists could not help seeing the dangerous implications of this policy. They warned the Chinese authorities against violating the technical requirements. But their advice fell on deaf ears. Due to the fact that the recommendations of the Soviet specialists were ignored and that the Chinese officials grossly violated technical standards, serious accidents occurred, some of them involving loss of life. This happened on the building site of the Hsinan-tsiang Hydropower Station, where hundreds of thousands of tons of rock crashed down because the technical requirements were scorned, and work on the project was considerably delayed. The dams burst and the pit was flooded at the Hsinfungtsiang Hydropower project for the same reason. In both cases there was a loss of life. It is only natural that the Soviet engineers and technicians could not treat all this with indifference. They protested, but being ignored, they began asking to be sent home.

Furthermore, beginning in the spring of 1960 the Chinese authorities began "indoctrinating" the Soviet specialists, trying to turn them against the Central Committee of the CPSU and the government of the USSR. This roused the legitimate indignation of our people.

The government of the USSR has repeatedly called the attention of the Chinese authorities to all these outrageous facts, and requested insistently that normal conditions be provided for the work of the Soviet specialists. But the Chinese authorities responded by treating our people in a still more unfriendly and insulting fashion, by spurning them as "conservatives," and by reviling Soviet experience and technology in every way. Surveillance of Soviet people increased, searches of personal belongings became more frequent, and the like. In the circumstances, there was no choice but to recall our specialists.

Now, after many additional facts have come to light, there is every reason to believe that after 1959, when the Chinese leadership began aggravating its relations with the USSR, it did not need the specialists so much but the question of these specialists could be used as one of the pretexts for the struggle against the CPSU.

After recalling the Soviet specialists, the Soviet government sought an adjustment of the matter in the interests of strengthening Soviet-Chinese friendship. In November 1960, on the instructions of the CC, CPSU, Comrade A. I. Mikoyan told the Chinese leaders at the Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties in an official conversation that if China really needed Soviet specialists and if they were provided with normal conditions for work, we were prepared to send them to the CPR. Comrade N. S. Khrushchov said the same thing in his talk with Chou En-lai and the other members of the CPC delegation to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. At the bilateral meeting of the CPSU and CPC delegations (in July 1963) and in the Letter of the CC, CPSU, of November 29, 1963,the Chinese leadership was again officially informed that if it required the technical help of our specialists, the Soviet government was prepared to examine the question of sending them to the CPR. The Chinese leaders did not reply to any of these proposals, while continuing to exploit the question of Soviet specialists for their unseemly ends. They even tried to blame the revision of their economic plans, the reduction of capital building and the difficulties which arose in the various branches of their economy on the withdrawal of our specialists.

But, firstly, everybody knows that the economic difficulties in the CPR arose before the Soviet specialists had been recalled, and that they arose due to the dangerous "big leap"experiment. Secondly, the greatest difficulties arose in those branches where there were very few or no Soviet specialists at all.

How, for example, could the recall of the Soviet specialists affect the coal, oil, timber, light and other industries, and agriculture as well if, in 1960, there were two specialists working in the coal industry, three in the Ministry of State Farms and Virgin Lands, and one each in the departments of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry? Yet it was these very branches, and especially agriculture, that suffered the greatest failures.

Is it not high time for the Chinese leaders to stop misleading their Party, their people and world opinion, and to speak the truth about the real reasons for the difficulties of the Chinese people?

These reasons stem from the fact that the CPC leaders ignore objective laws in their economic policy.

How is the fact to be explained that lately, due to the exertions of the CPC leadership, Soviet-Chinese economic co-operation, cultural relations and exchanges between public organization are dwindling from year to year, while insinuations and slander pour forth against the Soviet people? There is only one explanation: the Chinese leaders want to fence their people off from the Ioviet Union. They are afraid that their people will learn the truth about the selfless fraternal Soviet proposals for the development of relations between the

USSR and the CPR, and that then their vicious slander, whereby they seek to tarnish our Party and the Soviet people, will explode in their faces. The CPC leadership fears that co-operation with our country may carry as far as China the purifying breath of the 20th Congress ideas, which dissipated the intolerable situation created by the Stalin personality cult.

We also consider it necessary to tell the Plenum about the violations of the Soviet-Chinese border, occasioned through the fault of the Chinese side. This has already been mentioned in the documents of the CPSU and the Soviet government. In 1962 and 1963 violations of the Soviet border kept occurring continuously, often assuming the form of crude provocations.

The Soviet government has come forward with the initiative of holding consultations in order to specify the border line between the USSR and the CPR at certain of its points. We do so in the belief that no territorial issues exist between the USSR and the CPR, that the Soviet-Chinese border took shape historically, and that the issue can concern only some sections of the border, to make them more precise wherever necessary.

Undermining the foundations of Soviet-Chinese friendship, the CPC leaders have organized a malicious anti-Soviet propaganda campaign at home and abroad. The Chinese newspapers are full of slanderous articles which malign Soviet reality and cast foul aspersions on the Soviet people. In one CPR government statement the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is described as "a policy of alignment with the forces of war for struggle against the forces of peace, alignment with imperialism for struggle against socialism."

All these contentions are, from beginning to end, nothing but ranting slander, absolutely obvious not only to our friends, but also to our enemies. The Soviet Communists, all Soviet people, reject these brazen lies with indignation. The slanderers may go about their foul business, but the Soviet Union will continue to advance along the Leninist course as before.

V

ATTACKS BY THE CPC LEADERS ON THE PROGRAM OF THE CPSU

Comrades, lately the CPC leaders have spread their polemics also to questions concerning the internal development of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

They have made the Program of the CPSU the object of their attacks.

It is generally recognized that our Party Program is one of the most outstanding documents of modern times and that it reflects with exceptional depth and force the practice of building the new society in the USSR and the fraternal countries on the basis of the theory of scientific communism. Defying common sense, Chinese propaganda has in its attacks on the Program of the CPSU gone to the length of

absurd and monstrous slander, alleging that it is "aimed against the revolutions of the peoples which are still dominated by imperialism and capitalism", that it is "aimed against the completion of the revolutions by the peoples which have already embarked on the path of socialism" and, of all things, that it is aimed at "preserving and restoring capitalism" (article in *Jenminjihpao* and the journal *Hungchi*, September 6, 1963).

In opposing the CPSU Program, the Chinese leaders are trying to discredit the theory and practice of proletarian socialism, which has been victorious in the working-class movement after a long struggle against petty-bourgeois socialism, anarchism and other anti-scientific trends. Whether they admit it or not, the leaders of the CPC are reviving the concepts of petty-bourgeois socialism and trying to criticize the international experience of the building of a new society from these positions.

The Chinese leaders are attacking the CPSU because it is pursuing a policy of improving the people's standard of living. They say that the improvement of the living standard of the Soviet people is "bourgeoisification", and that the principle of material incentives "results in people seeking personal gain and enrichment. inducing the itch for profit and a growth of bourgeois individualism, and injuring socialist economics . . . and even corrupting it" (*Jenminjihpao*, December 26, 1963).

Is there not deep-seated contempt for the vital requirements of man, for the principles and ideals of socialist society, behind these strident contentions?

It may be recalled what great importance Lenin attached to the principle of socialist distribution according to labor, to material incentives for the development of social production. He taught us that a new society could not be built by enthusiasm alone, but with the help of enthusiasm roused by the great revolution, by personal interest, by incentives, on a cost-accounting basis.

The Chinese leaders ferociously attack the conclusions in the Program of the CPSU concerning the political organization of socialist society as it advances to Communism. They claim that the propositions of the Program of the CPSU on the state of the whole people and the party of the whole people all but substitute bourgeois theories for the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state, that they are tantamount to disarming the working class.

The Chinese leaders do not even try to analyze the actual processes operating in the socialist countries. Instead, they juggle with quotations snatched out of context from the works of the Marxist-Leninist classics, and interpret them incorrectly. They try to impose quasi-theoretical discussions on the world Communist movement concerning matters that have long since been settled by the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

One of these issues concerns their dogmatic contentions about the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese leaders stubbornly reiterate that the dictatorship of the proletariat should be preserved "until the entry into the highest phase of communist society." In

doing so they refer to a quotation from Marx, which says that "between the capitalist and communist society lies a period of the revolutionary transformation of the first into the second. This period conforms also with the political transitional period, and the state of this period cannot be anything but *a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*". (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, 2nd ed., Vol. 19, p. 27, Russ. ed.)

This quotation, snatched out of the context of Marx's exposition, is being exploited as the theoretical basis for the "criticism" of the Program of the CPSU.

But the Chinese leaders have clipped Marx's exposition, and do not quote the next two lines from the same work by Marx, which says with respect to the Gotha Program: "But the program does not concern itself with either this last (that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat—**M.S.**) or the future statehood in communist society." To follow the logic of the Chinese theorists, Marx should be declared an anti-Marxist for saying this. Indeed, the Chinese theorists proceed from what they call Marxist ideas to say that "the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also the withering away of the state." Yet Marx speaks about the "statehood in communist society", which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat.

That is just the point. When speaking of the transitional period from capitalism to communism, Marx has in mind the first phase of communism, that is, socialism.

Surely, the Chinese leaders know that Marx and Engels have spoken more than once about the two phases of communism and about the dictatorship of the proletariat being a state of the transitional period, whose aim, the building of socialism, is the aim of the first phase of communism. Pointing to the inevitably long and persistent struggle for the socialist rearrangement of society, Lenin wrote about "a whole period of dictatorship by the proletariat as a period of transition from capitalism to socialism" *(Works,* Vol. 29, p. 358, Russ. ed.) .

The Peking theorists go out of their way to hush up the proposition emphasized by Lenin. What he said was that the dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary "for the purpose of the final building and consolidation of socialism" (Vol. 29, p. 351, Russ. ed), and that, once the danger that capitalist relations may be restored disappears, there comes "an end to the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Vol. 33, p. 75, Russ. ed.).

That was how Lenin put it.

The facts have confirmed the correctness of Lenin's propositions. If the Chinese leaders had really been concerned about the truth, they could have turned to our everyday practice and seen how the economic basis and social structure of Soviet society have changed. Lenin considered that the suppression of the overthrown exploiting classes was a most important function of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist society in the USSR, as we know, long since consists of friendly classes, the workers and peasants, and the social group of the people's intelligentsia. They are welded by common ba-

sic interests, by the Marxist-Leninist ideology and by their identical goal, the building of communism.

Against whom do the Chinese theorists suggest that we enforce dictatorship? What are they leading up to, and how to interpret their demand that the CPSU should carry through a "policy of class struggle" inside the country?

We know where the theory put forward by Stalin about the inevitable aggravation of the class struggle as the successes of socialist construction accumulate led to. It may be recalled that this theory served as a vindication for gross violations of socialist legality. The CPSU has put an end to it and will never allow anything like it to happen again. It has pursued and will continue to pursue a policy of strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasants, of uniting all working people in a single collective of builders of communism.

The ideas of a state of the whole people and the party of the whole people are not the fruit of arm-chair rumination. They were generated by reality and reflect the high maturity which social relations have attained in the USSR. In view of the fact that the exploitingclasses have long since been abolished in the USSR, the Soviet state, having lost the character of a body suppressing the overthrown exploiters, now expresses the interests and the will of the people, while the party of the working class has become a party of the whole people.

After the complete and final victory of socialism the working class no longer carries out its leading role througn the dictatorship of the proletariat. It remains the foremost class of society also in the period of full-scale communist construction. Its leading role stems from both its economic position, the fact that it is connected directly with the highest form of socialist property, and the fact that it possesses the greatest steeling acquired through decades of class struggle and revolutionary experience.

All these propositions of the CPSU Program are not by any means of just theoretical importance. They define the practical policy of our Party, the policy of drawing the whole people into the administration of the affairs of society, of increasing the people's activity in the building of communism, of extending socialist democracy. Yet the Chinese leaders ignore Lenin's precept that "socialism is impossible without democracy" (Vol. 23, p. 62, Russ. ed.). It is indicative that there is not the slightest mention of socialist democracy and the need to develop it while advancing to communism, in the Letter of the CC of the CPC of June 14, 1963, and in the other statements of the Chinese leadership.

Does idealization of methods of violence and suppression during the entire period of transition from capitalism to communism have anything in common with the Marxist-Leninist approach to the matter?

While noting that the proletariat could not have won without employing revolutionary violence against the landed proprietors and capitalists, Lenin wrote that "revolutionary violence was a neces-

sary and lawful method of revolution only in certain periods of its development and only in certain and special circumstances, while organization of the proletarian masses, organization of the working people, was and remains a much more deep-rooted, permanent feature of this revolution and the requisite for its victories." (Vol. 29, p. 70, Russ. ed.)

The Chinese theorists maintain: "Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism can understand that the so-called state of the whole people is nothing new. Representative bourgeois figures have always called the bourgeois state a 'state of the whole people' or a 'state in which power belongs to all the people'."

A strong argument, indeed! To follow this train of thought, the Communists would also have to abandon the realization of such slogans as freedom, equality, fraternity and democracy for the sole reason that they were put forward in the bourgeois revolution and subsequently perverted and debased by the bourgeoisie on coming to power. We, on the contrary, think that the true meaning of these slogans should be revived, that these slogans should be carried into practice, and that this is possible only under socialism and communism.

So much for the concept of the state of the whole people.

When Lassalle spoke of such a state, or when imperialist ideologists speak of it today, the Marxists say rightly that their theory is nothing but deception of the people. For what these people have in mind is a state of the whole people in a class society. Such a state cannot exist in a society split into hostile classes. A state that develops out of the dictatorship of the proletariat that has completed its historic mission of building socialism within the country is an entirely different matter. Such a state can be nothing but a body expressing the interests and will of the whole people.

The Soviet state of the whole people, in which the working class retains its leading role, is continuing the cause begun by the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It performs faithfully its internationalist duty to the international working class and all the peoples of the world. The state of the whole people struggles consistently against imperialism. It ensures reliably the defenses of its country and contributes to the defense of the whole socialist camp. It develops fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries.

It is typical of the methods of the Chinese leaders in polemics to falsely depict the conclusion drawn in the Program of the CPSU about the growing over of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people under certain historical conditions as a rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of socialist construction. The Chinese theorists have even gone to the length of saying that the CPSU has "completely flung overboard the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism, the teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

That is a dirty and shameless lie! It is inscribed in the Program of the CPSU in so many words that "Soviet experience has shown that the peoples can achieve socialism only as a result of the *socialist*

revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Chinese leaders do not bother to examine the matter in substance and also attempt to malign the conclusion of the Program of the CPSU *on the transformation of the Communist Party of the working class in our country into a party of the whole people.* They describe this conclusion as "organizational and moral disarmament of the proletariat," and even as "helping to restore capitalism."

Have the Chinese leaders at all tried to substantiate their monstrous accusations against the Party that heads the building of communism? Nothing of the sort! They have merely, without reason and argument, hitched this question to the question of the state. If the state cannot be of the whole people until the complete victory of communism, they say, then the Party cannot be of the whole people either. That is the only argument they adduce.

The working-class party, without which the dictatorship of that class is impossible, retains its proletarian class character, both formally and in substance, until the final victory of socialism. That is an indisputable fact.

But it is also indisputable that as a political organization the Party also reflects the changes occurring in the class structure of society. The CPSU has stressed in its Program that until the complete victory of communism the working class remains the leading force of Soviet society. In the period of full-scale communist construction, too, the Party is the spokesman of the communist ideals and goals of the working class, and of its basic interests. At the same time, it becomes a party of the whole people. This does not happen just because someone wishes it subjectively, but because the working-class goals and ideals become the goals and ideals of all the classes and strata of the people that have built socialism.

While attacking the propositions of the CPSU Program concerning the historic fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the nature of the state and working-class party in the Soviet Union, the Chinese theorists ignore the new phenomena of social life and refuse stubbornly to see that the new conclusions and propostions of the CPSU Program were not framed arbitrarily but express what has become part of life. As they attack the course charted by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, they go to the length of questioning the very right of our Party and people to build communism.

The transition of a society that has built socialism to the full-scale building of communism is a historically inevitable and objectively necessary process. It is a vital task for the Soviet people, a task put forward by life. We have all the necessary economic, political and other prerequisites, created thanks to the victory of the socialist system, for its practical implementation. To obstruct this process is to try to stop social progress. The facts have confirmed over and over again that attempts to by-pass historically inevitable stages in social development and attempts to retard and slow down social development are equally wrong and harmful.

The men in Peking are evidently so badly blinded by the factional struggle that they have, in the heat of the fray, unconsciously come

into conflict with themselves. Just a few years ago, while proclaiming the "big leap" and "people's communes" policy, the CC, CPC, maintained that "apparently the realization of communism in our country is not something remote." (Decision of the CC, CPC, August 29, 1958.) Consequently, at that time the Chinese leaders thought it quite possible to go over to communist construction in their own country, although the building of socialism was then only beginning in China. Yet today they question communist construction in the USSR, where the final and complete victory of socialism has been achieved.

How can one fail to see the fact that the building of communism in countries that have built socialism accords with the interests of the peoples of all the socialist countries, all the revolutionary forces of our time? Is it not clear that it adds immensely to socialism's force of attraction, that it adds to the economic and defense potential of the socialist camp, and that it creates increasingly more favorable opportunities for greater effective economic, technical, cultural and other assistance and support to all the peoples fighting for socialist construction, for national independence and peace, against imperialism?

How can it be denied that the country marching first to communism is making the advance to communism easier and faster for the world socialist system as a whole, since its peoples are blazing untrodden paths for all mankind, checking how correct they are by their own experience, revealing the difficulties, finding ways and means of combating them, and choosing the best forms and methods of communist construction? It is this course that we consider correct, because it is the only course along which the peoples of the socialist countries can render the most effective support to the working peoples' struggle against imperialism, while cementing the unity and might of the socialist community and carrying into practice the communist ideals.

The Chinese leaders are attacking our Party for having worked out a scientifically reasoned plan of communist construction, for laying the accent on the creative activities of the whole Soviet people, on the building of the material and technical basis of communism, and for showing constant care for the improvement of the living and cultural standards of all working people in the country. That is truly monstrous and strange. It appears that the Chinese leaders' conception of socialism and communism, that their practice of building a new society, are very far removed from the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific communism. Neither Marx nor Lenin had anywhere even remotely hinted that the tasks of socialist construction may be realized by the method of "leaps" and cavalry charges, overlooking the degree to which the socio-economic and spiritual premises of the advance have matured and ignoring the task of improving the living standard of the people.

If the Chinese leaders want to impose their practice on us as a "universal truth," if they want us to accept for a "model" a society in which violence is idealized and democracy restricted, in which the

personality cult thrives and care for the working people is neglected, we will say bluntly: such a "universal truth" and such a "model" do not suit the Soviet people, and, we are sure, will not suit other peoples either.

Socialism, communism, which brings peace, labor, freedom, equality, fraternity and happiness for all the peoples has always been the goal of the Communist movement, and will remain so. We follow the theory and practice of scientific communism. We are marching and will always march along the road shown us by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The Chinese leaders have embarked on the dangerous course of undermining Soviet-Chinese friendship and, naturally, we denounce their wrong actions most strongly. The present attitude of the Chinese leaders is having an unfavorable effect on the whole socialist camp and on the Communist movement. It is doing great harm to China as well.

As concerns the CPSU and the Soviet Union, we remain true to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and will undeviatingly perform our internationalist duty. We have taken and will continue to take all the necessary measures aimed at normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations and strengthening the friendship of our peoples.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to work for a normalization of the situation and for a strengthening of friendship between the CPSU and the Communist Party of China. Our Party is deeply convinced that this friendship will exist, grow and flourish.

VI

THE SPLITTING ACTIVITIES OF THE CHINESE LEADERS WITHIN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Chinese leaders have lately stepped up very noticeably their subversive activities aimed at splitting the world Communist movement as well as a number of Marxist-Leninist parties. These activities of theirs have acquired an open character; developing on a wide front, they have become particularly insidious and are unprecedented as to the methods used. The CPC leaders have turned the controversy into a weapon of direct political struggle against fraternal parties.

The Chinese leaders have apparently decided to carry through to the end their subversive activity against the Leninist unity of the world Communist movement. In recent days they have openly alleged a split to have become "inevitable." In other words, they have now fully revealed their real aims, which they have had in view for a number of years with regard to the world Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders have pushed their factional struggle to a point where they are severing relations with certain Marxist-Leninist parties, which they arbitrarily describe as "non-existent," while giving

the name of "parties" to the little groups of splitters they have formed. They have announced for all to hear that they support the factional groups of splitters which they themselves have set up in a number of countries to fight the Marxist-Leninist parties. In other words, the CPC leaders have openly assumed the responsibility for the infamous activities of all those groups and for their struggle against fraternal parties.

The CPC leadership is plainly out to form under its own aegis a sort of separate international bloc and to set it up against the world Communist movement as an instrument for intensifying the struggle against this movement.

The Chinese representatives on international democratic associations have greatly increased their splitting activity and have openly set out to create separate organizations and disrupt the links between the progressive, democratic forces of different countries and different areas of the globe.

The result is that although the Chinese leaders still utter once in a while hypocritical phrases about unity and solidarity, all their practical steps are in fact aimed at shaking and splitting the world Communist movement. Today the policy and activity of the Chinese leaders are the main danger to the unity of the world Communist movement.

It is in this light that we should appraise the publication in two organs of the CC, CPC, *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi*, on February 4th last, of a factional article directed against the CPSU and the world Communist movement as a whole, an article which is a kind of platform for splitting the revolutionary movement of the working class.

In that article the Chinese leaders allege that the development of the Communist movement proceeds according to the formula: "Unity —struggle, or even a split—a new unity on a new basis." In so doing, they refer to the law of dialectics. But any Marxist-Leninist will see that these so-called dialectics are no more than a fresh attempt to mask a splitting policy with pseudo-theoretical talk.

Who can speak of an "inevitable" split today? Only those who are breaking with Marxism-Leninism, with the principles of proletarian internationalsm. By contrast, those who have the interests of the great cause of the international working class at heart see no objective reasons for a split in the present-day Communist movement. That movement has a political line tested by the experience of struggle over a long period, a line which has brought the working class and the socialist cause outstanding victories and which enjoys tremendous prestige among the people.

What would a split in the world Communist movement mean in present-day conditions? In our day, such a split would inevitably lead to undermining the unity of the main forces of the world anti-imperialist front, the socialist community, the international working-class movement, the national liberation movement, and the general democratic movements of the peoples. It would only benefit the aggressive forces of imperialism and would make it easier for them to attack the positions of the world-wide liberation movement.

Obviously, anyone who seeks a split is assuming a tremendous, a frightful historical responsibility.

Ever since the world Communist movement came into being the reactionaries all over the world have been making frantic efforts to split its ranks. Today the Chinese leaders are trying to achieve what imperialist reaction has failed to do.

In the light of the present splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, it is now clearer than ever why, at the Meeting of 1960, the CPC delegates insisted so vehemently on excluding from the Statement the passage regarding the impermissibility of factional activity within the world Communist movement. At that time the fraternal parties unanimously rejected that demand of the Chinese delegation. The Meeting of 1960 said in its Statement that one of the necessary conditions for the Communists to achieve their goals is the prevention of all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement.

Shortly after the Meeting the Chinese leaders violated that commitment, which they had made together with the other fraternal parties. They even tried, specifically in the article "Workers of All Countries, Unite! Fight Against Our Common Enemy!" (December 1962), to put on a "theoretical" basis their refusal to carry out a common decision. They put forward the concept of "majority and minority," which claims that the minority has a right not to comply with collectively adopted decisions and to combat the common line approved. This is nothing but a revision of the fundamental organizational principle of Leninism, for Lenin taught that "only the submission of the minority to the majority can be a principle of the working-class movement." (*Coll. Works,* Vol. 20, p. 354, Russ. ed.).

The majority to which the Peking leaders are now opposed is a majority comprising Communist parties that have brought the working class of their countries to power and are achieving epoch-making victories for socialism. It is a majority which includes Communist Parties of every single continent and is marching in the van of the revolutionary struggle.

The Chinese leaders are so blinded by their factionalism that they do not hesitate to describe the Marxist-Leninist parties as nothing more or less than a "fictitious" majority.

That device is by no means new. It was first used by splitters against Lenin. They declared boastfully that some day the majority would follow their lead and then they would recognize its will. Lenin wrote about such people that they "recognize the will of the majority of the class-conscious workers *not* at the present time but in the future, in that, and only in that, future when the workers will agree with them, the liquidators, Plekhanov and Trotsky" *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 20, p. 451, Russ. ed.).

It follows that splitters at all times resort to the same kind of stratagems in opposing the will of the majority.

Lately, in fighting against the principle of submission of the minority to the majority, the CPC leaders have been the first among the opportunists and splitters whom the world Communist movement

has ever encountered to put forward the thesis that the existence of several Communist parties in one and the same country is a "legitimate" thing. From what they say it follows that these parties should fight not so much against the enemies of the working class as among themselves. There is no need here to refute this thoroughly harmful concept at great length, for every politically-conscious worker realizes that the unity of the class interests and will of the proletariat, and its ideology and class organization are embodied in a single and solidly united Marxist-Leninist party. Still, it is worth pointing out once again the stratagems to which the present day splitters have recourse to bring confusion into the working-class movement and undermine Communist unity.

With that aim in view, they use a patently fraudulent device, by deliberately misinterpreting Lenin's statements. Here is a typical example.

In his well-known work "Violation of Unity Under Cover of Cries for Unity," Lenin condemns Trotsky's splitting activities, exposes his calumny against the Bolshevik Party and his attempts to disorganize the workers' movement with his propaganda of insubordination of the minority to the will of the majority of workers. Lenin wrote: "Where the *majority* of class conscious workers have rallied to pre cise and definite decisions, there is *unity* of opinion and action, there is Party spirit and a Party . . . Now by trying to persuade the workers *not to carry out the decisions* of that 'whole' which is recognized by the Marxists- *Pravda*ists, Trotsky *is trying* to disturb the movement and cause a split." Lenin regarded Trotsky's activities as "splitting activity, in the sense that it is a most impudent violation of the will of the majority of the workers" (Vol. 20, pp. 310, 312).

The editors of the article published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* magazine on February 4, 1964, cite Lenin's article perverting the position of Lenin who always emphasized that general proletarian discipline should be obligatory for all and demanded that the minority should submit to the will of the majority of workers. Trying to disorganize the Communist Parties, the Chinese splitters went as far as an outright forgery.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders obscure so obvious a point as the necessity for a definite international discipline within the Communist movement. They contend that such a discipline is out of the question since we no longer have a centralized organization of the Comintern type.

But that is a statement by which the CPC betray themselves, probably unwittingly. They do not realize that international Communist discipline in the present conditions does not imply the execution of orders given by someone on top, but the assumption by the Communist parties, of their own free will and from a keen awareness of their internationalist duty, of definite obligations towards the world Communist movement as a whole and towards one another, as well as the consistent fulfilment of these obligations. That is what prompted the fraternal parties to pledge themselves in their Statement of 1960 to adhere strictly to the following principles: to cherish party unity

as the apple of their eye; to abide in a spirit of solidarity by the jointly formulated appraisals and conclusions regarding the common tasks to be carried out in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism; to prevent all actions likely to undermine the unity of the world Communist movement; to support one another and respect the independence and equality of all the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Consistent adherence to the collectively expressed will of the world Communist movement is an indication of the Marxist maturity of the party concerned, of its internationalism, for Marxism-Leninism and internationalism are inseparable.

The Chinese leaders' statements on this point are apparently influenced by their general view on discipline, which they regard not as politically conscious fulfilment of its duty by every contingent of the great alliance of like-minded Communists, but merely as compulsory execution of orders. They are evidently influenced by a practice which is so characteristic of the CPC leaders.

But how foreign that is to the Marxist-Leninist spirit! Lenin, speaking of the Russian Bolsheviks, wrote: "We are proud of the fact that we decide the great questions of the workers' struggle for their emancipation submitting to the international discipline of the revolutionary proletariat, with due regard to the experience of the workers of different countries, to their knowledge and will, and in this way achieve, in deeds, and not in words as in the case of the Renners, Fritz Adlers and Otto Bauers, world-wide unity in the class struggle of the workers for communism" *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 244, Russ. ed.).

What the Chinese leaders are particularly proud of today is their complete disregard for international Communist discipline, their truly anarchist behavior both in polemics and in their relations with fraternal parties.

At present not only the underlying idea of the "theories" spread by the Chinese leaders with a view to justifying their splitting activities, but the main lines along which their activities are developing in practice, and their ways and methods, have become perfectly clear.

The CPC leaders aim their heaviest blows at the strongest and most authoritative contingents of the world Communist movement, that is, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist parties of other socialist countries, and the French, Italian and other parties. They are out to discredit at all costs all the genuinely Marxist-Leninist parties, which enjoy well-earned respect in the world Communist movement and among the masses.

The attitude of the CC, CPC, to the Communist parties functioning in the capitalist countries is particularly outrageous. The Chinese leaders are creating many additional difficulties for those parties, which have to work in difficult conditions as it is. They are doing their best to defame the Marxist-Leninist leaderships of those parties and to undermine their prestige. They fling at tried and tested leaders of the working class such insulting epithets as "as faint-hearted as mice," "parrots," "double-dealers," and so on .

They say those things about leaders of parties which have set an

example of heroic struggle against fascism, which today march at the head of the struggle against the monopolies and constitute a major national force. They say those things about militant and esteemed comrades who are fighting against heavy odds and are persecuted. Surely one cannot but resent it when they say that the leaders of the U.S. Communist Party "co-operate with the most reckless of the U.S. imperialists," that the Chilean Communists' position "meets the objectives of U.S. imperialism, which wants to maintain its rule in Latin America," that the leadership of the Communist Party of India is no more than a "clique," and so on.

An idea of what Peking means by proletarian solidarity can be gained from the reaction of the CC, CPC, to the execution of Salam Adil and other leaders of the Communist Party of Iraq by the Baath nationalists. In their interviews with foreign delegations, the Chinese leaders frankly gloated over the atrocious assassination of the Iraqi comrades. Immediately after the Baathist coup d'état they sought contact with the assassins. It is now clear that the Chinese representatives in Iraq wanted to take advantage of the fact that the Communist Party of Iraq found itself without a leadership and to form a splitters' group there.

The whole of the Chinese propaganda machine, the New China News Agency, information centres, various bulletins, and radio have now been turned against the Marxist-Leninist parties. The Chinese leaders have in effect opened a new ideological front against fraternal parties. Moreover, they do not mind directly borrowing any device, however base, from the anti-communist arsenal. There is, for example, the falsehood, launched by Chinese propaganda, about the "baton of Moscow" at a wave of which Communist parties are supposed to "turn" one way or the other. This falsehood is an affront both to the fraternal parties which staunchly champion the national interests of their peoples and to the CPSU, to which all interference in the internal affairs of other parties is alien. It is nothing but a new version of that old fable of imperialist propaganda about the "hand of Moscow." In the past it was used against Lenin and the Comintern by Right Social-Democratic leaders. Today it has become a weapon of Peking.

A recent development which may be called the height of the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders is their recruitment of adherents in the ranks of fraternal parties, and the formation of factional groups composed of them. In its letter of June 14, 1963, the CPC leadership already threatened fraternal parties that should they reject the propositions of Peking, they would be replaced by new people who "are or are not members of that party." Facts of recent date show that the Chinese leaders are now carrying out that threat by trying to saddle the working-class movement in some countries with leaders from among all sorts of renegades, turncoats and adventurers. The CPC leaders are trying to make the splitters' groups they form out of those renegades their main weapon in the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

To date anti-party groups of renegades and splitters have been set

up, with help and support from Peking, in Belgium, Brazil, Australia, Ceylon, Britain and some other countries. Some of those groups number less than ten members and some otherscomprise a few dozens of people. This does not, however, embarrass the Chinese leaders, for, on orders from Peking, these groups shout loudly and in unison, pouring lies and slander upon the world Communist movement and the Marxist-Leninist parties. The ringleaders of the groups unexpectedly come into possession of large sums of money. They found newspapers and magazines and begin to publish all manner of slanderous writings, and often open shops of their own to sell Chinese propaganda productions.

The political complexion of the members of these groupings bespeaks the Chinese leaders' complete lack of principle. These as a rule are opportunists, unstable elements expelled from Communist Parties for advocating anti-Marxist views, for factional activity or for immoral behavior, or ambitious men seeking a career, political "weathercocks" and the like. Members of anti-Party groupings in some countries have displayed rightist opportunist tendencies. There are people with a shady record and all kinds of adventurers acting in the splitters' groups in Austria, Chile and the United States.

It stands to reason that fraternal parties refuse to put up with factional groups and throw them out of their ranks. Whenever this happens, Peking "takes to task" the fraternal party concerned, which it accuses of nothing more or less than "using unlawful methods." The Chinese leaders declare expelled splitters to be "true revolutionaries" and "courageous fighters," although all that their "struggle" boils down to is the writing of high-sounding "manifestoes" against the Communist Party concerned. They make frequent trips to Peking, where they are received with great pomp and where their long articles peddling calumnies are published.

The meaning of the clamor raised in Peking over factional groups has become perfectly obvious in recent months. The Chinese leaders have revealed it themselves. A very short time ago they widely advertised a get-together of renegades in Belgium, which termed itself nothing more or less than a "national conference," and passed a ridiculous resolution to "re-establish (sic!) the Communist Party of Belgium" and "condemn the anti-Party behavior of the former (sic!) Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium." As for the Chinese leaders, they base themselves on that fiction to describe the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium elected by the Party Congress as the "former" CC, as if it were Peking and not the working class of the country concerned that founded a Communist party. In the same way the CPC leaders "abolished" the central committees of certain other Communist parties, such as that of Ceylon.

We must say plainly that there has never been anything like that in the history of the Communist movement. It has never occurred to a Communist party to declare wretched groups of splitters expelled from another Communist party to be the real Party and to describe the real Communist Party as a "has-been." The Chinese leaders, who talk so loudly about equality and non-interference by parties in one

another's internal affairs, today lay claim to the role of "supreme judges" in the Communist movement who shall decide for the Communist parties concerned matters bearing on their internal life.

The splitters' groups set up by Peking have no roots in the working-class movement and in the general democratic struggle of the masses, nor can they have any. They are outside the world Communist movement and no politically-conscious worker will ever agree to have anything to do with them. They have been brought into existence in an absolutely artificial manner, being a product of the splitting activities of Peking. It should be noted that their rise has been very well received by the ruling circles of the capitalist countries, which see them as a gratuitous "fifth column" in the working-class movement.

At present the leaders of the CC, CPC, are carrying things further, plainly intending to form, as a counterweight to the world Communist movement, a bloc of their supporters with its own platform and group discipline, and with headquarters in Peking. These plans were given away as early as the end of 1962 by Mehmet Shehu, who said that a bloc of parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism was being formed with the Chinese Party at the head.

Why is that bloc being set up? Anyone should realize that its aim is not to fight for the objectives of the working-class movement against world imperialism, for the very idea of the bloc contains the seeds of a split and, consequently, of a weakening of the working class. That bloc is being set up to fight against the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the world Communist movement, for the benefit of the special aims of the CC, CPC, leadership.

The Chinese leaders have extended their policy of splitting the world Communist movement to the international front of the democratic forces. For several years now they have been using the congresses and conferences of peace fighters and of women's, youth and other international associations for disruptive sorties. This was the case at the conferences of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization, the Women's Congress in Moscow, the session of the World Peace Council in Warsaw, and at other international forums. Juggling with "revolutionary phrases," the Chinese leaders try to impose on all those organizations tasks and functions alien to them, to discredit and declare unnecessary the principal slogans and demands which gave rise to such democratic movements. Obviously, the Chinese representatives' sectarian position is directed towards alienating from these movements large sections of the population holding different views and towards narrowing the mass base of the general democratic struggle.

Comrades, the world Communist movement has become the most influential political force of today. In waging a grim struggle against imperialist reaction, for the interests of the working class and all working people, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, it has made great progress, considerably increased its membership and scored outstanding victories. The post-war period has seen the rise of dozens of new Communist parties and today there is not a corner on the globe where Communists are not carrying the

great ideas of Marxism-Leninism to the people. The last decade has been particularly eventful for the world Communist movement. It is in this decade that the movement has, in eliminating the harmful effects of the personality cult, become much more active in its creative thought and practical work, which it has brought even closer to reality, to the needs and expectations of the mass of the people.

Against that historical background, the harm of the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, as well as the utter hopelessness of their attempts to lead world Communism astray from its Leninist path and make it subservient to their own designs, are particularly obvious.

It would be wrong, however, to underrate the danger of the factional activities of the CC, CPC. The Chinese leaders pin their hopes on all sorts of immature and unstable elements, and also on those who are unaffected by the new spirit which has permeated the Communist movement during the last decade and who cling to the practices of the personality cult and are still fettered by the dogmatic and doctrinaire patterns implanted by it.

The Chinese leadership's factional methods are also adopted by all manner of renegades and turncoats, who are willing to fight against communism under any flag.

Furthermore, the Chinese leaders clearly want to profit by the real discontent of the people at the anti-popular, reactionary policies of the ruling classes of the capitalist countries. In our day, when hundreds upon hundreds of millions of people, including people who are at sea politically and lack experience, are joining in an active political struggle, the "ultra-Left" revolutionary phrases in which the Chinese leaders couch their adventuristic concepts are likely to bring a certain response. This applies, above all, to those countries where there is no industrial proletariat or where it is small, and where petty-bourgeois ideology exercises considerable influence, while the theoretical maturity of revolutionary leaders is not always up to the mark.

To disguise their anti-Leninist line and their splitting activities, the Chinese leaders profess to be fighting "modern revisionism." They label as "revisionist" Marxist-Leninist parties and exalt themselves as the "true" revolutionaries. They expect that they can in this way mislead people who are unfamiliar with the true history of the struggle of the world Communist movement against Right and "Left" opportunism, and are inclined to assimilate superficial patterns of revolutionary struggle rather than to master the substance of our great doctrine.

We know well from the history of the Communist movement that irresponsible accusations of revisionism have repeatedly been levelled at the proponents of creative Marxism by all kinds of dogmatists and petty-bourgeois revolutionaries. In the autumn of 1920, for example, G. Gorter, a Dutch "Left" Communist expelled from the Comintern, wrote in his Open Letter to Lenin in reply to Lenin's book *"Left-Wing Communism," an Infantile Disorder:* "You and the Third International are now doing what Social-Democrats did in the past. . . . In accordance with the development of the working-class movement in Western Europe, there exist two trends: radical and opportunist.

You, however, Comrade Lenin, support the opportunist trend. . . . From a Marxist leader you are turning into an opportunist leader."

How many people recall today those wretched sallies against the greatest revolutionary in world history?

The methods used by the Chinese splitters cannot deceive the Marxist-Leninists of the world. The absolute majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties has openly condemned the anti-Leninist, adventuristic policy of the leaders of the CC, CPC. Numerous documents, statements by prominent leaders of the world Communist movement, and the Party press have strongly criticized the harmful propositions and factional, disruptive actions of the Chinese leaders. All this means that, taken as a whole, the world Communist movement today adheres to the only position that is correct, namely, the Marxist-Leninist position.

Our Party, which was reared by Lenin, will continue, together with the other fraternal parties, to fight unrelentingly against all opportunist actions both from the "Right" and from the "Left," for the unity of the fraternal parties and all the contingents of the world revolutionary movement, and for the purity of the all-conquering Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

VII

THE DANGER OF THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS, NATIONALIST, NEO-TROTSKYITE DEVIATION

Soviet Communists, as all other Marxist-Leninists in the world, cannot limit themselves to a criticism and political assessment of the erroneous, anti-Leninist views of the CPC leadership. Each of us inevitably asks the question: How has it happened that the leaders of a party like the CPC, which has considerable experience of revolutionary struggle and of building a new society, have taken the road of struggle against the world Communist movement? Who are we dealing with in the person of the CPC leadership?

The experience of our Party and of the whole international working-class movement shows that on many occasions Leninism had come to grips with views and propositions such as are now being trumpeted by the Chinese leadership. Naturally, the present advocates of these views do not simply repeat what their predecessors said. They adapt old ideas to new conditions and to their own requirements.

Lenin, as we know, pointed out that Bolshevism grew, gained strength and became steeled chiefly in the struggle against Right-wing opportunism. "This was," he wrote, "naturally, the principal enemy of Bolshevism within the working-class movement." At the same time he emphasized the importance of another aspect of the experience of Bolshevism, about which, he noted, much too little was known abroad. "Bolshevism," he wrote in *'Left-Wing Communism,' an Infantile Disorder*, "grew up, took shape and became steeled in

a drawn-out struggle against *petty-bourgeois revolutionism*, which smacks of anarchism or borrows something from it, which departs in all essentials from the conditions and requirements of a consistent proletarian class struggle" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31. pp. 15-16).

It is noteworthy that the Chinese leaders, who love to refer, relevantly and irrelevantly, to examples of past ideological differences and draw historical parallels, pass over in complete silence this aspect of Bolshevik experience. That is not accidental, for each word that Lenin directed against representatives of petty-bourgeois revolutionism or, as he ironically called it, petty-bourgeois "revolutionarism", is directed at the present ideological and political concepts and propositions of the CPC leadership.

A comprehensive characterization is given of petty-bourgeois revolutionism in Lenin's numerous works, in the decisions of our Party and in the documents of the Communist International. Lenin saw its sources in the special position of the petty proprietor, who easily goes over to "extreme revolutionism" but is unable to display self-control, organization, discipline and staunchness and is inclined to swing from one extreme to another.

Everybody knows of the struggle Bolshevism waged against the Socialist-Revolutionaries, a party "which more than any other," as Lenin noted, "showed a tendency to go over to petty-bourgeois revolutionism" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 16). We cannot help but recall that the Socialist-Revolutionaries rejected the idea that the working class plays the leading role and tried to prove that the peasant movement is the true socialist movement.

From time to time, particularly at sharp turns in history, petty-bourgeois vacillation made itself felt in the ranks of the proletarian parties as well. Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the proletariat was not insured against the penetration of petty-bourgeois ideology and prejudices into its ranks. Joining the proletarian parties the best of the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries re-educate themselves, seriously study Marxism and in the end become true revolutionaries. Others are either too slow or incapable of learning anything from the proletarian party "except a few words and 'striking' slogans learnt by rote . . ." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 16, pp. 44-45).

Our Party had to combat "leftist" petty-bourgeois vacillation most of all after taking over power, during the early years of the development of the Soviet state. We know the relentless struggle that Lenin waged against "Left-wing Communists", the "workers' opposition", Trotskyism and the "ultra-leftist" trend in the then young Communist movement.

Allow me to remind you of the struggle against "Left-wing Communists" in the period the Brest Peace was concluded, when they attempted to foist upon the Soviet Republic the disastrous adventurist tactics of a "revolutionary war". Lenin held that despite their clamorous revolutionary talk, the "Left-wing Communists" based their views on stark pessimism and utter despair. (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 27, p. 51, Russ. ed.). As regards the objective role played by the "Left-wing Communists" at that time, Lenin, addressing them, said bluntly: "By your objective role you are the weapon of imperialist

provocation. While your subjective 'psychology' is that of an infuriated petty bourgeois who swaggers and boasts and yet is fully aware that the proletariat is right . . ." *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 27, p. 297, Russ. ed.).

In the situation that has now arisen in the international Communist movement special mention must be made of the acute struggle that our Party wages against Trotskyism. Trotskyism was a clearly expressed petty-bourgeois deviation. It laid false claim to being more "leftist", a more "revolutionary" trend than Bolshevism. While proclaiming themselves the "true" champions of the world revolution, Trotsky and his supporters in actual fact opposed Leninism. Moreover, Trotskyism was a negation of the Bolshevik Party, of the unity of its ranks. Factionalism comprised the "soul" of Trotskyism. The Trotskyites joined hands not only with the small factional groups within the Comintern but also with organizations, groups and individuals that had never belonged to Communist parties, and also with enemies and traitors expelled from their ranks.

Do we have to recall all these facts? Yes, comrades, we have to, in order to take into account the lessons of past struggles against Leninism.

Do the Chinese theoreticians' present concept not remind us of many of the ideas of the petty-bourgeois trends that were defeated by Leninism long ago? Only a petty-bourgeois "ultra-revolutionary can regard the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems as a "renunciation" of the struggle against imperialism, a "rejection" of the revolution. He alone welcomes the thesis of the "revolutionary war" being the "last, decisive means" of putting an end to the contradiction between the two social systems. Only a petty-bourgeois "arch"-revolutionary can demand that revolution be started "at once" and "everywhere" without taking into account concrete conditions and the balance of forces. He alone can oppose the utilization of the peaceful road of revolution because his only criterion of "revolutionism" is the use of armed force regardless of whether circumstances require it or not.

It is quite understandable that having steered this course, the Chinese leaders have naturally come down to borrowing many of their ideas and concepts from the ideological arsenal of Trotskyism in the same way as they have inherited from it their factional, splitting methods of struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties.

Yes, comrades, it must be said openly that the entire range of the CPC leadership's theoretical and political views are in many ways a rehash of Trotskyism, which has long ago been thrown overboard by the international revolutionary movement.

What in actual fact are the views of the Chinese leaders on the questions of war and peace? Nothing but a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slogan of "neither war nor peace".

Or take the CC CPC leadership's active opposition to economic competition with capitalism. Is there anything new in it? No, it is merely a repetition of the old Trotskyite line of rejecting peaceful economic development and going over to the tactics of "revolutionary war", of giving the world revolution a "push" by armed force.

That, of course, was the real meaning behind the Trotskyite theory of "permanent revolution". The struggle against Trotskyism on this issue was of historic significance. The future of the world's first Land of Socialism, the future of the entire world revolutionary movement depended on the outcome of that struggle. What would have happened had our Party adopted that line? It would have found itself helpless in the face of world imperialism and would have fallen easy prey to it in the event of an armed attack.

Properly speaking, the dispute the Chinese leaders have started concerns the same question of whether to take the road of "revolutionary" adventures or to adhere to the Leninist policy of strengthening the economic and political might of the world system of socialism and developing the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples, taking full account of Lenin's theory of the revolution being the result of the aggravation of internal class contradictions in each country.

The kinship with Trotskyism is not less striking also in the Chinese theses on the danger of "bourgeois degeneration" in the socialist countries. In reply to these fabrications we can say that they are not new, that our Party has heard them before. They are a repetition under new conditions of the Trotskyite slander about the "degeneration" of the USSR into a "Thermidor" state.

Besides, do we not find features of Trotskyism in the Chinese concepts which exaggerate the role of force, of coercion in the revolution and in the building of socialism?

Furthermore, compare the views of the CPC leaders with the "ideas" of modern Trotskyism. Perhaps some people might think that the Chinese theory about the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America being the "the storm-centres of the world revolution" is new? No, it is almost a word for word repetition of one of the basic theses of present-day Trotskyism. The decisions of the so-called Fourth (Trotskyite) International contain the words: ". . . As a result of the successive defeats of the two major revolutionary waves in 1919-23 and 1943-48 and the weaker wave of 1934-37, the focus of the world revolution has for the present shifted to the colonial world."

Here you have the source of the Chinese leadership's political wisdom.

In the writings of modern Trotskyites one can find other "ultra"-revolutionary phrases, which are reproduced almost word for word by the Chinese press and given out as so-called "revolutionary principles". Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, the Trotskyites vociferate, "is not only impossible but also harmful to the working-class of all countries" because it helps "to strengthen the positions of capitalism and weakens the positions of socialism". They boastfully declare that "only the person who is fearlessly prepared to face the consequences of the nuclear war being hatched by capitalism can be considered a true revolutionary," and so on and so forth.

After this is it surprising that in addressing the CPC leaders the ringleaders of modern Trotskyism say to them (as was said last July by Posadas, one of the heads of Trotskyism in Latin America):

"Comrade Chinese, you have no right to maintain that all the questions you are putting forward as revolutionary conclusions are the result solely of your own theoretical and political works. They are the conclusions of the Fourth International."

Small wonder that the Trotskyites openly link up their hopes for a revival of their long-withered movement with the present political line of the Chinese leadership. "The political stand taken by the Communist Party of China," states the so-called 'Manifesto' of the sixth congress of their International, "indicate tremendous possibilities, which open a field of activity such as Trotskyism never had before."

The Chinese leaders pretend they do not notice all this. They have evidently reasoned along the following lines: "Present-day Trotskyism is a little-known trend and we can use its ideas by giving them a 'Sinified' form". But the truth will out. No matter how the Chinese leadership strive to conceal the real source of their ideas they cannot hide the coincidence of their views with those of the Trotskyites, past and present.

Like the Trotskyites, the Chinese leaders are demanding freedom for factions and groupings in the Communist movement and using their methods for subversive activity in the movement. Does anyone think we cannot recognize in the malicious personal attacks of Chinese propaganda against leaders of the CPSU and the Communist parties of France, Italy, the USA, India and other countries the familiar "handwriting" of the Trotskyites, who dreamed of finding ways of casting still more vicious slander at popular leaders of the working class?

The modern Trotskyites do not hide their jubilation over these actions of the CPC leaders. In a statement published in Paris at the close of last year, the joint secretariat of the Trotskyite "International" assured the Chinese leaders that it "would support them" in the struggle against the CPSU and also against the Indian, U.S., French, Italian and other Communist parties. At a meeting in the summer of 1963 the Executive Committee of this "International" issued a special resolution approving the "historical mission of joining the Chinese and working for a united front between the Fourth International and the Chinese comrades".

These facts speak for themselves. The logic of their struggle with the CPSU and the world Communist movement is bringing the CPC leaders ever closer to Trotskyism, the bitterest enemy of Marxism-Leninism.

One must say that at one time the Chinese leaders themselves saw the danger of petty-bourgeois pressure on the Communist Party of China. "Our Party," Mao Tse-tung, for example, said, "is not only surrounded by this broad social stratum from without, but people with a petty-bourgeois background form a huge majority within it as well . . . Petty-bourgeois ideology of all shades frequently finds expression in our Party" (*Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. 4, pp. 386-387 Russ. ed.) In the CPC, he said elsewhere, petty-bourgeois ideology finds expression in "dashing now to the left, now to the right, in a weakness

for leftist revolutionary verbiage and slogans, in sectarian exclusiveness and adventurism."

The Chinese leaders used to be right in what they wrote. But now they have ceased talking about the danger of petty-bourgeois degeneration. Is it because petty-bourgeois ideology has taken the upper hand in their own views, in their political line, in the methods of their activity?

Yet in a country like China, as in tsarist Russia, with its huge preponderance of non-proletarian strata among the population, Communists must be especially vigilant with regard to the penetration of petty-bourgeois views and traditions into the ranks of the working class. Under Lenin's leadership our Party successfully coped with this task. From its very inception it was a party of the militant working class, which was linked up with large-scale industry and had extensive training in the proletarian class struggle. The fact that Lenin and the Bolsheviks drew on the experience of the entire international working-class movement and firmly adhered to the principles and ideals of the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels was of fundamental importance.

The CPC leaders evidently lack sufficient Marxist-Leninist grounding to stand firm against the pressure of petty-bourgeois elements and uphold the line of proletarian socialism. This alone can explain the fact that petty-bourgeois ideology has laid its imprint on both their internal and foreign policy.

We would not have liked to touch upon the question of the internal policy of the CPC leadership. But we are compelled to do so, because the adventurist line of the Chinese leaders in the international arena is linked up with their mistakes in domestic policy.

Marxist-Leninists of all countries now know the results of the so-called policy of the "big leap" and people's communes. One cannot fail to see in this policy "leftist" attempts to "leap" over necessary stages of social development.

Our Party has always given the Chinese Communists due credit for the democratic and socialist transformation effected after the triumph of the Revolution. In the period 1949-57, when it pursued a realistic line, utilized the experience of the other socialist countries and relied on their support, the Communist Party of China achieved considerable successes in promoting China's economic, social and political development. Soviet people sincerely rejoiced over these successes.

But in 1958 this line was suddenly revised and replaced with the so-called policy of "three red banners — of the general line, the big leap and the people's communes." The Chinese leaders decided to accomplish in a few years the tasks for which back in 1956 it was felt three or more five-year plans were needed. It was decided to increase the gross industrial output 6.5 times (with an average annual increase rate of 45 per cent!) and the total agricultural output 2.5 times (with an average annual increase rate of 20 per cent!) in five years (1958-62).

These plans were drawn up without any economic substantiation whatsoever, without taking the country's real possibilities into ac-

count. The people's communes that were set up in the countryside had the job of ensuring the "leap to communism" in 3-4 or 5-6 years.

Everybody knows what came of these experiments. The CPR's economy found itself hurled back several years. The line of the "three red banners" led to a serious disorganization of the entire national economy, to a sharp retardation of the rate of industrialization and affected the people's standard of living.

In saying this, we are, naturally, not gloating over the failures of the Chinese Communists. Like them, we are distressed by the difficulties that have fallen to the lot of the fraternal Chinese people. Our sole purpose in speaking of these facts is to show what a departure from tested Leninist principles of socialist construction leads to.

In analyzing the present positions of the Chinese leadership one cannot fail to see that they also stem from the increasingly more open nationalistic, great-power aspirations that are particularly evident in the foreign policy of the CPC leaders. History knows of many cases when vociferous "revolutionarism" went hand in hand with the most blatant nationalism. Lenin pointed out time and again that the social and economic conditions giving rise to the petty proprietor impart especial stability to one of "the most deep-seated of petty-bourgeois prejudices, namely: prejudices of national egoism, of national narrow-mindedness" *(Coll. Works,* Vol. 31, p. 128, Russ. ed.)

Facts show that nationalism is gaining the upper hand more and more in the entire policy of the Chinese leaders, that it is becoming the mainspring of their actions. This manifested itself during the period of the "big leap", which was obviously planned as an attempt to overtake all the socialist countries "at one go" and occupy a dominating position in the world socialist system.

Later these tendencies became mode and more pronounced. This found expression in such actions of the Chinese government as the artificial fanning of nationalistic passions around frontier issues, the behavior of the CPC leaders during the Caribbean crisis and the stand of the Chinese government in the nuclear problem.

These and other facts reveal the complete discrepancy between what the Chinese leaders say and what they do. It is becoming increasingly clear that the "leftist" talk and prescriptions are intended mainly for "export", for the Communist parties of other countries. As for themselves, when matters concern practical steps in the international arena, the CPC leaders prefer to act from anything but positions of revolutionary struggle against imperialism. It is extremely surprising why at present Chinese propaganda reduces the entire struggle against imperialism solely to a struggle with the U.S., by-passing its allies — the Japanese, West German and French imperialists. Are they, perhaps, looking for partners among the monopolistic groups of these countries for the struggle against what they term "modern revisionism"?

Great suspicion is evoked by the Chinese leaders' so-called theory of an "intermediate zone", which regards West Germany, Britain, France and Japan as countries held in thralldom by U.S. imperialism, thereby embellishing the imperialists of Britain, France, Japan and,

in particular, West Germany, glossing over their aggressive nature and the threat they constitute for the socialist countries, the national liberation movement and world peace. The 1960 Statement lays stress on the special threat to the cause of peace from West-German imperialism and sets the Communist parties the task of intensifying the struggle against its aggressive aspirations. From their own experience the Soviet people know how dangerous this imperialist vulture is. West-German imperialism is no longer a mere satellite of U.S. imperialism. Relying on a huge economic potential, which considerably exceeds the potential possessed by the whole of nazi Germany, West-German imperialism has created a large war machine and is increasingly setting the tone in NATO.

British, French and Japanese imperialism are likewise exceedingly dangerous. This is seen from, say, the example of recent events in Cyprus, in East Africa, Gabon and South-east Asia, where the British and French imperialists are resorting to armed force to suppress the national liberation movement.

The CPSU holds that side by side with a determined struggle against U.S. imperialism, the major international exploiter and policeman, all anti-imperialist forces must also carry on a struggle against the aggressive, reactionary forces of British, French, West-German and Japanese imperialism. The Chinese theory of an "intermediate zone", on the other hand, objectively whitewashes the imperialists of Britain, France, West Germany and Japan, and is hence to their advantage.

It must be said that the ruling circles of the imperialist powers have "divined" the secret of Chinese policy. They have understood that the "revolutionary phrase-mongering" of the Chinese leaders is not at all directed against imperialism. In effect, the purpose of this phrase-mongering is to screen a savage struggle against the CPSU and the world Communist movement and in no way threatens the imperialists. That accounts for the change that has come about in the policy of the leading capitalist states with regard to China.

We shall not hide the fact that following all these manoeuvres of the Chinese leaders, we, like all other Marxist-Leninists in the world, are justifiably alarmed at the dangerous path onto which the Chinese leaders are dragging their great country. There is the danger that in pursuing their erroneous, anti-Leninist line, the Chinese leaders will virtually land themselves in the same boat with reactionary, bellicose elements of imperialism, as has already happened in connection with the CPR government's refusal to sign the Moscow partial test-ban treaty.

The nationalist policy of the CPC leaders has nothing in common with the actual national interests of the fraternal Chinese nation. Most of all, it is the people of the socialist countries that can be sincere allies of the people of China. The people of China have a vested interest in the consolidation of the world socialist system, in an enduring alliance with all the anti-imperialist forces. In that lies the earnest of the rapid advance of People's China along the socialist road.

It is impossible to comprehend the present attitude of the CC,

CPC both in the country and internationally unless it is viewed in the context of the situation within the Communist Party of China and in the country itself that has arisen due to the personality cult. It must not be overlooked that the Mao Tse-tung personality cult is having an increasingly negative effect on the activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

For many years Chinese propaganda has been drumming it into everybody's head that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the "supreme embodiment of Marxism-Leninism" and that our epoch is the "epoch of Mao Tse-tung". By asserting that the brunt of generalizing the historical tasks of our time has fallen completely upon the shoulders of Mao Tse-tung alone, Chinese propaganda claims that Mao Tse-tung's ideas are the Marxism-Leninism of our epoch, "the scientific theory of socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism."

It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leadership is striving to spread the Mao Tse-tung personality cult to the whole world Communist movement, so that the leader of the CPC should, like Stalin in his day, sit aloft, God-like, above all the Marxist-Leninist parties and settle arbitrarily all matters of their policy and work. The ideology and practice of the personality cult largely explain the appearance of hegemonic ambitions among the Chinese leaders.

But history does not repeat itself. What was once a tragedy will be no more than a farce if it occurs a second time. The CPC leaders ought to know that the Communist movement will never allow the personality cult, which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, to recur, for it has paid too dearly for it in the past. The Communist movement and the personality cult are incompatible.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU has put an end to this alien phenomenon in our Party once and for all, and has created conditions in which the things that occurred in the personality cult period can never be repeated.

The Party has completely restored the Leninist principles in Party and state affairs. It has restored and developed the principles of socialist democracy. The course charted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU was fully supported in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings. It is clear, therefore, that denouncing the struggle against the personality cult ideology is tantamount to departing from the agreed line of the Communist movement, that it is tantamount to impelling the Communist movement deliberately towards an incorrect path, a path foreign to Marxism-Leninism and the nature of the socialist system.

Yet that is exactly what the Chinese leaders are doing. They have undertaken the defense of the Stalin personality cult and have declared that fighting against it means "overthrowing Marxism-Leninism" and "stigmatizing the dictatorship of the proletariat".

However, it is the personality cult that leads to perversions of important aspects in the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the highest form of democracy, a democracy for the working people. In Lenin's time the democratic principles of party and state life and socialist legality were always strictly observed. He fought against

anti-party groups and trends with Party methods, drawing on the support of the Party rank and file. A different method predominated during the Stalin personality cult period — the method of physical elimination of all Party workers whom Stalin suspected of disagreeing with his views. What is more, the abuses and repressions against tested and faithful Party and government workers were particularly intensified at a time when the struggle against the opposition was over and socialism had won. Stalin turned the "avenging sword" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, intended to strike at the enemies, against the cadres of the Communist Party and the socialist state.

But it is evidently this very aspect of Stalin's activities that the Chinese leaders like most — since they identify this incorrect method of leadership with the dictatorship of the proletariat. In spite of the now widely known facts testifying to Stalin's abuse of power during the personality cult period, in spite of Stalin's departure from Lenin's precepts on certain important issues, the Chinese leaders place Stalin on a pedestal, depicting him as the "great continuer" of Lenin's cause. The Chinese leaders speak and write about the wholesale repressions during the personality cult period as though they were no more than slight "excesses".

This policy of the Chinese leaders augurs no good to the people. It smacks of the ideology and ethics not of Marxists, not Leninists, but of people who bank on methods of violence and suppression. The Chinese leaders ought to ask the Soviet Communists, the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia who experienced the evil consequences of the personality cult what they think of the attempts to vindicate the perversions and mistakes made by Stalin and of restoring the personality cult. They would get only one answer: never again!

Our Party has routed the Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov anti-Party group. This group resisted the abolition of the personality cult, not the least consideration being that many of its members were also responsible for the wholesale persecution of guiltless people at a time when they themselves stood at the country's helm together with Stalin.

The crimes perpetrated by Stalin and the subsequently exposed members of the anti-Party group against prominent leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, have now come to light. But that is not all. It has been learned that Molotov, together with Stalin, sanctioned the execution also of the wives of these leaders entered in the so-called "List No. 4 of the Wives of the Enemies of the People", containing the names of V. A. Dybenko-Sedyakina, E. C. Kosyor, A. I. Chubar, E. E. Eikhe-Rubtsova, and others. In many cases, Molotov tried, as the saying goes, to be "more Catholic than the Pope". In one of the documents, endorsing long prison terms for a large group of wives of arrested functionaries, Molotov wrote "supreme penalty" against one of the names in the list.

Do the Chinese leaders, perhaps, wish to restore these inhuman practices? Is that why they show such sympathy for people who have been expelled from our Party?

In the matter of the personality cult the Chinese leaders have

departed not only from the conclusions and propositions of the world Communist movement, but also from their own previous declarations.

It may be recalled that in 1956 and 1957 Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi in their speeches, and articles about the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat approved by the Political Bureau of the CC CPC, highly commended the efforts of the CPSU to eliminate the consequences of the personality cult. At the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1957, Mao Tse-tung said: "In the past four or five years since Stalin's death the situation has improved considerably in the Soviet Union in the sphere of both domestic policy and foreign policy. This shows that the line represented by Comrade Khrushchov is more correct and that the opposition to this line is incorrect." At that time the Chinese leaders rightly said that none but "the reactionaries of the whole world" could oppose the line of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

Yet now the Chinese leaders are defending the personality cult in pursuance of their own political designs. They are defending Stalin's distortions and mistakes largely because they are themselves implanting the Mao Tse-tung personality cult.

The present political line of the CPC leaders again shows the world Communist movement and the politically conscious workers of the whole world how pernicious are the practices of the personality cult, and what harm they inflict on the interests of the peoples, to the great struggle against imperialism, for socialism. Affirmation of the personality cult ideology in the Communist movement would lead it into a cul-de-sac and do grave harm to the socialist and communist cause.

Therefore, an examination of the sourcees of the present anti-Leninist disruptive policy of the CPC leadership leads to the conclusion that the world Communist movement faces the real danger of a petty-bourgeois nationalist deviation disguised by "Left" phraseology. The danger of this deviation is all the greater since we are dealing with leaders of a party in power which has at its disposal a large state machine and the means of ideological indoctrination.

It is clear that the CPSU, like all the other Marxist-Leninist parties, cannot but take measures in order to attenuate as much as possible the harm that this petty-bourgeois deviation may inflict on the world Communist movement.

VIII

FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ON THE BASIS OF MARXIST-LENINIST PRINCIPLES

Comrades, our Party has every right to say that we have done and are still doing everything in our power to overcome the differences and to restore co-operation between the CPC and the CPSU,

to strengthen the friendship between the CPR and the Soviet Union and to cement the unity of the world Communist movement. In spite of the inadmissible methods of debate used by the leaders of the CPC, in spite of their open struggle against the CPSU and other fraternal parties, our Party has shown the maximum of restraint, the maximum sense of responsibility, and the maximum concern for the cohesion of Communist ranks.

In the last few years, acting on the initiative of Comrade Khrushchov, the CC CPSU and the Soviet government undertook many practical measures aimed at uniting our Parties and at preserving and expanding co-operation with the CPR in the political, economic, scientific, technical and cultural spheres. If these measures have failed to yield results, the blame rests entirely with the Chinese leaders.

When the Chinese leaders began their unveiled attacks on our Party, the CC, CPSU, addressed several letters to the CC, CPC, pointing out that the fundamental interests of the socialist and communist cause require that our Parties should, as before, in spite of the existing differences, pursue an agreed policy in all matters of principle. We suggested stopping the needless controversy over questions on which our opinions differ, and to cease making any public statements, which only tend to deepen the differences. The letters put forward concrete proposals envisaging co-ordinated actions in world affairs, greater exchange of foreign policy information and agreed action in the international democratic organizations, etc.

In October 1962, Comrade Khrushchov asked the Chinese Ambassador to the USSR, who was returning home, to tell the Chinese leaders that we proposed to "abandon all arguments and differences, to stop discussing who is right and who is wrong, not to rake up the past, and to begin our relations over again with a clean slate".

Although the Chinese press had by then published a whole series of articles containing gross attacks on the CPSU and other fraternal patries, Comrade Khrushchov declared in a conversation wtih the new Chinese Ambassador in January 1963 that "we want to return to our previous fraternal relations and are ready to do everything for this purpose."

But the leaders of the CPC invariably responded to these acts of good-will on the part of the Central Committee of our Party by deliberately doing everything possible to aggravate the differences, and mounted fresh attacks on the CPSU, the Soviet government and the general line of the world Communist movement.

In the struggle against the CPSU and its Leninist policy, the Chinese leaders are concentrating their fire mainly against Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov who stands in the van of the remarkable developments that have taken place in our Party and country since the 20th Congress and which ensure the successful advance of the Soviet people to communism. That is why they would like to isolate Comrade Khrushchov from the Central Committee, for their subversive ends, and to oppose our Central Committee to the Party and the Soviet people.

But this foul plan is adventuristic and hopeless, and is doomed to complete and ignominious failure.

The Chinese leaders, and not they alone, should know once and for all that our Central Committee, headed by the loyal Leninist Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov has never been so united and monolithic as now.

Comrade Khrushchov with his inexhaustible energy, his truly Bolshevik zeal and devotion to principle, is the recognized leader of our Party and our people. He expresses the most cherished thoughts and aspirations of the Soviet people. The Leninist line pursued by our Party cannot be separated from the Central Committee, from Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov. This line has elevated our country's world prestige to unprecedented heights, it has elevated its prestige in the eyes of the working people of the whole world. This Leninist line is supported wholeheartedly by all the Communists and all the people of our land.

Our Party has never feared ideological struggle. But it believes that ideological differences should be settled on the basis of Leninist principles and that the polemics should be subordinated to the interests oft he working-class movement.

The CC, CPSU, clearly foresaw the danger that the Chinese leaders would seek to use open polemics not as a means of ironing out disputed questions but as an excuse for piling up absurd, slanderous charges, an instrument of ideological and political struggle against the Communist movement.

Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, our Party has exerted considerable effort to terminate the open polemics forced upon us by the CPC leaders. The CC, CPSU, has repeatedly taken the initiative to that effect — notably in January 1963, in the speech of Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC, CPSU, at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. This initiative was backed by the overwhelming majority of Marxist-Leninist parties. But the Chinese leadership refused to discuss this proposal and saw fit to extend the range of questions in dispute, to aggravate and provoke the polemics.

Last spring an agreement was reached on a bilateral meeting of CPSU and CPC representatives. We hoped that at this meeting the Chinese comrades would be ready to concentrate efforts not on what divides us, but on what unites the CPC with the CPSU and with other fraternal parties. The CPSU delegation suggested that all questions in dispute be thoroughly thrashed out in order to clear the path for a normalization of relations, to cement the unity of our Parties and of the world Communist movement as a whole. We submitted a concrete program for the development of relations between the USSR and the PRC.

But the CPC delegation took advantage of the meeting to exacerbate the differences and to level violent and groundless attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. After reading prepared statements, which completely ignored our arguments and proposals, the Chinese delegates called for an adjournment of the bilateral talks.

All the measures taken by the CC CPSU were prompted by a sincere desire to strengthen the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the cohesion of the socialist countries. Our task was to utilize every available opportunity to remove the differences and prevent a split, and not be carried away by the heat of the struggle.

The Chinese leadership, however, apparently understood these measures of ours differently. It became all too clear that they took our restraint, our striving towards unity, for a sign of weakness. Lately they have begun saying that they will not agree to any improvement of relations with the CPSU, except on the basis of our "unconditional surrender". What do the Chinese leaders want?

In substance, they want the Communist movement to retreat from its positions on all the basic problems of our times.

The world Communist movement considers it vitally necessary to utilize the present situation, all the revolutionary forces of our time, ever more closely and to develop the world revolutionary process further.

In contrast to this the Chinese leaders have set their sights on dividing the main revolutionary forces of our time — the world socialist system, the international working class, and the national liberation movement. This can only act as a brake on the development of the world revolutionary process.

Marxist-Leninists believe that it is the cardinal task of the Communist parties to marshal all the peace-loving forces for the defense of peace and the deliverance of mankind from a nuclear disaster. They consider peaceful coexistence to be the general principle of relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries.

The Chinese leaders scorn this task. What they are doing, in effect, is whipping up the nuclear arms race and calling for new powers to join it. They are pursuing a line that is liable to cause an atomic war and consider the struggle for peace a secondary task, opposing it to the struggle for socialism.

The Marxist-Leninists consider it their duty to strengthen in every possible way the Marxism-Leninism and to concentrate the special attention of the socialist countries on economic development in order that socialism win out in peaceful economic competition with capitalism.

The actions of the Chinese leaders are subverting and undermining the unity of the socialist camp. They are isolating China more and more from the other socialist countries. The CC CPC underrates economic development and ignores the tasks confronting the socialist countries in their economic competition with the capitalist countries. This policy tends to weaken the might of the socialist countries and impedes their struggle against imperialism.

Marxist-Leninists, the working class of the capitalist countries see it as their task to step up the struggle against monopoly capital, in defense of the vital interests of the masses, to make maximum use of the now available opportunities to effect a peaceful socialist revolution not involving civil war, and at the same time to be ready to take the non-peaceful way, to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie by armed force.

In contrast, the CPC leaders vilify in every way the struggle of the working class and its communist vanguard for the vital interests of the working class, for peace and democracy, and reject the tactics of broad anti-monopoly alliances, the possibility of effecting social revolution peacefully. They call for reckless armed actions irrespective of the existing situation.

Marxist-Leninists and the peoples fighting for national liberation consider it their duty to complete the anti-imperialist, democratic revolution, to create and consolidate the national front, and to work for the establishment of states of national democracy, for the non-capitalist way of development.

The Chinese leaders ignore the essence of the present stage of the national liberation revolution. They are blind to the differences in the situation prevailing in the various countries and offer the peoples of all countries one and the same prescription — armed struggle and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such prescriptions may, if put into practice, undermine the national front and strengthen the positions of the colonialists and neo-colonialists.

Marxist-Leninists are eager to strengthen the unity and cohesion both of each indivdual Communist party and the entire army of Communists in the world on the basis of the principles laid down in the Declaration and the Statement.

The Chinese leaders are disrupting the unity of the Communist movement and of the democratic organizations; they are setting up factions and are striving to split our movement and its national contingents.

In brief, the CPC leaders are opposing the Communist movement in all the basic questions of strategy and tactics. Theirs is a course in which petty-bourgeois revolutionism and nationalistic, great-power aspirations merge.

In a malicious anti-Soviet article, slanderous from beginning to end, which appeared on February 4 in the CC, CPC publications, the Chinese leaders declare for everybody to hear that they will step up their subversive activities against the world Communist movement. With nationalistic arrogance they boast that they will continue their attacks on the CPSU in order to disorganize the work of the Party founded by the great Lenin.

To the Soviet Communists, the sons and daughters of the October Revolution, the pioneers of the new, communist world, who have withstood so many gruelling ordeals, such threats are ridiculous.

The Soviet Communists will not keep silent while the Chinese leaders prosecute an unbridled offensive against our great cause of communist construction, against the Leninist course of our Party and the positions of the world Communist movement. We shall have to explain the substance of the anti-Marxist, neo-Trotskyite position of the Chinese leaders publicly.

The urgent task at present is to protect Marxism-Leninism from the distortions to which it is being subjected by the Chinese leaders. The interests of preserving the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, the interests of the world Communist movement and, in the

final analysis, the interests of the Chinese people itself, require that we come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions of the CPC leadership.

We stand for strengthening friendship with the Chinese people and are ready to develop co-operation with the CPR in all fields. The Soviet Communists have a sincere regard for the great people of China and a deep respect for the revolutionary traditions of the Communist Party of China. We are sure that nobody will ever succeed in undermining the foundations of the friendship of the great Soviet and Chinese peoples and that the present attitude of the CPC leadership does not reflect the true national interests of the Chinese people. We shall do everything in our power to bring relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China back to a path that conforms with the fundamental interests of the working class and all the working people of our countries.

We are fully aware of the danger of the present attitude of the Chinese leaders. The facts show that a grim and evidently long struggle lies ahead for the strengthening of the unity of all the socialist forces for friendship and co-operation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. It is now perfectly clear that the CPC leaders intend to persist in their incorrect stand, that they intend to carry on with their factional activities in the world Communist movement. Together with the other fraternal parties, our Party will resolutely defend Marxism-Leninism; it will firmly defend the unity and cohesion of all the forces working for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Our Party favors convening another meeting of fraternal parties to discuss the basic problems of our time and to hold the broadest possible exchange of opinions in the interest of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen in the Communist movement. These difficulties have been caused by the CPC leadership's differences with the world Communist movement. The joint efforts of all the fraternal parties are therefore perfectly justified in order to determine what must be done to preserve and strengthen the Marxist-Leninist unity of Communist ranks. It is perfectly clear to the CPSU that the meeting should serve this very purpose.

The CC, CPSU, is certain that no matter how great the difficulties experienced by the world Communist movement, that this movement will be strong enough to surmount them and to cement its ranks in the struggle for the great Communist cause.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to pursue the policy of promoting unity with all the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on the basis of the Program documents of the world Communist movement — the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The road followed by our Party, by the world Communist movement is the Leninist road and, therefore, the only true road. We have adopted a new Program, in which we have charted our development twenty years ahead. Our Party and the whole Soviet people regard

fulfilment of this Program and a determined and purposeful advance to the heights of communism, as their supreme internationalist duty to the international working class and Communist movement. As always, our Party will perform its internationalist duty honourably!

Under the invincible banner of the great Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue consistently and undeviatingly to pursue a line aimed at carrying out the CPSU Program for the building in our country of the most just social system—communism.

STRUGGLE OF THE CPSU FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

DECISION OF PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC, CPSU, ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 15, 1964.

Having heard and discussed the report of Comrade M. A. Suslov, member of the Presidium, and Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, "On the Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement", the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, expresses its profound concern over the splitting activities of the leadership of the Communist Party of China which are causing great damage to the socialist community of nations, the whole of the world Communist and working-class movement.

Aware of the historical importance of the unity and solidarity of the Communist movement, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has lately taken new steps towards overcoming or, to begin with, at least diminishing the differences between the leadership of the CPC and the CPSU and other fraternal Parties, towards strengthening economic and political co-operation between the USSR and the CPR. Moves to prevent the deepening of these differences have also been made by other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU notes with regret that the leadership of the CPC has not responded to this initiative, has not answered the letter of the CPSU nor stopped the open polemics, on the contrary, it has intensified the campaign against the general line of the Communist movement defined by the Meetings of 1957 and 1960.

Under the cover of verbal assurances of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, under the banner of struggle against the imaginary revisionism of the Marxist-Leninist Parties the leaders of the CPC have assailed the basic theoretical and political principles by which the Communist movement is guided at the present stage.

The new appraisals and conclusions arrived at through collective efforts of the fraternal Parties on the basis of the creative applica-

tion of Marxist-Leninist principles to the present day conditions—on the role of the world socialist system, on the ways of building socialism and communism, on the possibility of averting a world war, on peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the necessity of combating the ideology and practice of the personality cult, on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist states and in the countries liberated from colonialism are all being distorted by the Chinese leaders.

Having departed on all basic questions of strategy and tactics from the Leninist line of the world Communist movement, the Chinese leaders have put forward a course of their own which is compounded of petty-bourgeois adventurism and great-power chauvinism. On a number of questions they, in effect, descend to Trotskyite positions, adopt Trotskyite methods of struggle against the Marxist-Leninist Parties, and set up factional groups of their supporters in various countries. The leadership of the CPC is seeking to impose its dissenting ideological platform on the whole of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement, and on the international organizations.

The Chinese leaders have adopted a course aimed at worsening Soviet-Chinese inter-state relations, undermining friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. Having rejected all the proposals of the CC, CPSU on the normalization of the Soviet-Chinese relations, they have intensified anti-Soviet propaganda inside the CPR and are grossly interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, holds that the vital interests of the socialist world system, of the Communist movement and the defense of the purity of Marxism- Leninism call for the ideological exposure of the anti-Leninist position of the CPC leadership and for a resolute rebuff to their splitting activities.

Fully and unanimously approving the political and practical activities of the Presidium of the CC, CPSU and of Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC, CPSU, aimed at builidng Communist society in the USSR, ensuring the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, and strengthening the solidarity of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU instructs the CC Presidium to continue firmly to uphold the general line of the world Communist movement, to work to strengthen the unity of all the revolutionary forces of today.

Our Party is following, and will continue to follow, the tested Leninist road and nobody will ever succeed in diverting the CPSU, from this course—the course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses.

In spite of the fact that the Chinese leaders have gone far in their splitting activities, the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, placing the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement, above all else, expresses its readiness to exert further efforts towards the normalization of relations between the CPSU and the CPC. If the CPC leaders have not lost all sense of their international responsibility, they must realize, at last, that by their actions they are diverting the forces and attention of the Communist and Workers' parties from the solution of the urgent tasks of socialist construction, im-

peding the struggle against imperialism, damaging the entire anti-imperialist front.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU is firmly confident that the world Communist movement will overcome the existing difficulties, rally still closer around the banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin and achieve new successes in the struggle for the great cause of the working class, for the cause of peace and the peoples' security, for the victory of communism.

THE SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Raymond Guyot

Excerpts from a report on the situation in the international Communist and working-class movement made by RAYMOND GUYOT, member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, at a meeting of the Central Committee held on March 25-26 and published in L'HUMANITE.

Since the Central Committee meeting of October 6, Guyot said, a number of developments have taken place which make it necessary to inform the Central Committe of the situation which has arisen in the international Communist and working-class movement.

In the past few years the peoples have registered important successes in their struggle for peace and disarmament, for national independence and socialism. But it is also in this period that the leaders of the Communist Party of China—in opposition to the majority of the Communist parties and trampling underfoot jointly agreed decisions—have made an attempt to divert the international Communist movement on to the path of sectarianism and adventurism. They show complete lack of faith in the ability of the working class and the peoples to avert war and achieve disarmament in our epoch. Their attitude has already done grave harm to the cause of communism; it impedes the struggle for peace today when there exist great possibilities to deliver new blows at the aggressive forces of imperialism, when whole continents, as well as countries like Cuba and Algeria are actively fighting together with all the peace-loving forces of the world for peace and peaceful coexistence.

It is precisely in this period that the leaders of the Communist Party of China have been intensifying their campaign against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government, against the Communist parties which adhere to the positions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings. Their attacks against our Party and its leadership have become more numerous and more vicious.

They engage in large-scale splitting activity, the more recent manifestation of which was the behaviour of the Chinese delegate who tried to break up the united anti-imperialist and anti-colonial front at the meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Council in Algiers.

The article which appeared in the Chinese press on February 4, openly calling for a split, revealed the true intentions of the Chinese leaders: to create a factionalist bloc under their hegemony with a program of its own; to lay increasing claim to being the sole heirs of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, the supreme judges in the sphere of the theory and practice of communism; to dictate to all

the parties—in the capitalist as well as in the socialist and newly-emergent countries—what they must not do, while they, the Chinese leaders, would decide who are the leading Marxists and who, modern revisionists.

They have their own interpretation of history and philosophy: the centre of the revolution (meaning China) is shifting, and this is normal; everything is destined to split in two, for such is the law of nature, and this also holds true for the international Communist movement, etc.

In many countries factional groups are being formed inside the parties or parallel with the parties, with the participation of renegades and Trotskyites. Such, in particular, is the case in Switzerland, Australia and some of the Latin American countries; for example, such pseudo-parties have been formed recently in Belgium, and attempts have been made to replace Central Committees (Ceylon, Peru) with splinter groups.

Particularly unseemly practices are being used against the parties which are fighting fascist dictatorships. At the Central Committee meeting last October Waldeck Rochet branded the practice of Chinese documents being widely circulated in Spain while the Communists and anti-fascists of that country were subjected to persecution. We have recently received the following letter from our Spanish comrades:

". . . The Franco political police have already utilized the differences in the international Communist movement to publish a fake issue of Mundo Obrero (organ of the Communist Party of Spain—*Ed.)* in an attempt to give the impression that our Party has been split.

"Our activists have established that this issue, a copy of which we are sending you, was distributed by police agents, and have vigorously rebuffed this fabrication. But this very fact demonstrates how dangerous for the whole Communist movement, and particularly for the parties working in illegal conditions, is the turn which the Communist Party of China has given to the polemics, and the splitting activity which it supports in the various countries."

Guyot also pointed to the use of government radio by the Chinese leaders for propaganda against the Soviet Union. Peking Radio systematically broadcasts materials violently attacking the Soviet Union, its Communist Party and its government. The calumny published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on February 4 was transmitted in Russian 125 times for 80 hours during the first two weeks.

In our Party, Guyot went on, the position adopted by the Chinese leaders has evoked indignation and unanimous condemnation. The few attempts to foster anti-Party groups made with the support of renegades and Trotskyites have failed. It is, nevertheless, necessary to draw the attention of the Central Committee to certain aspects of the situation which has arisen in the French-Chinese Friendship Association, whose aim is to promote friendly relations between the two peoples. Certain elements, notably in the Marseilles Committee of the Association, instead of working to foster the broadest unity in the interests of true friendship with the Chinese People's Republic,

are doing their utmost to distribute Chinese materials directed against the international Communist movement and the French Communist Party, i.e., engaging in activity which has nothing in common with the noble aims of this Association. These attempts will be thwarted by the vigilance of all Frenchmen who stand at once for both French-Chinese friendship and for peaceful coexistence, disarmament and peace.

It is also necessary to step up the ideological and political struggle against the attitude of the Chinese leaders vis-a-vis the de Gaulle government. De Gaulle, they assert, is the standard-bearer of national struggle against U.S. imperialism.

This anti-Marxist position of the Chinese leaders in regard to the Gaullist power has become even more strongly pronounced in connection with the recognition of People's China and the establishment of diplomatic relations with France (we have always fought for this recognition, just as we are now carrying on the fight for the admission of the Chinese People's Republic to the UNO.").

In Peking they pretend to be unaware of the true aims of de Gaulle's foreign policy (the search for new markets for the capitalist monopolies, possession of atomic armament, a bigger say in NATO and alliance with German militarism, the attempts of French imperialism to regain some of its positions in Asia and Latin America, etc.). The recent statements made by Pompidou in the American Club and the interview given by Couve de Murville to the *U.S. News and World Report* throw light on the character of de Gaulle's policy. On its part, *La Nation* declares unashamedly that "France, which has long been active in Oceania, is preparing new installations there" (meaning nuclear bases, of course), and it asks: "Perhaps from this standpoint, too, it is believed desirable to maintain official relations with the principal power in this part of the globe?"

What Mao Tse-tung said about the atom bomb during a meeting with the Gaullist MP's visiting China echo de Gaulle's own claims: "I know, you are ahead of us, but we shall have our own bomb. This is the way to be strong."

It should be noted that not a single word appeared in the Chinese press denouncing the Gaullist repressions in Gabon, the persecution of the youth on Martinique or of Comrade Paul Verges on Reunion. Not a single voice of protest was raised against the establishment of a nuclear experimental centre in Polynesia at the time when protests are resounding in France, Australia, New Zealand, Chile and Peru.

In the meantime a "new theory" is being elaborated in Peking, the theory of the so-called "second intermediate zone" which should embrace Britain, West Germany, de Gaulle's France and Japan. "Ceasing to be agents of the United States" these countries, along with China, will constitute a kind of "third world". For France and the other above-mentioned countries this anti-Leninist and grossly opportunist policy would mean the liquidation of the working-class struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Our Party is fighting against U.S. imperialism and its aggressive

policy, against our own imperialism which is no different from that of the United States, and, as Comrade Maurice Thorez has stressed, we oppose everything in de Gaulle's policy which runs counter to the national interests, the independence of the peoples and the cause of peace.

The situation in the international Communist movement confirms the soundness of the attitude taken by our Party on a whole range of problems.

Limiting ourselves to the more recent decisions of our Party, we would like to stress the significance of the October meeting of the Central Committee, the documents of which were published (in the form of a pamphlet subsequently translated into German, Spanish and English and sent to the fraternal parties); Leon Feix's reply in *l'Humanité* to a Chinese article which slandered our Party and its leadership; the more lengthy reply given editorially in the February issue of *Cahiers du Communisme*, which also appeared in pamphlet form. Lastly, we would like to recall the chapter on these questions in the draft resolution for the 17th Congress, which is now being widely discussed in the Party.

One cannot remain "neutral" in this struggle which is of exceptional significance for the unity of the Communist movement. For this is not a matter of differences between the CPSU and the CPC but of differences between the latter and the vast majority of the Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world. To avoid qualifying and denouncing the policy and the disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders, as is sometimes the case, means to refuse to ensure the future of our struggle for socialism and communism.

The grave threat which menaces the international Communist and working-class movements, and which cannot but alarm us, is a result of the attempts made by the CPC leaders to impose their views on the world movement, a result of the campaign they are waging against the CPSU and other parties, a result of their subversive activity. These are the causes of the situation that has arisen in the international Communist and working-class movement. The CPC leaders are wholly to blame for this situation which, in fact, plays into the hands of the imperialists.

At the October meeting of the Central Committee we came out for the convocation of a meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties at the earliest possible date. Today we feel that this need has become even more urgent.

We reaffirm at this meeting of the Central Committee the unequivocal positions of our Party clearly set forth in many documents and notably the more recent ones (resolution of the CC meeting in October, draft resolution for the 17th Congress).

The Central Committee maintains that the line elaborated by the Chinese leaders in opposition to the general line of the international Communist movement, their splitting activities in the various countries, the material and moral support they render to the splinter groups in the various parties, their slander of the leaders of the fraternal parties, cause grave harm to the movement as a whole, to

the cause of peace and socialism. It holds that reconciliation with the Leftist and nationalist line of the Chinese leaders and their splitting activity would spell danger for the international movement, for the Chinese people themselves, for our Party and its broad policy of unity needed for the struggle against one-man rule.

The Central Committee would welcome the convocation at the earliest date of a meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties which would reaffirm, in the light of the changes that have occurred, the general line of the international Communist movement and adopt all the decisions which would be necessary to safeguard its unity. It is our earnest desire that the differences which oppose the CPC to the other Communist parties will be overcome and that the Communist Party of China will again make its contribution to the unity of the international Communist movement, to our common struggle for peace and national independence, for democracy and socialism.

In the course of preparations for the 17th Congress and during the discussion we must pay close attention to the ideological struggle on the fundamental points of the 1957 and 1960 meeting and our own earlier congresses. And we must be prepared to make another contribution to the ideological struggle in its various aspects on all the problems affecting the international Communist movement.

At the same time it is necessary to wage a struggle on two fronts in our own ranks, primarily against the main danger—dogmatism and sectarianism. Any conciliation with splitting activity is inadmissible.

Our struggle to put an end to one-man rule and bring nearer the hour of the democratic alternative, for the unity of the working class and the alliance of all democrats in the fight for social progress, freedom, national independence, peace, disarmament and socialism, Guyot concluded, cannot be separated from our efforts to achieve the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement.

AGAINST THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE CHINESE SPLITTERS

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMITTEE OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY.

The open attacks by the Chinese leaders against many aspects of the joint policy of the international Communist movement are known to the members of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Hungarian people. Thus, the Chinese leaders oppose the policy of peaceful coexistence, set at nought economic competition between the two social systems, deny the possibility of socialist revolution triumphing peacefully, without civil war. The Chinese leaders take the stand that there is no need to rectify the gross mistakes committed at the time of the cult of the individual, which caused incalculable harm to the international working-class movement. As we know the parties which uphold the purity of Marxist-Leninist principles, including the HSWP, most patiently discussed with the Chinese leaders their incorrect views. In this discussion the parties, adhering to a joint line, did not adopt the virulent tone of Chinese propaganda, its methods of abuse, but pointed out the incorrect views and their harmful political consequences, rejecting fabrications.

After the overwhelming majority of fraternal parties came out against their wrong views, the Chinese leaders took the path of splitting activities. They have organized factional groups made up of Trotskyites and renegades who are prepared to go to all lengths, and they have the effrontery to call some of these groups Communist parties. They are doing this at a time when the forces of socialism and peace are multiplying throughout the world, when the national independence of the peoples of former colonies is growing stronger, when the internal contradictions in the capitalist world are intensifying, when imperialism is at a stage of profound crisis and the process of its disintegration is accelerating. The combined might, united action by the socialist world could accelerate this process still more, could render still greater assistance to the peoples battling against colonialism and neo-colonialism; the fight in defense of world peace would become still more effective were it not for the fact that the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders are dividing the international Communist movement, are hampering its common struggle.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China formulated the essence of its policy in a 25-point document published in June 1963, which was printed also by the Hungarian press. This document and the entire activity of the Chinese leaders show that their tactics are aimed at splitting the international Communist movement, that the CPC leaders want hegemony, want to impose

their views on the international Communist movement. Actuated by this desire they oppose the Statements of the Communists and Workers' parties of 1957 and 1960.

In the autumn of 1963 the Central Committee of the HSWP supporting the initiative of the fraternal parties, including the CPSU, ceased to publish materials concerning the differences in the international Communist movement. The purpose of this step was to create favourable conditions for a new international meeting of the fraternal parties to discuss the differences. The Chinese leaders, however, replied by continuing their open attacks, by become even more abusive and absolutely ignoring the position of the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties which insisted on ceasing the public debate.

In the February 4 issue of *Jenminjihpao*, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese leaders published a long article in which they openly declared that they support and will help to organize factions against the Central Committees of the fraternal parties which oppose the views of the Chinese leaders, condemn their desire for hegemony and which are in solidarity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They call this undermining of unity "an internationalist obligation". They ignore the propositions of the Moscow Statement of 1960 regulating the relations between the fraternal parties, and by impermissible methods interfere in their internal affairs. They attack the Central Committee of the CPSU and Comrade Khrushchov personally with blind rancour, calling him "anti-Soviet", "the greatest of all revisionists", the "greatest splitter of our time". With the help of an extensive propaganda network they create big difficulties for the Communist parties, and first of all, for the fraternal parties battling in the capitalist countries.

It is characteristic of the Chinese leaders that instead of engaging in a theoretical discussion of fundamental ideological issues they are waging a political struggle against the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. The fabrications, distortions and abuse contained in the *Jenminjihpao* article of February 4 divert attention from the fundamental differences. This clearly is the purpose of the assertions that "the leaders of the CPSU are bent on seeking Soviet-U.S. cooperation for the domination of the world", that "the revisionism and splitting of the leaders of the CPSU are the product both of the lush growth of bourgeois elements inside the Soviet Union and . . . of U.S. imperialist policies. . . ."

This policy of the Chinese leaders which they try to justify with assertions that are absolutely lacking in a sober assessment, is nothing but an adventurist policy which has as its purpose to mislead people; it is a policy which is doomed to failure.

The Central Committee of the HSWP has from the very outset condemned the sectarian, dogmatic views of the Chinese leaders and their splitting activity. The Central Committee emphatically rejects and denounces their new attack of February 4, which is even more vicious than all previous attacks and which is directed against the entire international Communist movement and consequently

against the HSWP. By their splitting activities the Chinese leaders are assailing the unity of the socialist countries and the international Communist movement, are making things easier for imperialism in the face of the progress of the socialist world, are hampering the struggle of the Communist parties in individual countries and on the international arena.

Together with the other fraternal parties the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party firmly adhering to the Moscow Statements of 1957 and 1960, resolutely opposes the undermining activity of the Chinese leaders.

The Central Committee of the HSWP is in full solidarity with the CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee, and personally with Comrade Khrushchov. It is absolutely clear that the attacks of the Chinese leaders are directed first and foremost against the CPSU. The steadfast Marxist-Leninist policy of the CPSU, its great international prestige make impossible the Chinese policy of adventurism. Neither the old nor the new anti-Soviet attacks can alter this fact.

The Central Committee of the HSWP has decided that if the Chinese leaders do not stop their open attack and splitting activities, they will have to be answered in public. We are not deceived by the tactics of the Chinese leaders in accordance with which they attack first one and then another fraternal party and its leaders. We shall oppose all attacks, and uphold the common cause and policy of our Party.

The Chinese leaders are trying to set off some countries of the socialist world system against each other. The Central Committee of the HSWP rejects and condemns these attempts and also interference in the affairs of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid.

The class enemies are trying to make the most of the differences caused by the leaders of the CPC in the international Communist movement. With the help of diplomacy and other methods the imperialists are seeking to weaken the unity of the socialist world system. The imperialist press picks up and spreads the anti-Soviet slander circulated by the Chinese leaders in order to provoke differences and a split in the revolutionary working-class movement in the capitalist countries. Upholding the ideas of Marxism-Leninism the Communist parties are steadfastly combating the attempts to cause a split.

The Central Committee of the HSWP and the Hungarian people who have from the very outset unanimously rejected the harmful views of the Chinese leaders now more than ever before strongly condemn the intensified splitting activities of the Chinese leaders and their unbridled anti-Soviet slander.

In our fight against pseudo-Lett views and against the splitting, undermining activities of the Chinese leaders we do not lose sight of the fact that there are still Right reactionary elements in Hungary who will try to exploit the attacks made by the Chinese leaders to whip up dissatisfaction with the policy of our Party and the government.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party forged its ideological poli-

tical and organizational unity in a difficult period, in hard-fought battle, at the price of big sacrifices in the struggle against counter-revolutionaries, revisionists and dogmatists, and it has the necessary experience to repulse the attacks of both the Rights and the "Lefts." Those who will attempt undermining activities will learn to their cost that the Party is able to combat these attempts with vigor and determination.

At the same time it necessary through patient explanatory work and persuasion to clear up the ideological confusion of those who have been misled on certain issues by the pseudo-revolutionary phrases of the Chinese leaders and those Right elements who are seeking to use the discussion with the Chinese leaders to bolster their revisionist position. One of the important tasks of our Party organizations is to raise still higher the ideological and political level of the members of the Party, to strengthen still further the unity of our ranks by exposing the anti-Marxist line and splitting activities of the Chinese leaders.

The political line of the HSWP, which practice has shown to be a correct line, is based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism; it faithfully adheres to the Moscow Statements of 1957 and 1960, to the jointly elaborated general line of the international Communist movement, it draws on the experience of the working-class struggle and of our people. We consistently adhere to the political line of our Party, and will in the future, as heretofore, defend it against all Right and pseudo-Left attempts to distort it. The paramount task facing our Party and our working people today is to carry out the decisions of the Eighth Congress and to complete the building of a socialist society. Every new success along this road, every new achievement in our economic and cultural work is the best answer to all attacks against the policy of our Party, including the attacks of the Chinese leaders.

ON THE DIFFERENCES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST PARTY

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SALVADOR*

INTRODUCTION

The Communist Party of Salvador has viewed with deep concern the differences in the international Communist movement.

Unfortunately, the differences concern vitally important aspects of the strategic and tactical line of the international Communist movement. They include all the basic issues of the struggle for peace, against imperialism and capitalism, the national-liberation struggle, the struggle for socialism and communism. They embrace also internal questions of the international Communist movement and the principles on which this movement rests, as well as the relations between the parties and questions of proletarian internationalism. Consequently, these are not superficial differences of opinion, but profound disagreements affecting the future of mankind.

Our Party, which cherishes the greatest respect and friendship for the Communist Party of China and the heroic Chinese people, hoped that the revolutionary maturity of the Chinese comrades would enable them to find the right way to settle their differences with the rest of the international Communist movement. Unfortunately, our hopes were disappointed. Indeed, the intransigence of the Chinese comrades increased and their relations with the rest of the international Communist movement steadily deteriorated to the point where they began rapidly to break away from the countries comprising the world socialist camp, and from the international Communist movement as a whole.

In this situation it is the duty of our Party, as of all other revolutionary detachments of the proletariat, clearly and unequivocally to define its own position in conformity with the principles of Marxism-Leninism in order to preserve the internal unity of our Party, to give our members the proper orientation, and to conduct the ideological struggle against incorrect, erroneous positions prejudicial to the unity and the development of the international Communist movement.

1. THE PROBLEM OF WORLD PEACE AND WAR

The cardinal issue of the ideological dispute between the world Communist movement is that of peace or war.

---

*Abridged translation. This Statement, published in full in pamphlet form under the above title by the **Ediciones Farabundo** (organ of the Communist Party of Salvador), was adopted by an enlarged meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Salvador held in December 1963 to discuss the differences in the international Communist movement.

For us who live under imperialist rule in conditions of brutal exploitation and repression, who suffer from the effects of militarization, and who see our oppressed peoples living in hunger and want, the phraseology of the Chinese comrades might have a certain appeal when they say that the sacrifices, whatever they may be, are unimportant, so long as the peoples are delivered from imperialism; when they declare that on the debris of nuclear war mankind will build their socialist future even sooner; or when, by the way of argument, they cite the fact that the result of the two past world wars has favoured socialism notwithstanding the suffering caused by these wars, then they are indeed striking a most responsive chord in our people's hearts—their yearning for speedy liberation. Thus the way is cleared for counterposing the interests of the peoples fighting for their liberation to the policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in their relations with the capitalist countries.

Faced with arguments of this kind, we Communists of the whole world must study this problem in detail and ask ourselves the question: does the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems help or hinder the movement of the peoples for their liberation? This question cannot be answered by emotional or bombastic phrases. For us Communists, who are guided by the Marxist-Leninist teaching, there exists but one correct way, namely: to compare the theory with practice; to analyze the problem concretely without resorting to polemical evasions. The truth is always concrete, and it must be sought in the concrete facts.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: is modern history reduced to the development and the aftermath of the two world wars? Is it not true that there was a period of several decades between the two world wars and after the last war when there was no world war, and that the cause of world revolution was furthered and many nations liberated in the period of peaceful coexistence? Why then is this experience not examined, why are all the arguments concerned solely with the history of the two world wars?

There is no doubt that in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism (just as in past centuries in the transition from lower to higher social formations) wars, political conflicts between classes, ideological struggles, etc. lead to the defeat of the old social order and to the victory of the new through a complex process in which temporary and partial retreats are by no means excluded.

Marxism-Leninism, drawing on the sum of historical experience, has proved that the replacement of the moribund social system by the new is bound to be effected through class struggle and through a process which develops not only in the period of wars, but at all times and in all spheres (ideological, political, economic, military, etc.); this is a cumulative process of change; when the accumulation of change reaches a certain point a revolutionary leap takes place. The experience of our time shows that the world revolution is developing at an increasing pace from day to day in the conditions

of peace between states with different social systems. Capitalism's tragedy lies in the fact that, having no prospect of winning a world war, it also has no possibility of avoiding its own destruction in conditions of peace; capitalism is doomed to disappear, and it will disappear.

In these circumstances only those who close their eyes to reality can fail to see that socialism came to our continent in the period of peaceful coexistence, a period marked by the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism in Asia and Africa and the emergence of many new independent states. All these states constitute a big force counteracting imperialism and war.

Had the Chinese comrades continued to adhere to the positions of dialectical materialism they would have had no difficulty in recognizing the dialectics of development. But they abandoned these positions and, in order to arrive at their conclusion concerning the present revolutionary process, they lay undue emphasis on the experience of the two past world wars, ignoring the historical experience of the other period, the period without wars and the tremendous differences between the destructive capacity of past wars and the destructive capacity of a nuclear war.

Every revolution has two principal stages: first, the struggle to remove the ruling classes from power and hand over the power to the revolutionary class, and second, the building of the new socio-economic system after the power has been won. The working class fights against the bourgeoisie not out of a desire for revenge; it fights the bourgeoisie in order to destroy the capitalist system which is founded on the exploitation of many by man, and to build a socialist system in its place, a system without exploitation and in which man's dreams will be fully realized. The peoples of the colonies and dependent countries too are not fighting imperialism out of a thirst for vengeance; they are fighting imperialism in order to put an end to the imperialist regime of exploitation and colonial oppression, to open the way to independent economic and cultural progress and to carry on in more favourable conditions the struggle against all forms of exploitation. The proletariat of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, like the proletariat of the developed capitalist countries, is carrying on the struggle with their gaze fixed on the socialist and Communist future.

Hatred for the exploiters and a desire for revenge are transient emotions, and they can in no way be the cause and the objective of revolutionary struggle. But to listen to the Chinese comrades it would appear that the first stage of the revolution is the most important and that the entire problem of revolution consists in destroying the power of the enemy. We refer to the argument by means of which they seek to convince people that the destruction caused by nuclear war is not important inasmuch as imperialism would be destroyed.

Our science teaches us that every social system corresponds to the level of development of its productive forces, on the level of its material base. The complete victory of socialism and communism

as societies superior to capitalism will come only when the level o their productive forces is higher than that under capitalism. Henc when speaking of the second stage of the revolution, Communist should always bear in mind that the building of the new societ will proceed the faster the more resources we have at our disposa and the better the conditions for the development of the productiv forces and for expanding the material base of society. Yet th Chinese comrades wish to convince people that on the debris o nuclear destruction mankind would be able to build a "truly beau tiful future".

Today, when the world revolutionary process has made the vi tory of revolution possible without allowing the capitalist stat to unleash war against the socialist states; when the advent of atomic weapon has turned the prospect of world war into prospect of colossal devastation of the most advanced mater base in the world; when thanks to the increased weight of t tremendous power accumulated by the world revolutionary mov ment, war has ceased to be inevitable and the victory of revoluti can be achieved without necessary recourse to war; today, despi all this, the Chinese comrades are trying to convince people th the path of nuclear war is not so bad and that, consequentl there is no particular need to warn the people about the cata trophe that would engulf the world in the event of a nuclear wa

When man created means of destruction capable of extinguishi all life on this planet, there emerged also the social forces capabl of preventing war and putting an end to the exploitation of ma by man. This is a dialectical contradiction of our time whic makes it incumbent on the Communists, the vanguard of all ma kind, to ensure the triumph of life over death, revolution ov nuclear war.

Of course, nuclear war would bring about the destruction the power of the bourgeoisie throughout the world. But in th event of nuclear war, vast masses of working people in the c pitalist countries, entire cities, factories, means of transport, ag culture, etc., would be wiped out; the destruction would be wi nigh total. In the countries of victorious socialism the destructi would also be very great. In that case it is in place to ask: wo socialism, as a social system already built, be brought nearer a a nuclear war? Can socialism and communism be rapidly b on the ruins and on the corpses of hundreds of millions of worke i.e., on the corpses of those who are destined by history to bu the new society? And finally, assuming that a nuclear war wou affect only the big nuclear powers and no one else, where wou the peoples of the backward countries find the material suppo for the rapid building of the radiant future, the socialist futur This is not to speak of the difficulties of life and progress in a atmosphere contaminated by radio-active fallout. Undoubted socialism, despite all these obstacles, would eventually be bui but how long this would take and how much suffering and har ship this would entail it is impossible to predict.

Thus, if we as Marxists do not forget that the decisive stage of any revolution is the stage in which the new social system is being built, the conclusion is obvious, having in mind the present situation in the world: the path of nuclear war postpones the victory of revolution for all peoples; socialism is nearer today than it would be after a nuclear war.

Let us examine the given problem for a simpler and more direct point of view. If a nuclear war breaks out what would become of the revolution in each of our countries? Would a nuclear war accelerate or retard the revolution in each of these countries? What role in the event of war would each of our peoples play in the struggle for the victory of their revolutionary cause? It is enough to picture the conditions that would be created in the world in the event of a third world war to reply at once to these questions. The clash would occur without any preliminary warning being given the peoples and without their consent. Within the space of a few minutes vast areas would be swept by a raging and destructive holocaust that would make no distinction between revolutionaries and reactionaries. Revolutionary plans, the gains and the successes won by the revolutionary forces would be wiped out and those who worked out these plans and who fought in the ranks of the revolution would perish. And even if by some miracle we should be saved from the immediate and subsequent destructive effects of a nuclear war, even so the revolutionary plans would be essentially frustrated by the consequences of the clash. The prospect of building socialism in a brief historical period, a prospect at present made tangible by the possibility of obtaining material assistance from the socialist camp, would be dealt a serious blow, inasmuch as the socialist camp itself would be subjected to frightful destruction.

Let us now examine another perspective, that of the development of the world revolution in conditions of peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries. In the conditions of peaceful coexistence the class struggle is maturing in that part of the world still dominated by imperialism. The peoples, led by their advanced parties, have outlined their plans, worked out their revolutionary programmes, set up their revolutionary organizations and are waging a struggle against their enemies. This struggle, (peaceful or non-peaceful depending on what path one or another people is compelled to choose) is being crowned with victory now in one, now in another country.

Hence it is the duty of the Soviet Union as a nuclear power and as the mightiest and most reliable bulwark of the world proletariat, to mobilize all its resources and efforts to prevent war from breaking out. By following this course the Soviet Union is fulfilling its duty not only to its own people but to the world revolution as well. This is also the duty of all other socialist states, of all Communist parties and progressive forces the world over. By virtue of our principles and our objectives, we Communists have a greater

obligation than anyone else to fight for the preservation of wor peace.

And finally, let us examine the given problem in the light Marxist humanism. The Chinese comrades scoff at arguments favour of peaceful coexistence based on the lofty postulates Marxist humanism, seeking to depict them as nothing more th false sentimentality. It is a well-known fact that whenever o enemies wish to discredit the Communists in the eyes of the mass and undermine our prestige they accuse us of subscribing to t anti-humane and reactionary maxim which holds that "the end ju tifies the means". On the contrary this infamous slogan was a remains the slogan of those classes which are unwilling to leave t stage of history. We Communists have always rejected this slog We are humanists. The whole of our theory, all our aims and our practical activity is permeated with the loftiest striving for t perfection of all humanity in every field of endeavour. Violence not our principle, although we do not hesitate to employ violen for the sake of the victory of the revolution should the enemy comp us to take such a course. Humanism and revolution are not co tradictory. The end does not justify the means. On the contrary, t end and the means constitute an integral whole. Such is our Marxi Leninist position, and we have no cause to revise it now when t world revolution has matured and is rapidly developing everywher

We Salvador Communists resolutely declare our firm adheren to the policy of peaceful coexistence, inasmuch as we regard t preservation of peace among states with different social systems, t prevention of nuclear war as *the most important condition in t present-day world* for the ripening and speedy consummation of t world revolution. Therefore we condemn the position of the Chine comrades on this question as a position at variance with the interes of the world revolution. Notwithstanding our respect for the Co munist Party of China, notwithstanding its great services and i victories which we acknowledge, and notwithstanding the fact th we are a small party, we nevertheless declare this without hesit tion. This is a problem affecting all peoples, big and small, all mankind, and we Communists must all state our point of view.

II. THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Another major problem involved in the ideological conflict b tween the Communist Party of China and some other parties, o the one hand, and the overwhelming majority of the internation Communist movement, on the other, concerns the national-liberatio struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and th link between this struggle and the struggle of the internation working class.

It is obvious and incontestible that in our time the main contra diction is that between socialism and capitalism. This contradictio will be resolved with the world-wide victory of the working clas

with the establishment of socialism and communism in all countries. At the same time our epoch is marked also by other important contradictions, outstanding among which is the contradiction between the colonial and the semi-colonial countries, on the one hand, and imperialism and colonial rule, on the other. This is a very sharp contradiction, and the prime role here is played by the oppressed countries and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The big victories won by the national-liberation movement since the Second World War have increased the number of independent countries and at the same time caused the ground on which imperialism stands, i.e., colonial and semi-colonial domination, to slip from under its feet. We are convinced that the struggle of the oppressed people could not have led from victory to victory and acquired its present gigantic scope had there not existed, alongside the indomitable resolve of the peoples to win national liberation, the steadily growing might of the socialist camp. Among all the forces constituting the irresistible revolutionary torrent of our day the peoples belonging to the camp of socialism and communism play the leading, vanguard role. . .

All the movements for democracy and peace, against capitalism and imperialism, and for national liberation and socialism should be closely and inseparably linked with one another as indivisible components of the world revolutionary process. Therefore we qualify as pernicious the efforts of the Chinese comrades to counterpose, by diverse means, crude and subtle, overt and covert, the national-liberation movement to the socialist world camp and the world peace movement. We likewise disagree with the Chinese comrades' claim that the international Communist movement ignores the struggle for national liberation. To claim this is to resort to fabrications. And this is dangerous indeed. . .

Marxism teaches us to analyze the struggles waged in class society from the standpoint of class interests, proceeding from the thesis that the history of class society is shaped in class struggle. Yet in this as in other questions the Chinese comrades prefer to depart from Marxism and to speak of nations as of united entities without making any distinction between the classes within these nations or between the interests of these classes. For the Chinese comrades there exist only oppressor nation and countries and oppressed nations and countries. They seem to have forgotten that the proletariat of both types of nations and countries have common interests and are fighting against a common enemy and for common goals. True, in conducting the polemic the Chinese comrades point to these common interests and goals of the world proletariat, but only to the extent that this bolsters up their arguments on other points. When they speak of the connection between the struggle for national liberation, the struggle for socialism and the vanguard role of the socialist camp, they prefer to speak only about countries and not classes. In other words, they incline towards the positions of bourgeois nationalism, departing from Marxist-Leninist positions.

III. THE PATHS OF REVOLUTION

On the question of the means the peoples should use to win power —both at the stage of national liberation and at the stage of transition to socialism—there is full clarity in the international Communist movement. This question was theoretically elucidated in the statements of the Communist and Workers' parties in a way which seemed to leave no loophole for sowing confusion.

The Chinese comrades, after categorically asserting in their June 14 Letter that they are for faithful and consistent pursuance of the line set forth in the documents of the Communist and Workers' parties, ridicule the opportunities for peaceful struggle against the oligarchy in the various countries and against imperialism which are opening before a number of peoples. Clearly the Chinese comrades are assuming the posture of conservatives and dogmatists. Many peoples today have access to means of struggle which could hardly be envisaged when socialism was taking its first steps. The more the forces of socialism and progress become the decisive factor of social change, the more possibilities open up for the peoples for waging a successful struggle for power.

The Communist Party of Salvador, repudiating the position of the Chinese comrades and their attacks against other Communist and Workers' parties, once again reaffirms the Communique issued by its Central Committee in April 1963 which declares that our Party ". . . maintains that national independence may be won either by peaceful means or through armed struggle, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned, and that in each case it is up to the Marxist-Leninist Party of the given country to determine the revolutionary tactics and the forms and means of struggle." The Communique states further: "Consequently, we maintain that it is dogmatic to claim that there is only one way to be followed and one form of struggle to be used in all cases. Underestimation of the possibilities opening up in the course of the struggle would only lead to defeat and unnecessary suffering for the peoples."

As regards our country, the Communist Party of Salvador holds that at present and in the foreseeable future the only possible form of struggle for power. We would not be Marxist-Leninists if we non-peaceful form. In other words, in order to win, the people must be prepared to take up arms against their enemies—imperialism and the oligarchy.

The people have worked hard to win democracy by peaceful means; but the broad masses have come to realize that the peaceful path of the revolution has been blocked by imperialism and the oligarchy. Long years of mass murders, terror, denial of democratic rights, refusal to allow the agricultural labourers to organize, constant trampling on the freedom of speech, and military coups against governments which sought to foster some democratic tendencies have shown that the ruling classes have placed their stakes on force, and this has convinced the people that they must prepare to counter force with force.

The foregoing does not mean that the Communist Party of Salvador excludes the possibility of change taking place in the internal and the international balance of forces favouring the peaceful path of struggle for power. We would not be Marxist-Leninists if we associated the popular revolutionary process in Salvador with only one particular form of struggle, if we denied the possibility of new conditions and circumstances emerging in the course of the development of the mass struggles giving rise to new methods of defense and attack, if we closed all but one door to a better life and insisted on using forms of struggle no longer according with the historically evolved conditions. We would have to be completely blind and certainly not Marxist-Leninists to fail to see that the balance of strength between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp in the international arena is steadily becoming more and more favourable to the camp of socialism.

Consequently, as regards the internal situation in our country, we do not rule out the possibility of a time coming when the organized forces of the people of Salvador, united in struggle against the tyranny and the interests it represents, will achieve such a preponderance of strength as to make the peaceful path to power possible. We do not underestimate the possibility of a government of national democracy coming into power—a government consistent with our political process which would launch out on the path of non-capitalist development. Nor do we rule out the possibility of a situation arising in which a transitional government respecting democratic freedoms, guaranteeing the free development of the political forces and enjoying the firm support of the people might be formed.

IV. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING RELATIONS BETWEEN PARTIES

The differences between the Communist Party of China and the international Communist movement extend to the highly important question of relations between parties within the international Communist movement. All the fraternal parties which signed the 81-Party Statement solemnly undertook to observe the basic Marxist-Leninist principles governing relations between the various revolutionary detachments of the proletariat. These principles are: the equality and independence of the Communist and Workers' parties; non-interference in the internal affairs of other parties, mutual aid based on international working-class solidarity; fraternal relations between parties. These principles make for the maximum solidarity of the socialist camp and the international Communist movement in the struggle for the final victory of the working class and the peoples, in the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and communism. . .

If the Communist parties did not cherish their independence, they would not be able correctly to elaborate their own political line according with the specific conditions prevailing in the country at

the given moment; they could not effectively lead the struggles of their peoples.

The equality of the parties, the fact that there are no "superior" and "inferior" parties, is a guarantee of the observance of the principles of proletarian internationalism. Whenever there have been deviations in this respect, as, for instance, in the twenties (owing to Trotskyite influences) or in the period of the Stalin cult, they have had an adverse effect on the international Communist movement.

As regards the Communist Party of Salvador, it has strictly adhered to these principles in its relations with fraternal parties.

Further, recognition of these principles and their correct implementation can in no way detract from the important relevant thesis that the vanguard role, the role of the bulwark in the fight against imperialism, is played and will continue to be played by the USSR and the CPSU.

Recognition of this fact, far from harming, strengthens the international Communist movement. Recognition of this fact is an important element in the strategy and a vital factor of unity of the entire progressive world, while refusal to recognize it weakens the solidarity and the impact of the struggle waged by the Communist movement and the peoples of the world. This is an elementary truth recognized by the international Communist movement, a truth which even the Chinese comrades, with due modesty, always used to acknowledge.

As regards the Communist Party of Salvador, we realize the importance of the equality and independence of the Communist parties; we also realize that these do not conflict with the positive fact that the CPSU plays a vanguard role in the international Communist movement. Therefore our Party has clearly defined its stand on this question in its decisions.

Nothing would please the imperialist camp more than the weakening of the solidarity of the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement with the USSR, for the diffusion of their forces would enable the imperialists to deal with the various socialist countries, detachments of the working class, popular movements and national-liberation movements one by one. But these dreams of the imperialists will never come true, for nothing will ever make the international Communist movement forsake its main bulwark of strength.

We categorically declare that we shall always stand together with the parties which strictly and faithfully observe the principles adopted by the international Communist movement. We do not consider any fraternal Party infallible. Any Party may make one or another mistake in applying the general line of the international Communist movement, but this is not a valid reason for disrupting the unity of the movement.

In view of the situation that has developed, our Party urges that a conference of the parties be called to discuss concrete instances of mistakes which one or another fraternal Party has committed, or is presumed to have committed, in carrying out the general line.

V. UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The unity of the international Communist movement is the basic condition for the final victory of the working class and the peoples over capitalism and imperialism.

The immortal slogan "Workers of all lands, unite!" is more timely than ever at the present stage when socialism is becoming the decisive factor of social development and the victory of the proletariat is the order of the day. Yet it is precisely at this moment when all the forces of the proletariat and the peoples should be concentrated on ensuring maximum cohesion in the common struggle against imperialism, exploitation and war that the differences examined in the present document have arisen.

Differences as such, even on cardinal questions of strategy and tactics, are no cause for alarm or surprise in the international Communist movement. But using such differences to undermine or destroy the unity of the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement is alien to Marxism and extremely damaging to the internationalist Communist movement and all humanity. And this is one of the gravest errors committed by the leadership of the Communist Party of China.

Resorting to systematic action which at first seemed inexplicable and caused surprise in other parties but which, as developments have shown, were part of a far-reaching plan elaborated in advance (and designated as the plan of "three great world-wide ideological campaigns"), the Chinese comrades set to work to deepen the differences and to worsen relations with the entire international Communist movement to the extreme, and then launched a vigorous drive to split the socialist world camp and the international Communist movement as well as individual parties. This divisive struggle was launched on a scale and by means without precedent in the history of the international Communist movement.

No Communist Party can remain indifferent to this state of affairs. It is a matter of deep concern to every Communist, to every progressive throughout the world.

The Chinese leaders, departing from the general line of the international Communist movement, unleashed a campaign of slander and invective against the leadership of many Communist and Workers' parties. They sling mud at the leaders of the Communist parties of France, Italy, U.S.A., Brazil, Spain, Australia, Belgium, etc., calling them "modern revisionists" who are "in the service of imperialism", and accusing them of "betrayal", "cowardice", etc. It is symptomatic that all the scum thrown out of the various Communist parties are raising their heads and, holding up the basic theses of the Chinese comrades, waging a struggle against these parties. No wonder, then, that the leaders of the CPSU have been congratulated and warmly greeted even by the Trotskyite so-called Fourth International.

The international Communist movement has regarded with anxiety the disruptive activities of the Chinese comrades, but at the same time it has displayed great patience and forebearance in the

hope that the Chinese comrades would ponder over the serious damage they have caused to the international Communist movement and would return to the correct positions. But the Chinese comrades gave a wrong interpretation to this fraternal attitude which was prompted by a sense of proletarian unity, and hardened their erroneous stand still more.

Ever since the differences came to light the Communist Party of Salvador has fervently hoped that they would be overcome in conformity with the standards of proletarian internationalism and that no actions damaging the unity of the internaional Communist movement would be taken. Regrettably, however, the disruptive actions of the CPC have assumed such proportions that our Party cannot but condemn them; our Party once again confirms its resolve to uphold the unity of the international Communist movement based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

VI. STRUGGLE AGAINST DEVIATIONS FROM MARXISM-LENINISM

Rarely has anyone pursued a sectarian line on the fundamental questions of the strategy and tactics of the international Communist movement in so glaring a form as the leaders of the CPC today. If the international Communist movement were to take an attitude similar to that of the leaders of the CPC towards the peace movement and the international democratic organizations, we Communists would find ourselves isolated, both at home and on the international arena, from the broad progressive masses adhering to diverse religious faiths and political views. Such a loss of contact with the interests of the masses would inevitably postpone the final victory of the peoples in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

The Chinese comrades refuse to admit that they had committed an error in creating a cult of the personality of Mao Tse-tung, and proceeded to misreprent the efforts that were being made to combat the personality cult, which did so much harm to the international Communist movement.

A petty-bourgeois nationalist deviation is becoming ever more clearly evident in the position of the Chinese comrades on a number of questions; and this confirms the correctness of the recommendations contained in the 81-Party Statement that the Communist movement should regard struggle against "all manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism" as one of its prime duties. It would be tragic if these deviations were to lead to manifestations of racism, which is utterly alien to the class outlook of Marxists; yet indications of this are already apparent in some of the statements issued by the Chinese comrades.

In view of the foregoing, the Communist Party of Salvador declares:

—that it firmly adheres to the principled positions of the inter-

national Communist movement; that it is guided by the principles laid down in the statements of the meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties of 1957 and 1960; it considers that these statements have fully demonstrated their historical correctness;

—the Party considers that the practical realization of the principles of the international Communist movement by the Communist movement, by the Communist and Workers' parties has created better conditions and prospects for the struggle of the peoples;

—it cannot regard as correct the line and ideological position adopted at the present time by the Chinese comrades; this position and line do not accord with the general line endorsed by the whole international Communist movement;

—the Party recognizes the great Soviet Union and its Party, founded by the leader of the world proletariat Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, as the indomitable and invincible vanguard of the international Communist movement;

—the Party believes that in the struggle for Marxist-Leninist principles these principles will inevitably prevail over revisionism, dogmatism and sectarianism; the Party holds that the public debate could even be continued provided the hostile tone is abandoned;

—the Party is in favour of calling a conference of the Communist and Workers' parties to discuss concrete instances of mistakes which one or another fraternal Party has committed, or is presumed to have committed, in carrying out the general line;

—and lastly, the Communist Party of Salvador addresses to the Communist Party of China and all the Communist and Workers' parties a fervent appeal for unity on the basis of the principles by which the international Communist movement is guided.

The cause of peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and communism will emerge from these grave trials stronger than ever before.

Under the banner of Lenin, forward to the final victory of the working class and the peoples of the whole world!

"Proletarians and oppressed peoples the world over, unite!"

SHOULD THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT FEAR INTERNATIONAL DETENTE*?

Larbi Bouhali

The underlying factor of the foreign policy of the Algerian People's Republic is the struggle against colonialism and imperialism, the friendship and solidarity with the peoples, particularly the peoples of the Arab, African and socialist countries, the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence. At the Addis Ababa conference of the heads of state and government of African countries held in May 1963 Algeria played a paramount role in intensifying the anti-colonialist struggle with a view to achieving the complete liberation of Africa from colonial oppression, building African unity and transforming the continent into a nuclear and missile-free zone.

The people of Algeria like all the peoples of the world passionately strive for peace. And the foreign policy of the Ben Bella government is deeply coloured with this striving for peace on the part of our people.

Immediately after the announcement of the Moscow test-ban treaty presidents Ben Bella and Julius Nyerere welcomed it in a joint statement which said: "It is with great satisfaction that we learnt about the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests. We are convinced that this treaty expresses the legitimate aspirations of all peoples and that it will largely contribute to the strengthening of world peace and security."

In an interview with the newspaper *Izvestia* Hadj Ben Alla, President of the National Assembly of the Algerian Republic, declared: "I maintain that the Moscow test-ban treaty is the outstanding event of the year for all countries and, notably, for Algeria."

The Algerians rejoice over the fact that the overwhelming majority of the states in the world have adopted the same attitude to the Moscow Treaty as our own government inasmuch as the treaty expresses the profound will of all the peoples, and notably the peoples who have won their freedom or are still fighting against the colonial yoke.

WHO SPEAKS ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT?

We understand very well why the de Gaulle government, the West German militarists and the Pentagon brass hats are hostile to the

*Abridged, reprinted from **Democratie Nouvelle,** December 1963.

Moscow treaty. But it is difficult for us to understand a similar attitude on the part of the Chinese leaders, who claim that the treaty is directed against their country. While they have feelings of admiration for the great Chinese people, the Algerians categorically reject the standpoint of the Chinese leaders according to which the Moscow treaty is a "betrayal" of the interests of the peoples. This is not only a rude calumny against the Soviet Union and the glorious Party of Lenin but also an insolent challenge to all the peoples who support the actions of their governments in this direction and, consequently, a challenge to the Algerian people. The betrayal of the interests of the peoples consists in the fact that a struggle is being waged against the cause dear to all the peoples under the pretext that the imperialists were compelled to support it. In fact, however, the opposition of the Chinese leaders to the Moscow test-ban treaty derives from their erroneous attitude to the general line of the international Communist and working-class movement and, in particular, to the struggle against war, for the strengthening of world peace.

The Chinese leaders maintain that the policy of peaceful coexistence, which they themselves earlier supported, is demobilizing the peoples and retarding their struggle for national and social emancipation. In order to push through their adventurist standpoint they are trying to counterpose the national-liberation movement to the international working class and its principal gain, the socialist world system. But, in effect, what right do they have to speak on behalf of the national-liberation movement after they refused to honour their commitments in the international democratic organizations and launched a violent campaign against one of the deepest aspirations of the peoples which compose this national-liberation movement? Why did they ignore the Addis Ababa conference which gave a clear expression to the opinion of the African peoples on the question of war and peace? Or perhaps they consider all the heads of state and governments who attended that conference to be traitors to their peoples?

Is it necessary to recall that peaceful coexistence has never meant, nor will it ever mean, renouncing the struggle of the oppressed countries against the oppressors, of the exploited against the exploiters, the struggle between two diametrically opposed ideologies, as the Chinese leaders would like us to believe? When it is a question of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-economic systems, the revolutionaries have in mind the peaceful coexistence of the socialist and the capitalist countries. The peaceful coexistence imposed by the peoples on the imperialists creates a real possibility for humanity as a whole to avoid a terrible nuclear catastrophe. Neither of the nations, not one forward-looking person, can remain indifferent to this perspective. But if it is true that peaceful coexistence rids the people of nuclear holocaust, it is equally true that it cannot either arrest or retard the national-liberation movement and the class struggle. On the contrary, it presupposes their continued development. Moreover, it creates even more favourable conditions for

this development as can be seen from the experience of the postwar years.

Before the Second World War imperalism dominated the majority of the population and reigned on most of the territory of the world. And after the end of the war, i.e., in the conditions of peaceful co-existence, over 50 countries with a population of 1,500 million political independence.

Why did not these countries win their national independence before or during the Second World War? Did they not want it or did they not fight for it? To suppose so would mean to abuse them. It is common knowledge that each people subjected to colonial oppression has not for a moment ceased to fight against it. On the other hand, it is not of their free will that the imperialists granted independence to the peoples. This means that the peoples won their independence in struggle and that this struggle proceeded in far more favourable conditions.

NO ADVENTURISM!

Liberation from colonialism requires above all that the peoples concerned fight against it, and this is the principal condition of success. But the peoples are not waging this struggle in one and the same form. Some of them had to make recourse to armed struggle, to partisan warfare combined with various forms of mass political action—and all is over a span of many years. This, for example, was the case with the peoples of Vietnam and Algeria. For others it was enough to take political action to obtain independence. An example of this is Guinea and many other territories of former French Africa south of the Sahara. This means that an insurrection which can be indispensable for one people is not absolutely necessary in all cases, as claimed by the Chinese leaders who brand as counter-revolutionaries all those who do not favour armed insurrection in all cases. Had the Algerian people been given the chance to achieve independence in a peaceful way, it would never have agreed to sacrifice more than a million of its sons and daughters whom it needed alive for national construction. But when imperialism confronted it with violence, it did not hesitate to use the same means and stopped at no sacrifices.

For true Marxist-Leninists an armed insurrection is not a game of chance. It is imperative that it has the maximum of chances of success, and for this it is necessary to take cognizance of the sum-total of objective and subjective conditions. To fail to do so and seek to impose on the people an armed uprising as the whole means of their liberation means to plunge them into an adventure.

As a matter of fact, the Algerians have already seen for themselves the workings of this adventurist policy of the Chinese leaders. During a meeting with a delegation of the Algerian Communist Party in October 1959 in Peking the latter criticized the decision of the Algerian Party to disband its armed groups and merge them with the National-Liberation Army. They suggested that the ACP should do

everything to re-establish these armed units as soon as possible, saying that a Party without its own armed forces was nothing. Our delegation rejected this "suggestion" as pernicious both for the Communist Party and the Algerian people as a whole.

In order to shake off the chains of colonialism our people made enormous sacrifices and engaged in glorious struggle, which was undoubtedly the decisive factor of our victory. But every Algerian realizes that, no matter how heroic this struggle was, alone it could not have defeated the most powerful colonial army ever known to history. If the people of Algeria won, this was because their struggle developed in a favourable international situation.

The imperialist countries, with the exception of the U.S.A., were weakened by the Second World War. This circumstance encouraged the struggle of the colonial peoples which began to shatter the colonial system of imperialism. Every nation that won its freedom made new breaches in the flanks of imperialism and rendered active support to the struggle of other peoples. That was how the national-liberation movement grew. At the same time a movement and struggle for democracy and peace got under way in the capitalist countries and began to render political and moral support to the national-liberation movement.

But these two movements could not have reached their scope without the emergence and strengthening of the socialist countries which formed a world system of socialism. It is the joint efforts of these three mutually complementary world forces that are steadily sapping the foundations of imperialism and will ultimately vanquish it.

To try to isolate the national-liberation movement and counterpose it to other progressive force, as the Chinese leaders are doing, means to harm the interests of all peoples and objectively play into the hands of the imperialists.

All peoples know full well that without the socialist countries, without the Soviet Union and its great economic, scientific and technological achievements, the image of the world would be different today. The stronger the socialist system the greater the political, moral and material aid it is rendering to all peoples, both those which are fighting for their liberation and those building their independent states.

All peoples know that it was thanks to the vigorous actions of the Soviet Union that the imperialist aggressors had to retreat in many countries such as Cuba, Egypt, Syria and Iraq.

In defiance of indisputable historical facts, the Chinese leaders accuse the Soviet Union of not supporting the struggle of the peoples against colonialism. They claim that it did not want to support Algeria in the liberation war against French colonialism. As for the Algerian people, they know and highly appreciate the aid rendered them by the USSR in the political and diplomatic fields as well as the material aid, including arms and munitions. The Algerian leaders, be it said, often recall this aid, as did President Ben Bella in an interview with the Soviet journalists during the Third World Meeting of Journalists in Algiers: "We," he said, "are much obliged to the

peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for the aid they have given us and for the great material aid we are receiving at present, at the time when we are launching out on the building of a highly developed and independent socialist economy."

In the future we shall be able to receive the ever-growing aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries only in measure as these countries develop their economy and go from success to success. And for this there must be peaceful coexistence and further international détente. The aggression unleashed by the Moroccan monarchy against our borders has shown that had our people been forced to wage a prolonged war to protect our territorial integrity, this would have inflicted grave damage to the building of our national economy and to the development of our revolution.

Such are the additional reasons explaining why the Algerian Communists resolutely support the consistent policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as the struggle for peaceful coexistence, for general and controlled disarmament.

POLITICAL RESOLUTION OF THE FIFTH CONFERENCE OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY*

In the conclusion of its proceedings the Fifth Conference of the ICP adopted the following political resolution:

1. The Fifth National Conference on Organization of the Italian Communists, which met in Naples at a grave moment of our national life, draws the attention of all Italians, with the authority of a great political, democratic and national force, to the serious deterioration of the economic, social and political situation of the country during the three months that have elapsed since the setting up of the Moro government. The big monopoly groups, after having exercised growing pressure in order to condition the action of the Centre-Left government, are today developing a great offensive in order to have their will and their interests prevail in full. Such an offensive, made possible by the agreement on the platform of the present government, has been more and more encouraged by the docility of the Centre-Left group. Thus, serious threats arise to the living conditions of the working masses and to the initiatives of the middle strata, as is clearly shown by the attack on wages and the demand for shorter working hours, wide-scale dismissals, the restriction of credit to the small and medium-size enterprises and the curtailment of public expenditure. At the same time, scandalous concessions have been made to tax evasions and an inadmissible tolerance has favoured the escape of capital abroad. The gaps, the contradictions, the traditional injustice of Italian society, above all the South Italian question—already sharper due to monopoly expansion during the years of the "economic miracle"—are now sharpening more and more. The striving for renewal on the part of the more advance section of the Centre-Left group has been paralyzed by the prevalence of the conservative orientation, outside and inside the government. The confusion that has characterized the government actions in these months has worsened the economic situation, humiliated the Socialist Party and the most advanced forces of the Catholic world, struck a blow at the prestige of the democratic institutions and may create the conditions for reactionary chaos.

A resolute renovating action by the government can offset the pressure, the economic and political blackmail on the part of the big monopoly groups and the anxiety and demagogical campaign, by means of which the Rights are trying to influence the middle

*Reprinted from **Foreign Bulletin** published periodically by the Foreign Section of the Central Committee of the ICP.

strata. A revival of Italian economic development on a different basis, opposed to that indicated by the big employers, if possible if one has the will and the force to defeat the sabotage, manoeuvres and speculation of the big capitalists and make them pay the cost of that rebirth which is now weighing down on the shoulders of the working class and the middle strata. First of all it is necessary:

a) to stop the inflation process;

b) to prevent the consequences of the present difficulties being shifted to the shoulders of the popular masses.

For this, it is necessary to adopt immediate measures of public interference and public control capable of stopping the increase in the cost of living and of stimulating investments to meet with the most urgent needs of the national economy and the working people.

Such measures should immediately start democratic economic planning, based on essential structural reforms, subordinate the action of big capital to the interests of the collective and give the working masses a new role in society and in the state. These basic orientations should underlie all government action and also the utilization of the loan now given to Italy by the United States, rejecting all political conditions.

The policy and the solutions of the Centre-Left government have revealed their deep limitations due both to the composition of the majority and the program and orientation that have been chosen. Today the PSI is faced again with a dramatic dilemma between defense and development of its essential features or assumption of the role of a mere supporter of the capitalist system. More and more critical is also the position of those forces inside the Catholic movement that refuse to accept unconditionally the present capitalist set-up and the monopoly leadership of society.

It is essential and urgent that all the secular and Catholic forces understand the necessity not to remain subjected to the pressure of the monopoly group and feel the urgency and the actual possibility of imposing today a decisive orientation of renewal of the nation and of drastically limiting big capital's power. The experience of the past two years shows that even the most timid and contradictory reforms come up against the harsh resistance of the ruling classes, resistance which cannot be faced and defeated without mobilizing the widest and most militant political forces expressing the interests and the will for progress of the working people and the middle strata. The confidence and support of these great social and political forces are decisive in order to emerge from the economic and political crisis, to give new impulse to the democratic institutions, to defeat the plans of the Right inside and outside the government, to create the conditions and the basis for a Left-wing shift.

But appealing to these forces means creating a new majority characterized by an anti-monopolistic platform of economic planning and by a line of development towards a real democracy. The Communists are conscious that in this situation the possibility of and the conditions for closer ties between the Socialist and more advanced Catholic forces and the ICP, arise. Relying on the elabora-

tion made in these years of major problems of unity of the international Communist movement with due regard for diversity and autonomy of the experience of every party, of the important problems of search for one's own perspective of democratic advance towards socialism and of new forms of participation by the working class in government, the Communists propose a discussion, open to all the Left forces, on the ways of democratic renewal of the nation.

2. Recent developments have again demonstrated how futile are the attempts to pursue a policy of democratic development in Italy against and without the Communist Party, and how absurd is the perspective of embarrassing our Party. In face of the stubbornness of the monopoly groups and the grave political weakness shown by the other sectors of the Left movement, the growing strength of the ICP—so clearly evidenced in the organizational field by the successes gained in the re-registration campaign of 1964—represents a beacon for all the social strata aspiring to a deep-going transformation of national society.

It is the task of the Communists to make the most of this strength in the present dramatic phase of the national economic and political situation.

The Fifth National Conference on Organization calls upon the Party to start immediately a campaign of orientation, propaganda and agitation aimed at defeating the insidious activities through which the monopoly groups try to repress the advancement of demands, deprive the working-class movement of autonomy, and isolate the middle strata from the working class. At the same time the Conference calls upon all the party organizations to develop, on the basis of unity, the widest initiatives of struggle for peace, for disarmament and for an autonomous and independent development of the underdeveloped countries, for the immediate establishment of regional institutions, for land reforms and for the rebirth of the South, against the rising cost of living and against every attack on the employment levels, for new town-planning legislation, for school reform and for a higher level of scientific research.

It is in the spirit of these renewed militant tasks of struggle that the organizations of the Party and of the Young Communist Federation are called upon to carry on the campaign of re-registration and registration towards new successes which—in the year since the big victory of April 28—indicate the constant and increasing popular support given to the ICP and its policy.

The Fifth National Conference on Organization, the impulse coming from it as a result of the renewal of the organizational structure and further extension of democracy in the party, indicates that the ICP is a virile and essential force in Italian democracy, capable of making a new, decisive contribution to the common struggle of the Italian people for peace and socialism.

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

PUT MONOPOLY UNDER CONTROL by Tim Buck
(now in preparation)

Outlines a new economic policy for Canada.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75
393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75
404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50
735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

10

in this issue

COMMUNIQUE, POLITICAL BUREAU, CP OF FRANCE

RESOLUTION NC, CP OF CANADA

EDITORIAL IN TRYBUNA LUDU

SPEECH BY A. NOVOTNY

information bulletin - 10

contents

SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Communique issued by the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party 5

STRUGGLE WITH DETERMINATION AGAINST CHINESE SPLITTERS
Resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Bulgaria 7

GUARD AND STRENGTHEN UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Resolution of 7th Plenary Meeting Central Committee, Communist Party of Greece 13

FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Resolution adopted at 18th National Convention, Communist Party of Canada, March 27-30, 1964 15

CEYLON COMMUNIST PARTY'S STRUGGLE AGAINST SPLITTISM
Article by P. Keuneman, General Secretary, Ceylon Communist Party 17

REPORT BY COMRADE D. URBANY
at the 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Luxembourg 24

THE WAY TO SOCIALISM IN THE CONDITIONS OF PEACE, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE
Statement of the Communist Party of Luxembourg 27

FOR UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP
A **Trybuna Ludu** Editorial 32

WE EMPHATICALLY CONDEMN THE ANTI-MARXIST POLICY OF THE CPC LEADERSHIP
Speech by A. Novotny 37

FOR UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Editorial in **Neues Deutschland** 41

REPLY TO THE SPLITTERS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
An Editorial in **Kansan Uutiset** (Central organ of CC of the Communist Party of Finland) 45

SOME QUESTIONS OF UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Article by M. Alicata 47

DOCUMENTS ON SPLITTING ACTIVITIES
The Communist Party of Chile exposes the intrigues of the splitters directed against the popular movement 51

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada
as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the
monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague

PRINTED IN CANADA
May 22, 1964

SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

COMMUNIQUE OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY*

The Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, at its meeting on April 9, 1964, under the chairmanship of Comrade Maurice Thorez, examined the latest developments in the international Communist movement.

The Political Bureau notes that the leaders of the Communist Party of China are departing more and more from the principles jointly elaborated by the fraternal parties at the 1957 and 1960 meetings, that they refuse to support the proposal to terminate the public debate, and are levelling violent attacks on the policy and leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, our own Party and the majority of the fraternal parties. They are organizing groups hostile to the Communist parties of the various countries including parties which are working in the difficult conditions of illegality, thereby playing into the hands of imperialism.

The report of Comrade Suslov published recently by the Central Committee of the CPSU is a firm and reasoned reply to the dogmatic theses and disruptive activities of the leaders of the CPC.

The Political Bureau stresses the importance of the proposal advanced by the Central Committee of the CPSU to convene at the earliest possible date another conference of all the Communist and Workers' parties. It will be recalled that in October 1963 and in March 1964 the Central Committee of our Party expressed itself in favor of such a conference. In the light of developments since 1960, it is necessary to reaffirm the general line of the movement and to take necessary measures to preserve its untiy.

Full accord exists between our Party and the CPSU on fundamental theoretical and political questions affecting the international Communist movement.

Full accord exists between our Party and the CPSU on fundamental theoretical and political questions affecting the international Communist movement.

The French Communist Party is firmly resolved to foil the attempts to undermine the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties, that unity which is the principal guarantee of success in the struggle for peace, democracy, national and social liberation for all people.

The Political Bureau urges all Communists, in preparation for the

*L'Humanité, April 10, 1964.

17th Congress of the French Communist Party, to study and discuss the documents relating to the situation in the international Communist movement. The ideological and political unity of the Party is a condition for the efficacy of its actions in defense of peace, in defense of the interests of our people, in the name of the alliance of all workers and democratic forces against one-man rule, for the establishment of genuine democracy in our country.

STRUGGLE WITH DETERMINATION AGAINST THE CHINESE SPLITTERS

RESOLUTION OF THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BULGARIA

A Plenary Meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, held on March 21, 1964, heard and discussed the report of Mitko Grigorov, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC, BCP, on some questions of the world Communist movement, and unanimously approved the conclusions and appraisals contained therein.

The Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party notes that the Chinese Communist Party leadership has lately taken advantage of the discontinuance of open polemics by the CPSU and other fraternal parties to intensify and deepen its deviation from Marxism-Leninism and to step up its disruptive activities in the world Communist and Workers' movement. This is doing great harm to the socialist camp and gravely jeopardizes the unity and cohesion of the world Communist front. The Plenum believes that the situation is no longer tolerable. An irreconcilable struggle must be waged against the harmful anti-Marxist and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders. Their dogmatic, nationalist and Trotskyist views, and their factional and subversive activities must be exposed to the last.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal parties have gone to great pains to eliminate the differences caused by the Chinese Communist Party leadership in the world Communist movement. It was on the initiative of the CC, CPSU that representatives of the two parties held negotiations in Moscow in the summer of 1963, and it was the fault of the Chinese leadership that these yielded no results. In the last few months, the CC, CPSU has repeatedly suggested that the bilateral talks be resumed, but for a long time the Chinese leaders did not reply to them. The CC, CPSU proposed discontinuing the open polemics in order to create a calmer and more favourable atmosphere for a discussion of the questions in dispute. Although the Chinese leaders did not reply to this proposal, the open polemics were discontinued in the Soviet Union. In our country, too, and in other fraternal parties the open polemics were stopped.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, held on July 31 and August 1, 1963, called on the Chinese leaders to strive for the removal of the differences and for the consolidation of Marxist-Leninist unity among the Communists of the whole world. Our leadership has invariably backed

the efforts and measures of the CPSU and of other Communist and Workers' parties to that effect.

But the CPC leadership responded, and now responds, to all the efforts and actions aimed at removing the differences and consolidating the unity of the world Communist movement by intensifying its factional activities and redoubling its campaign of slander against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. The Bulgarian Communist Party membership is deeply alarmed, troubled and angered by the CPC leadership's refusal to discontinue open polemics, by its provocative declarations that it will continue and expand its disruptive work, by its vicious anti-Soviet propaganda and by its public calls for a split in the world Communist movement.

The Plenary Meeting of the CC, BCP believes that the dogmatism and sectarianism of the Chinese leaders are the chief danger for the world Communist movement at the present stage, for they are disrupting its unity and creating grave difficulties in the common struggle of the fraternal parties for peace, democracy, socialism and Communism.

The Chinese leaders have passed all bounds in their deviations from Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They have completely betrayed the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meeting and have given their new political line, which they seek to impose on the world Communist movement, final shape. In the beginning of their splitting activities they said they differed with the fraternal parties on just a few questions of strategy and tactics, but have now passed over completely to nationalism, petty-bourgeois adventurism and Trotkyism on a number of key issues. Deep-going differences of principle exist today between the CPSU and other fraternal parties, on the one hand, and the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, on the other, in relation to all the basic problems of our time, to Marxism-Leninism and to the general line of the world Communist movement. The Chinese leaders adopted the positions of great-power chauvinism and Trotskyism, and continue doggedly to develop and deepen their erroneous and harmful "theories" on these basic problems.

The Chinese leaders have come out against the policy of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, the struggle for general and complete disarmament, the Moscow Treaty for the partial banning of nuclear weapons tests, and all the other peaceful proposals made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Thereby they create serious difficulties for the peace forces in their effort to safeguard and strengthen world peace. In contrast to the Leninist theory of socialist revolution, they are harping more and more insistently on the old Trotskyist thesis about permanent revolution, the "pushing" of revolution, and on its victory through war. In matters of war, peace and revolution, the Chinese leaders are continuously intensifying their dangerous and adventurist policy. In doing so, they line up with the most aggressive and reactionary forces of the imperialist camp, helping to aggravate the international situation and adding to world tension.

Furthermore, in these activities the Chinese leaders are resorting

to crass demagogy and hypocrisy. When, in the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries negotiate and seek understanding with the capitalist countries on certain issues, when they strengthen and expand their economic and other contacts with the capitalist countries, the Chinese leaders accuse them of "revisionism" and "treachery", but when the Government of the Chinese People's Republic associates with capitalist countries and even helps certain reactionary forces, the Chinese leaders parade as genuine "revolutionaries" and "Marxists".

The Chinese leaders also persist in, and deepen, their anti-Marxist line in relation to the national liberation movement. In so doing, they are bent on creating an Afro-Asian front under their own leadership. Their main goal at present is to tear the national liberation movement from, and oppose it to, the world socialist system, the world Communist movement and, particularly, the Soviet Union. In pursuance of this goal, they are expanding their disruptive activities in Asia, Africa and Latin America more and more, trying to create separatist organizations, etc. In their struggle against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, they have adopted a racist stand, substituting the slogan of opposition to whites generally for the class approach.

By seeking to deprive the national liberation movement of the immense assistance and the influence of the world socialist system and world Communist movement, which have done so much for its extension and successful development, the Chinese leaders are causing the most painful damage chiefly to the struggle for freedom and national independence waged by the peoples of the dependent and colonial countries.

At present, the Chinese leaders are concentrating their disruptive activities in the world Communist and workers' movement on attempts to establish an international bloc of factional groups, which they aim to oppose to the CPSU and other fraternal parties. To this end, they issue unveiled calls for dissent within the Communist and Workers' parties and seek to create anti-party groups within them, to organize and unite all the Trotskyist and anarchist elements, politically and morally corrupted people expelled from the various parties, careerists and adventurers who would support them in the factional struggle.

In many capitalist countries the authorities, and even the police, give the Chinese leaders active assistance in this respect. In order to justify and camouflage their disruptive and subversive activities, the Chinese leaders have developed a special theory that splits are objectively inevitable in the world Communist movement. This theory has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and goes completely against the facts of history.

Lately, the Chinese leadership has stepped up still more its provocative and corrupting activities in the various international democratic organizations. The Chinese representatives in these organizations strive to impede their work by all possible means and to create all sorts of difficulties with the object of discrediting the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, of saddling their will on

them, and overriding the will and the decisions of the vast majority by the will of the minority.

The Chinese leaders have extended their ideological differences to their relations with the socialist countries, and persist in worsening these relations. They are disrupting the unity of the world socialist system and oppose themselves to all its activities and its development. It is through the fault of the Chinese leadership that mutual assistance and co-operation have decreased drastically between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic, and between the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries, including the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Some time ago the Chinese leaders began to stage crude provocations on the Soviet-Chinese border.

With the object of maligning the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and justifying the deterioration in the condition of China's working people, which is due entirely to their own erroneous and reckless policy, the Chinese leaders have invented a specious "theory" on the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries, and on their turning bourgeois. They go to the length of saying that the Soviet Union has no right to build communist society as long as imperialism exists in the world. The Chinese leaders maintain that the higher the living standard rises in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the more intensively the restoration of capitalism and the spread of bourgeois tendencies proceeds. They denounce the program of the CPSU and declare that its great slogans of Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness are bourgeois.

In their disruptive activities the Chinese leaders are aiming their chief efforts primarily against the Soviet Union, against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee headed by N. S. Khrushchov. That is no accident. By discrediting the CPSU and the Soviet Union, the Chinese leaders hope to decapitate and disorganize the whole world Communist movement, and to impose their own pernicious and harmful general line upon it. In their struggle against the Soviet Union and the CPSU, in their unbridled anti-Soviet activities, they emulate the bitterest enemies of the Soviet state. The foulest of slander and all sorts of insinuations and falsehoods are their chief weapon. Without shame or remorse, the Chinese leaders today spread monstrous accusations and slander, alleging that the Soviet Union has struck a deal with American imperialism to seize possession of, and divide the world. They allege that the Soviet Union, together with the United States, is the chief enemy of the Chinese people, that the Soviet Union is bent on enslaving the other socialist countries, that the CPSU orders the fraternal parties about, etc. In the past, the Chinese leaders hailed the assistance rendered to China's socialist construction by the Soviet Union. Today, they deny it completely. They are so deeply resentful of the Soviet Union and the CPSU that they accuse the Soviet Party and Government leadership of anti-Soviet activities. They fiercely defend and extol the harmful personality cult, which has been done away with for good.

The Bulgarian Communists consider it their sacred internationalist duty to emphatically reject the Chinese leaders' monstrous inventions and slanders against the Soviet Union and the CPSU. In so doing, they declare once more that anyone who attempts to discredit and malign Lenin's great Party will be branded as a deviationist from Marxism-Leninism and a traitor to proletarian internationalism.

The Bulgarian Communist Party has always considered, and now considers, the CPSU to be the strongest and most tested detachment of the world Communist front, one that has the richest revolutionary experience and is the commonly recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement. The CPSU, the party founded and raised by the great Lenin, is making the biggest contribution to the creative development of Marxism-Leninism and to the worldwide victory of socialism and communism.

The Bulgarian Communist Party will always, as before, march firmly and staunchly together with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and will struggle shoulder to shoulder with it for the triumph of the great communist cause. The fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union and life-giving Bulgarian-Soviet friendship have always been, and alway will be, an important condition for the final building of socialism and communism in our country. During the recent visit of a Bulgarian Party and Government delegation, headed by Todor Zhivkov, to the Soviet Union, and in the Joint Bulgarian-Soviet Statement signed in Moscow, the two countries again reaffirmed their fraternal relations and Bulgarian-Soviet friendship was raised to a new, higher stage of development.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party again expresses the deep affection and loyalty, and the appreciation of all the Bulgarian Communists, of all the working people of our land, to the mighty Soviet Union and its glorious Party. Again they express their boundless gratitude to and their confidence in, the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU and N. S. Khrushchov, for their exteremely important role in the world Communist movement, for their tireless struggle for the strengthening of its unity and cohesion, and for the immense assistance they are rendering our country.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party heartily approves and unanimously supports the proposal of the CC, CPSU to convene an international conference of fraternal Communist and Workers' parties in the autumn. We strongly object to the attempts of the Chinese leaders to retard and delay the conference, because this is likely to complicate the situation and further deepen the differences.

In the several years since the Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' parties, the world Communist movement has scored new big successes and victories. In following the jointly formed general line, the world Communist movement has consolidated and increased its ranks. The strength and might of the world socialist system has grown. Thanks to the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and thanks to the efforts of the

Soviet Union and all the world's progressives, world peace has been safeguarded and strengthened. The revolutionary struggle of the working class and all the working people in the capitalist countries has expanded. The national liberation movement against imperialism and colonialism is developing at a rapid pace. The general democratic struggle of the peoples against capitalist monopolies and reactionaries is growing continuously.

The giant battle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism has completely borne out the general line of the world Communist movement. At the same time, developments show graphically how wrong and harmful the dogmatic and adventurist policy of the Chinese leaders is.

Reared by Dimitr Blagoev and Georgi Dimitrov in the spirit of unshakable loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the Bulgarian Communist Party has always steadfastly followed, and will continue to follow, this general line. It has always waged and will continue to wage an uncompromising struggle in defense of the great Marxist-Leninist teaching.

GUARD AND STRENGTHEN UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE, APRIL 1964

The Seventh Plenary Meeting discussed the serious situation that has arisen in the international Communist movement as a result of the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist line and the increasingly disruptive activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China have long been carrying on a systematic campaign aimed at distorting and undermining the line jointly elaborated at the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings in order to impose their hegemony and dogmatic, adventuristic, neo-Trotskyite, chauvinistic line on the world Communist movement.

The Communist Party of Greece from the very first rejected the positions and actions of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and came out in defense of the Marxist-Leninist principles set forth in the Moscow documents; it reaffirmed its solidarity with and support for the efforts of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties aimed at ending the public and harmful polemics, overcoming the differences and consolidating the unity of the ranks of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. Unfortunately, events showed that the Chinese leaders did not want to listen to the voice of reason, did not want to consider the interests of the world Communist movement. Moreover, they interpreted these efforts on the part of the fraternal parties as a sign of weakness.

Of late the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party has stepped up the propaganda of its erroneous views and is openly intensifying its subversive and splitting activities against the world Communist movement. The chief target of its unbridled slander is the CPSU, the tried and tested vanguard of the world Communist movement, its Leninist leadership and Comrade Khrushchov personally. The leadership of the Chinese Communist Party is extending the struggle to inter-state relations, engaging in hostile sallies against the Soviet Union and striving to split the socialist camp. It is carrying on its splitting activities in international mass organizations as well.

The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party are now openly taking under their wing all anti-party factionalist elements in the different countries, all renegades from communism, organizing these elements into splinter groups and calling them "communist parties". They are trying to unite these anti-party groups and all those who support their views in a central organization under their hegemony as a counter-weight to the great community of Marxist-Leninist parties.

This systematic undermining of the world Communist movement at a time when the struggle of the peoples against imperialism is mounting, objectively helps the imperialists to weaken the socialist camp, prevents the broad masses in the capitalist countries from uniting with the working class to fight for democracy and socialism, weakens the struggle of the enslaved peoples, undermines the front of all revolutionary anti-imperialist forces and is detrimental to the peoples' fight for peace.

The anti-Marxist views, the subversive and splitting activities of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, which affected our own country as well, are creating additional difficulties for our Party working in underground conditions and for our entire democratic movement at a time when the need for unity of the working class, the entire nation, and all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces in their efforts to steer the country onto a path of democracy, peace and social progress is greater than ever before. The actions of the Chinese Communist Party tend to bolster up dogmatic tendencies refuted by life itself, to underestimate the struggle for democracy and the importance of alliances for the working class. They are prejudicial to the fight for peace, for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans and the Mediterranean, for a policy of peaceful coexistence in relations between states.

Our Party resolutely condemns the attempt made by the Chinese leaders to impose their dogmatic, adventuristic line on the world Communist movement and to revive the pernicious practices of the personality cult. Our Party knows by its own bitter experience how much our popular movement suffered as a result of the dogmatic, sectarian adventurist line of the Zachariadis leadership.

The Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece holds that in order to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international Communist movement it is imperative to expose the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist ideological positions of the leaders of the CPC and to give a resolute rebuff to their disruptive activities. The Plenary Meeting urges the entire Party, without relaxing the struggle against revisionism which in the specific conditions of our movement in Greece remains a very serious danger, to intensify the struggle against dogmatism, the danger of which has been greatly increased in our movement as well by the subversive actions of the Chinese leaders.

The Plenary Meeting is of the opinion that the interests of the international Communist movement require the speediest convocation of a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties to discuss the basic urgent problems of the international Communist movement and the need to safeguard and strengthen its unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The Seventh Plenum is confident that the world Communist movement will, through the joint efforts of all Marxist-Leninist parties, overcome the present differences, close its ranks in still stronger unity and forge ahead with redoubled resolve toward new major victories in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism.

FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 18th NATIONAL CONVENTION, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA (MARCH 27-30, 1964)

Our last Convention (January 1962) acknowledged the report by Tim Buck on the differences in the world Communist movement particularly as they bear on our own program and policies. These differences have since become more acute. What commenced as ideological differences has now been transformed by the Communist Party of China in its February 4, 1964, *Red Flag* article into organized efforts at splitting the world movement and individual Communist and Workers' parties. The leadership of the Communist Party of China is openly justifying and encouraging splits, thereby disuniting the world Communist movement and in effect working for the establishment of an international centre under its leadership directed to pursuing an entirely different strategical and tactical line to that agreed to unanimously at the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960 as embodied in the documents adopted by these meetings.

Such a course, if persisted in, would have disastrous consequences. It would shift the balance of forces on a world scale in favour of imperialism by splitting the countries of the world socialist system and so weakening the world front of peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

A split in the world movement would be the biggest gain for imperialism. Imperialism, headed by the U.S.A., is working for such a split, seeking in every way possible to "fish in muddy waters", so as to undermine the unity of the world movement.

In this difficult and complex situation it is necessary to avoid aggravating the situation, and step by step, to patiently resolve the differences which have arisen, subordinating them to the primary need of strengthening the unity of the world movement and thereby the world-wide movement against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

But to accomplish this it is necessary not only to cease public polemics, but that the leadership of the Communist Party of China desist from its splitting policy and agree to a patient discussion and resolution of differences.

History will never forgive the leaders of the Chinese Party if they continue to pursue policies deliberately calculated to undermine and destroy the unity of the world Communist movement.

The policies advocated by the Communist Party of China, *and which they put forward as a "general line" for all Communist parties,* go contrary to the program and policies democratically arrived at

by our Party. We reject those policies and will uphold our position against any attacks.

This Convention calls on all members of our Party to reject the totally wrong and un-Marxist line of the Chinese leaders and to energetically oppose the attempt to divide the world Communist movement.

This Convention declares that our Party, like the majority of the Communist and Workers' parties, will patiently and in a comradely and fraternal spirit persevere in all efforts at restoring and consolidating unity on the firm and principled basis of Marxism-Leninism, of proletarian internationalism and solidarity, and the documents of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings.

It endorses the action of the National Committee in urging the convening of a World Conference of Communist and Workers' parties as soon as possible, in order to restore the unity of our world movement.

CEYLON COMMUNIST PARTY'S STRUGGLE AGAINST SPLITTISM

Pieter Keuneman

General Secretary Ceylon Communist Party

The Communist Party of Ceylon is a comparatively young party, just over 20 years old, working in the difficult and complicated conditions of a newly-independent Asian state. Although our country is small, the Ceylonese people have played a creditable part in the fight for peace and against colonialism. Ceylon's role in the affairs of the Afro-Asian and the non-aligned states has also been an important one. Recent examples of this role have been Ceylon's initiative, together with other Colombo Powers, to promote a peaceful and negotiated settlement of the Sino-Indian border dispute and its sponsorship of past and forthcoming conferences of no-aligned states. Despite differences on specific questions with its neighbors, like India, Ceylon has maintained a policy of friendship with them and has resisted all attempts to exploit these differences in order to draw her into specifically anti-Indian alignments.

During the past two decades, our Party has upheld Marxism-Leninism and endeavored to apply its scientific teachings to the concrete conditions under which the revolutionary process is developing in Ceylon. We have upheld proletarian internationalism against bourgeois nationalism and racial chauvinism. We have maintained and developed relations of fraternal solidarity with all our brother Marxist-Leninist parties. We have valued highly their assistance to and encouragement of our struggle and have always supported their struggles in every way we could.

Our Party has consistently supported and solidarized itself with the great Chinese revolution and explained its profound significance to our people. We have stood in the van of all the struggles to strnegthen and consolidate the friendly relations between Ceylon and the People's Republic of China. Our relations with the Communist Party of China have always been warm and cordial. Even when we disagreed with specific political positions and actions of our Chinese comrades, we have never permitted this to impair the respect and regard in which we hold the Chinese Communist Party and its achievements.

For all these reasons, we deeply resent and condemn the open support and encouragement that the Chinese press and radio have given and continue to give to a small group of opportunists and renegades in their factional struggle against our Party.

This is not a question of "ideological differences" but gross interference in the internal affairs of a brother party, an impermissible

violation of the norms that regulate relations between fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

Day in and day out, the Communists of Ceylon read and hear the pronouncements of our Chinese comrades about the "equality of all parties, big and small" and against big-power chauvinism. Is it any wonder that we feel deeply grieved and indignant at the support and encouragement that a big and powerful party like the Chinese Communist Party has given to attempts to split a young and small party like ours?

To judge from the statements in the Chiness press and radio, our Party's crime, in the eyes of the Chinese comrades, is the statement of our Central Committee of September 26, 1963, in which we upheld the agreed general line of the international Communist movement evolved at the 1957 and 1960 Meetings of fraternal parties, and expressed our disagreement with the attempts of the Chinese leaders, as witnessed by their letter of June 14, 1963, to the CPSU, to impose on the international Communist movement a unilateral "general line" of their own.

The Central Committee's statement of September 26 was the first public expression by our Party of any disagreement with the Communist Party of China. We had, of course, expressed disagreement with certain positions of the Chinese comrades at the 1960 Meeting of fraternal parties and in personal discussions with responsible representatives of that party. But we refrained from any public comment or polemics. It was only after the Chinese comrades openly challenged the general line of the 1960 Statement, to which our Party was also a signatory, that our Central Committee felt it necessary to make our own position clear in public.

We cannot accept that the September 26 Statement of our Central Committee is any reason for the open encouragement and support that the Chinese comrades have given to those who sought to split our Party. But in point of fact, we are well aware that long before September 26, 1963, the Chinese leaders had established special relations with opportunist and anti-party groups within our Party who, as was discovered subsequently, had conducted a systematic and planned campaign to split our Party.

In its struggle for a correct Marxist-Leninist policy for our country, the Ceylon Communist Party has had to wage a systematic and continuous struggle against both dogmatic "Leftist" and reformist "Rightist" deviations within our Party.

In August 1962 our Central Committee took a historic decision to initiate a campaign for a United Front of the Left parties on the basis of a common agreed program. The establishment of such a United Left Front would enable the working class to rally and lead all other progressive forces in the struggle to complete those tasks of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic stage of the Ceylonese revolution which still remain unaccomplished. But when our Party began to implement this decision, representatives of both the "Left" and "Right" deviations in our Central Committee combined to oppose this. The main spokesmen of these two deviational trends were N. Sanmugathasan and P. Kumarasiri.

This period also coincided with the Caribbean crisis and the outbreak of hostilities on the Sino-Indian border. Our Party was not in agreement with several positions which the Chinese comrades adopted. We did not, however, express these disagreements publicly but concentrated on the positive presentation of our point of view.

It was in these circumstances that the opportunist groups within our Party, who had begun to take the path of anti-party factionalism, embraced the erroneous views that the Chinese comrades were publicly advocating in the internationalist Communist movement.

Without the knowledge of the Party, they set up a clandestine organization called the "Ceylon Marxist Study Circle", which was the nucleus of a rival party that they intended to form. Membership of this "circle" was confined to handpicked members of the Communist Party. A special committee was set up to guide the work of the "circle". A series of lectures were given to members of the "circle" by Sanmugathasan in which the leaders of our Party and other fraternal parties were slandered as revisionists and traitors and an attempt was made to create ideological cohesion among members of the "circle" on the basis of the special views advanced by the Chinese leaders.

The anti-party group also began at this time a surreptitious whispering campaign among Party members and workers, slandering the leadership of the Party and other fraternal paties, principally the CPSU. Special materials were sent from China and Albania. The anti-party group also intensified their opposition to the great campaign for a United Left Front, which was then in full swing, and earned the plaudits and support of the reactionary bourgeois press.

In July 1963, when our Party was celebrating its 20th anniversary, Sanmugathasan attempted another open sortie against the Party. He announced through the medium of the bourgeois press a public lecture on "Marxism-Leninism vs. Modern Revisionism". But he was once again forced to retreat when the Political Bureau ordered him to cancel the lecture and his attempt was condemned by the Party membership. He also withdrew a special article which he had submitted to the bourgeois newspapers without the knowledge or sanction of the Party.

Shortly afterwards, the Central Committee became aware of the existence of the "Ceylon Marxist Study Circle" and other parallel organizations that had been started by the anti-party group. When the Central Committee began to investigate these organizations, the anti-party group panicked and informed the Party that the "circle" had been dissolved.

The activities of Sanmugathasan and the anti-party group were subjected to severe criticism at the Central Committe meeting at the end of August 1963. In order to give them a final opportunity to take a correct path, the Central Committee decided to call an extended session to discuss the differences within the Party and the international Communist movement. This meeting of the Central Committee also decided to summon the 7th Party Congress in April 1964.

The attitude of the anti-party group to the extended session of the

Central Committee showed clearly that they sought merely to delay decisions in order to gain time to perfect their practical preparations for a split. After the failure of an initial attempt to prevent the Central Committee from supporting the conclusion of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, P. Kumarasiri absented himself from all further sittings. Sanmugathasan appeared only to make occasional statements denouncing the Central Committee and other fraternal parties. But none of these tactics could prevent the Central Committee from adopting by an overwhelming majority the statement of September 26, "On Questions of the International Communist Movement".

Although Sanmugathasan and his handful of supporters had the further opportunity to canvass their views during the pre-Congress inner-party discussion and at the 7th Congress itself, they preferred not to do so. Instead they rushed to the bourgeois press with statements denouncing the Central Committee and its decisions and attempted, without success, to organize a revolt in the Party against the Central Committee. Sanmugathasan and Kumarasiri were then served with specific charges of violations of the Party constitution and Rules and given an opportunity to appear before the Central Committee to answer them. They refused to avail themselves of this opportunity, issued statements to the bourgeois press justifying their anti-party factionalism, and were expelled from the Party.

Having failed to organize a revolt in the Party against the Central Committee, the anti-party group proceeded to put into operation the plans to split the Party which had been prepared earlier.

The attempts to set up a new "Communist party" were more elaborate and received the open support of the Chinese comrades.

The first step was to issue on October 27, 1963, a so-called public "reply" to the Central Committee's statement of September 26. Although this reply is said to have been signed by four out of the 25 full members of the Central Committee (including Sanmugathasan and Kumarasiri who had been expelled) and six out of the 10 alternate members, such a signed document was never presented to the Central Committee of the Party. Extracts from it were, however, published in the bourgeois press and the entire "reply" was quoted in full in the Chinese press and radio. It was reprinted in *Peking Review* (November 29) and *Global Digest* (January 1964).

The November 29 issue of *Peking Review* also carried a special article of its own entitled: "Protesting the Revisionist Leadership of the Ceylon Communist Party". This tendentious article, which is full of inaccuracies and mis-statements, glorifies Sanmugathasan, Kumarasiri and other splitters by name and seeks to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party. It describes the disciplinary action taken against Sanmugathasan and Kumarasisi as "unwarranted", accusing the Party leadership of "manipulating" the CC statement of September 26 and brands them as revisionists "parrotting the tone of the CPSU leaders".

It is worth noting that, in all these events, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party never cared to ascertain from our Central Committee what the real position and facts were.

The next step of the anti-party splitters was to hold a secret meeting on November 17, 1963. Eighty-five persons were present, including persons who were not members of the Communist Party and persons who had been expelled from the Party at various times for factional activities. P. Kumarasiri made the main report where he stressed the need to set up a new party. Sanmugathasan gave a report on the organizational steps that should be undertaken. The meeting issued an appeal addressed, "To All Marxist-Leninists Inside the Ceylon Communist Party". The substance of this appeal was to split the Party and set up a parallel "Communist Party".

This appeal for a split of our Party was also given wide publicity in the Chinese press and radio. It was reprinted in full by *Peking Review* (December 13), together with a report of the meeting.

In the face of this open call for a split, the Central Committee and the membership of the Party rallied to protect the unity of the Party. The Central Committee called district meetings of all members of the Party where the record, conduct and aims of the anti-party splitters were exposed. These district meetings of Party members passed resolutions condemning the splitters and supporting the actions taken against them by the Central Committee. The Central Committee expelled those members who had joined with the anti-party group and the Party branches took action to remove the others from membership of the Party.

The Central Committee of the Federation of Communist and Progressive Youth Leagues of Ceylon took similar action to rally the communist youth in support of the Party and against the splitters.

Our Party did not confine our struggle against the splitters to the members of the Party and the youth leagues. We took the issue to the masses, especially the working class. We organized many discussions and public lectures and innumerable meetings at factory gates and workplaces where the aims of the splitters were exposed concretely in relation to their actual disruption of the mass movement in Ceylon.

The anti-party group led by Sanmugathasan suffered a big and rapid defeat in the trade unions as well.

Workers in factory after factory and in innumerable plantations and other workplaces held meetings of protest, condemning Sanmugathasan and his co-conspirators and affirming their support for the Communist Party and the United Left Front.

As a result, when the anti-party splitters held their so-called "7th Congress" in January 1964 and set up their split-away, parallel "party", they cut no ice among the working people. Even the reactionary bourgeois press, which had earlier given these splitters tremendous encouragement and support, felt that they were backing a losing cause. In point of fact, this so-called "7th Congress" of the splitters received more attention in China than it did in Ceylon.

The struggle against the anti-party splitters' group, who would long ago have disappeared altogether from the political scene were it not for the support they receive from China and from domestic reactionary circles, continues and registers new victories every day. The special sessions of the Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions on

March 6 and 7, 1964 and the real 7th Congress of the Ceylon Communist Party on April 16-19, 1964 will be further landmarks in this struggle.

The Chinese press and radio have sought to depict the anti-party splitters' group as "genuine revolutionaries" and "heroic fighters" for Marxist-Leninist principles. But the Ceylonese Communists are well aware of the histories of the persons concerned and their despicable methods.

How can Ceylonese Communists take seriously the claim of this unprincipled gang to be considered as "genuine revolutionaries" when we know that Kumarasiri, the "general secretary" of the new "Party", was one of the main spokesmen in our Party for a reactionary policy of class collaboration and subordination of the Party to the national bourgeoisie, a man who used to boast openly that he had opposed all strikes and mass struggles since 1956? Do the Chinese leaders expect any Ceylonese Communist to regard D. Jinendrapala, the "Assistant National Organizer" of the new "party", as a "heroic fighter" when we all know that he decided to become a "genuine Marxist-Leninist" only after a Party commission had found him guilty of financial irregularities? It seems to us that the Chinese comrades do not mind what stick they pick up to beat those who do not agree with them.

The neo-Trotskyite positions of the anti-party group are also extremely striking. They prate about the "return to capitalism" in the U.S.S.R. and other familiar Trotskyite slanders.

In the history of our movement, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, operating under Trotskyite slogans, was used to split the united left movement in 1940. Since then our Party has waged a long and successful struggle to defeat anti-communism and anti-Sovietism as a basis of reuniting the left movement. The formation of the United Left Front in August 1963 was a signal victory in this struggle. And it is just when the unity of the Left movement has again been established that this renegade groupe once again seeks to split the movement, operating under neo-Trotskyite slogans.

Indeed, it is a striking feature of the political situation in Ceylon that many of the erroneous political positions of the Chinese comrades have become a common weapon of factional groups in all Left parties of the country.

In the fight against the splitters and their supporters, our Party has acquired many useful experiences. Our experience has confirmed Lenin's teachings that dogmatic ultra-leftism mainly attracts the petit-bourgeoisie and has little or no support among the workers. We have seen in practice how the Left-deviators and the Right-capitulationists feed each other and unite. We have seen the connections between dogmatism and opportunism.

Another important lesson that we have learnt is the need to pay great attention to the social composition of the membership of the Party, to strengthen continuously membership from among the working class. This is especially so in countries like ours where petty-commodity production and semi-feudal relations are strong.

In conducting the struggle against splittism, our experience has

shown that it is necessary to wage an offensive struggle and not submit to the blackmail of the splitters, to expose the real aims of the splitters to the widest masses, to show them what dogmatic and splitting policies mean in practice for their own struggles. We have also learnt that a successful struggle against splittism should be linked with the struggle to build the widest unity of the masses in the fight for their vital interests.

The anti-party group and their supporters hoped to weaken our Party. But the opposite has happened in practice. The Party has been strengthened by purging itself of opportunist and corrupt elements and in the mass fight against the splitters our ties with the working class and the broad masses have also been greatly strengthened.

REPORT AT 17TH CONGRESS, COMMUNIST PARTY OF LUXEMBOURG*

(Abridged)

D. Urbany

Our last congress met during the Christmas holidays in 1960. Since then there has been no change of government, although in some respects the situation with which they, and, for that matter, we, have to reckon is no longer what it was then.

The disillusionment of the population in general with the policy of the Christian-Liberal coalition, which has proved insolvent, reactionary and clearly pro-capitalist, is perhaps even greater than its disillusionment with the militarist and anti-communist policy of the preceding Christian-Socialist coalition.

This disillusionment stems from the developments underway throughout the world and in our own country, developments which are asserting themselves more and more and can hardly be welcomed by our reactionary "European" circles. The cold-war climate, to which the anti-popular activities of the reactionary forces in the Western countries were geared for years, is being slowly but steadily dispelled. The consistent peace policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is bearing fruit. The idea of peaceful coexistence is reaching ever broader sections of the people in the capitalist world. The growing difficulties and controversies in the NATO camp, the signal successes of the movement for independence in the former colonial and semi-colonial countries, the steady growth of the economic and political strength of the socialist camp and especially the Soviet Union, and the progress made by the Communist, democratic and peace-loving forces in the capitalist countries– all this is increasingly undermining the influence and weight of the warmongers and ultras generally in our countries, tying their hands and forcing the reactionary monopoly capitalists and their placemen in the governments to resort to all manner of defensive manoeuvres and compromises.

The eradication of the personality cult and other non-democratic and non-Marxist Stalinist deviations in the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties, including the Communist Party of Luxembourg, the restoration of the principles and precepts of Marxism-Leninism, all of which is aimed at ensuring peace and uniting all the progressive and anti-imperialist forces against our main enemy — monopoly capital — have given new strength to the world Communist movement and the peace movement. This augurs new victories for socialism and the common emancipation movement of the peoples.

*From **Zeitung Vüm Letzeburger Vollek,** April 7, 1964.

ON THE CORRECT PATH

There is no doubt that our Party owes its successes to its loyal adherence to the decisions of the Moscow meetings of the Communist parties and to the fact that it drew the right conclusions from the lessons of 20th Congress of the CPSU for our Party work in general and our inner-party life in particular.

Today we stand in closer unity than ever with the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties of the world in support of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the dynamics of the balance of forces in the world generally and in the Western capitalist countries in particular create a real possibility of preventing a new world war, a nuclear clash between East and West which would spell death and destruction for many countries and nations, and especially for our small country; that it is possible not only to ensure peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two systems but also to create through them more favorable conditions for the world-wide victory of socialism; that the defense of peace is the most pressing and important task of the day. Because of this we support the initiatives of the Soviet Union in this direction, for example, the Moscow test-ban treaty, and resolutely reject the adventuristic policy of the Chinese Communists which is aimed at sabotaging this policy of peace. We also subscribe to the conclusion that the ways leading to socialism may differ, that the struggle of the working class and the peoples cannot be fitted into the same stereotyped pattern everywhere, and that, due to their specific conditions, the possibility of transition to socialism without civil war is present or maturing in some countries. This applies also to our country, to our people, who have deep-seated democratic and parliamentary traditions. The working class constitutes the majority of our population. Our working people are in a position to foil any attempt by our reactionaries to resort to dictatorship and terror; they are in a position to implement by democratic means measures putting an end to the rule of monopoly capital and leading to socialism. All this, of course, will not happen of itself; the way to this lies through bitter and unceasing social and political clashes with big capital, with the reactionaries.

The leading role in this process belong to the working class. But success can be achieved only in cooperation with the other sections of the working people and their organizations, through joint action by all progressive and forward-looking parties, primarily the Communists and Socialists. Hence we hold that the one-party system and one-party government are not necessarily prerequisites of socialism and working-class rule.

SECTARIANS AND ADVENTURISTS HAVE NO FUTURE

Our views are diametrically opposed to the interpretations given by the leadership of the Communist Party of China to the decisions of the Moscow meetings, interpretations which bear more and more unmistakably the stamp of chauvinism and political adventurism.

It is regrettable that leading Chinese Communists are conducting

what they claim to be an ideological polemic with the other Communist parties on these questions by totally non-Marxist and undemocratic methods aimed at splitting the world Communist movement. They have begun openly and provocatively to undermine the solidarity of the socialist camp, viciously attacking the Soviet Union and organizing subversive factional activities in the other Communist parties.

Such attempts have been made in our country too, though with negligible results. Only one comrade has found it fit to circulate the propaganda materials of the Chinese Party. So long as this was a matter of propaganda about construction, cultural and other endeavors in China there was nothing reprehensible in it, for we remain the friends of the Chinese people. But for some time now these journals, pamphlets and bulletins have contained increasingly malicious and slanderous articles against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist parties, voicing views completely at variance with the political line of our Party. More, the above-mentioned comrade has latterly gone over to spreading vicious accusations against individual comrades in the Party leadership and sabotaging our Party work. Suffice it to mention one example of his subversive activity. You know how difficult it is for us to put up 27 candidates in the capital. But when he was asked to run in the elections on our ticket, he not only refused but tried to persuade other comrades to refuse in the hope of being able to prevent our Party from scoring an electoral success in the capital. These speculations — his and our opponents completely failed.

Needless to say, such factional activity causing damage to the Party cannot be tolerated in a Communist Party. We must do everything in our power to ensure the unity and solidarity of our Party. In view of this our Central Committee, at its meeting held on March 2, in Esch, unanimously expelled this comrade from the Party for "persistent gross violation of the line and rules of our Party".

Expulsion of comrades who have turned into open enemies of the Party is, of course, not enough. It is necessary to make sure that our comrades, our Party and the people are absolutely clear on all the problems arising from the dogmatic and disruptive activities of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party. Therefore we join with other parties in welcoming the fact that the idea of another international meeting is close to realization; we feel that it should not be put off. We likewise welcome the publication of the report by M. A. Suslov on "The Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement". We are in full agreement with the conclusions of this report which refute the groundless theories of the Chinese Party leaders and expose their true motives which run counter to the interests of the international Communist movement.

THE WAY TO SOCIALISM IN CONDITIONS OF PEACE, FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY AND NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF LUXEMBOURG ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE 17th CONGRESS OF THE CPL IN DIFFERDINGEN ON APRIL 5, 1964*

The Communist Party of Luxembourg, founded on January 2, 1921, considers its aim to be the replacement in Luxembourg of the existing capitalist society by socialist society. It is a Marxist-Leninist Party, its program, activity and organization being founded on the principles of scientific socialism elaborated by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin.

Marxism-Leninism holds:

1. that the capitalist system, owing to its inherent and insurmountable contradictions, especially since the time when it reached the stage of imperialism (monopoly rule), has *chained* human progress (the unleashing of the two world wars, the establishment of fascist dictatorships, colonial and national oppression, chronic mass unemployment, malnutrition of a half of the world's population, periodic and disastrous economic crises, the wasting of the national income for the arms race and war preparations, the constant generation of new sources of war danger, etc.) and that therefore the abolition of this obsolete system and its replacement by socialism, i.e., the transformation of capitalist private ownership of the basic means of production (mines, factories, banks) into state and people's owner ship, has become a pressing historical necessity. Socialism alone can ensure the full utilization of modern productive forces and their further development and planned organization on an international and world-wide scale, and thereby guarantee forever social security, peace, freedom, a decent life and cultural development to the whole of mankind. The victorious socialist construction in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries proves that socialism, as a socio-economic system, is not only *possible* but is *superior* to capitalism;

2. that capitalism does not automatically grow over into socialism, but that the working class in alliance with other sections of the working population should win political (state) power in order gradually to transform the capitalist means of production into public (commonly-owned) property and replace the capitalist economy based on profit-seeking by a socialist planned economy which will meet man's requirements, and that therefore it is the imperative task of the working class in each country to build a strong, purposeful and

*Published in **Zeitung Vüm Letzenburger Vollek,** April 11, 1964.

disciplined party which *leads* the masses in the struggle for state power. The Communist Party of Luxembourg is this type of party. It unites in its ranks the more forward-looking workers, intellectuals, peasants, representatives of the middle sections, etc., who are prepared to fight for socialism.

True to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, brilliantly confirmed by history, the Communist Party of Luxembourg rejects all forms of revisionism and dogmatism.

Revisionism, represented mainly by the Right-wing leaders of the Socialist parties, denies the true nature of monopoly capitalism ("people's capitalism") and the trends of its development, and is seeking to replace the class struggle by conciliation with monopoly capitalism ("social partnership") with a view to preserving the existing state of affairs and limiting the demands of the working class to purely economic objectives. It turns the working people into an appendage drifting in the backwash of monopoly capitalism and its international economic, political and military bodies (European Coal and Steel Community, NATO, etc.).

Dogmatism, on the contrary, denies the need always to take cognizance of the advance of science and the march of history, and always to bring the theory and practice of the working-class movement in line with the changed conditions. Ostensibly revolutionary, dogmatism, in the shape in which it is today practiced by the leaders of the Communist Party of China, isolates the Party from the masses and creates the danger of sectarianism and political adventurism.

The changes, which have occurred in recent years in the balance of forces between socialism and capitalism, have enriched the theory and practice of the Marxist-Leninist working-class movement with new experience and new conclusions. The socialist system has become firmly and completely established in one-third of the world with a population of a thousand million people, which was largely due to the successes of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Socialism is increasingly becoming the determining factor of world politics. Today it possesses such economic, political, military and moral power that there exists the real possibility to prevent imperialism from unleashing another world war and *impose* upon capitalism peaceful competition with socialism. Preservation of world peace and the state of peaceful coexistence and competition, due mainly to the growing prestige and superiority of socialism, create new, more favourable conditions both for the struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries and for the struggle of the oppressed peoples. For this reason it will be possible to achieve socialism without a violent revolution and civil war in many countries, especially those with a strong working class and developed democratic traditions. The Communist Party of Luxembourg is confident that this is also possible in our country.

The Communist Party of Luxembourg is a *democratic* party. It is working to win over the majority of the people through propaganda and persuasion, and mainly by selflessly upholding *all* the demands of the people and the country. In view of the fact that our people have rich democratic and parliamentary traditions, the democratic-

parliamentary form of the state in Luxembourg can be the suitable foundation on which the working class will come to power and build socialism. The condition of this bloodless road to socialism is the close alliance of all working classes and sections under the leadership of the proletariat, the combination of the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary forms of struggle, and firm determination on the part of the people to nip in the bud all reactionary attempts to curb or abolish democracy and to resist socialist legality with either force or sabotage. The democratic road to socialism, too, lies through constant and bitter social and political struggles against the forces of the old, moribund system. The existing democratic institutions, rights and liberties must be extended, improved and developed already today. Parliament must become a truly sovereign legislative and executive organ of the people.

The Communist Party of Luxembourg is a *national* party. Both today, in the conditions of capitalism, and in the future socialist society it comes out for the preservation of complete national sovereignty, acting on the principle: "Luxembourg for the Luxembourgians". National sovereignty is the foundation on which the people of Luxembourg will build a socialist system and will regulate, freely and independently, their relations with other states on the basis of equality and fraternal cooperation.

The Communist Party of Luxembourg is at the same time a party of proletarian *internationalism*. It is free and independent in adopting decisions concerning its own activity and its own program, but it is conducting its struggle in friendly contact with the Communists and working people, democrats and peace supporters of all countries, true to the slogan formulated in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848: "Workers of All Lands, Unite!" The Communist Party of Luxembourg is working tirelessly for the preservation of the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the decisions jointly adopted by the Communist and Workers' parties. This international friendship, particularly with the Soviet Union, is the best guarantee of our security and national co-operation in building socialism in our country and securing world peace. Hence the national and international positions of our Party complement and condition each other. Our Party rejects all forms and manifestations of national chauvinism and racialism. It expresses its complete solidarity with the peoples who are still fighting against the colonial and semi-colonial yoke and against fascist and racial oppression.

In the spirit of the principles of Marxism-Leninism generally and the decisions of the 1960 Moscow Meetings of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, which it helped actively to draft and which it approved, the Communist Party of Luxembourg is following *its own* road to socialism, a road which corresponds to the experience and traditions of the people of Luxembourg and the conditions obtaining in the country. This means, in particular, that:

1. The Communist Party of Luxembourg is working perseveringly for the restoration of the political and trade-union unity of the Luxembourg working class, realizing, however, that this unity cannot be achieved by any artificial, and still less by dictatorial, means, and

that it must develop from the experience and voluntary decision of the workers themselves. It is quite possible that the building and victory of socialism will be achieved in fraternal union between the Communist Party and the other parties and organizations of the working class and the small and medium producers. Therefore the Communist Party rejects the idea of a one-party system and one-party state in Luxembourg because it is convinced that this idea does not correspond to the conditions and traditions in Luxembourg.

2. The small and medium producers (peasants, wine-growers, handicraftsmen, small and medium manufacturers) are still playing an important and useful role in the economic life of our country, and will continue to perform it under socialism. The Communist Party comes out in defense, and for assisting, the individual or family enterprise founded on the personal labor of its owner, and also in defense and for the right of inheritance of private property acquired by labor and personal savings. The transition of the small and medium-sized enterprises to a higher form of co-operative property can take place only on the basis of their good will and material advantage.

3.The Communists respect the religious feelings of their compatriots. They stand for the freedom of religious and other conscientious activity, in the spirit of tolerance and mutual respect, as well as for the freedom of scientific research and creative endeavour.

Socialism means neither rigorism nor anarchy. For the people of Luxembourg it will create the material prerequisites for free development of the abilities and talents of man, for higher social ethics which will no longer be founded on the exploitation of man by man, but will proceed from the premise that labor is a source not of enrichment for the few but of prosperity and a better, truly human life for all. Thanks to the unprecedented increase of labor productivity achieved with the help of the socialist organization of the economy and science, humanity will advance from socialism to communist society where there will be no material worries, with the working time reduced to the minimum and the last armaments dumped into the sea, where the peoples of the world will live in one close-knit family and where state coercion will wither away. It is only with the advent of communism that the true history of mankind will have begun. To be a member of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, whose program rests on the ideas of the greatest thinkers of all mankind and on the experience of the heroic battles of the international working class, a program which at once absorbs and furthers the finest national and democratic traditions of our people, is both an honour and obligation for each class-conscious worker, each progressive and, last but not least, for each intellectual who is aware of his responsibility to this country.

* * *

Never losing sight of its great ultimate aim, the Party is persistently and perseveringly upholding the immediate demands and interests of the working people, the satisfaction of all their material, social

and cultural needs. In so doing, it centres its attention on those demands and reforms which can create the best conditions for the advance to socialism: the preservation of peace and our independence, complete restoration of our national sovereignty, extension of the political, trade-union and economic rights of the working people, curbing the power of Big Business, the right of the working people to control and have a say in the management of the enterprises, in the economy and the state, and the building of the broad united front of all social, democratic and national forces, regardless of party affiliation and world outlook, against the main enemy of the people of Luxembourg as represented by international monopoly capital.

Each Communist is duty bound to uphold in the day-to-day struggle the demands, both big and small, advanced by the working people and their organizations (trade unions, etc.) and be active and exemplary in other progressive mass organizations, while respecting their particular status and discipline.

FOR UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP

A *TRIBUNA LUDU* EDITORIAL

Comrade M. A. Suslov's report to the February Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, made public a few days ago, is an immensely important document. The response to it was world-wide, especially among the Communist and Workers' parties. The report makes an exhaustive examination of the substance of the differences between the Communist Party of China, on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist parties, on the other.

The CPC leaders have ignored the repeated appeals of the CPSU, of our Party and many other Communist parties to end the public polemics. Their endless, increasingly sharp and unusually rude attacks on the policy and ideological positions of the CPSU and the Soviet government have put the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a position where it was forced to publish materials demonstrating the substance of the differences in the world Communist movement.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU levelled strong criticism at the irresponsible conduct of the CPC leaders. It approved the stand of the Presidium of the CC and of Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, and instructed the Presidium of the CC to preserve in upholding the general line of the world Communist movement and to work for the strengthening of the unity of the revolutionary forces.

At their Meetings in 1957 and 1960, the Communist and Workers' parties worked out a common general line of struggle for peace, socialism and the freedom of the peoples. They also worked out the principles of co-operation and solidarity that unite all the Marxist-Leninist parties. This line, jointly framed in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings, is being consistently followed by the world Communist movement. The Polish United Workers' Party, too, takes guidance from it in all its activities. In the meantime, throughout the past few years, the CPC departed more and more from this jointly elaborated platform, attacked the policy of the CPSU and other Leninist parties with increasing ferocity, and worked out its own, special course of action.

The CPC leaders assaulted the basic idea of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which revealed to mankind the possibility of avoiding a military disaster in our epoch and became the cornerstone in the restoration of the Leninist principles governing relations between Communist parties and socialist states. The CPC leaders attacked the jointly framed foundations of Marxist-Leninist theory, strategy

and tactics on the questions of war and peace, on the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, on the national-liberation movement, on socialist democracy, on trends of development for the socialist countries, on the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement, and on a number of other problems.

The CPC launched out on a campaign, accusing the CPSU and some other parties of revisionism, loss of revolutionary perspective, treason and surrender to imperialism, and flirting with imperialism.

Time and again, our Party made clear its critical attitude to the CPC line, and its complete solidarity with the ideological position of the CPSU and the foreign policy of the USSR. At this crucial juncture, too, our Party reaffirms this solidarity most emphatically.

Our Party fully shares the opinion that the most important task of the working-class movement and the socialist camp at the present time is to avert a thermonuclear war and that in view of the contemporary relation of world forces there exists a possibility of preventing a world war even before the final victory of socialism, and that the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence constitutes, and must constitute, the underlying principle of the foreign policy of the socialist states in their relations with the capitalist countries.

Our Party rejects as unfounded and inconsistent with historical experience, the contention that contradictions exist between the struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism and national liberation. Far from retarding and complicating the class and national-liberation struggles, the struggle for peace helps to develop them more widely and effectively, and creates favorable conditions for their victory. The peace banner held aloft by the socialist forces unites the masses and rallies them to the struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism and reaction.

Ending the arms drive and effecting partial agreements that may facilitate an early general and complete disarmament, is a composite part of the policy of peaceful coexistence. We reject the view disseminated by the Chinese leaders that disarmament is an illusory slogan that only misleads the people. If we were to abandon the struggle against the arms drive, we would only be grinding the imperialist axe, for it is the imperialists who are organizing and expanding the armaments race.

Our Party considers the efforts to achieve reasonable compromises with the capitalist countries in behalf of peace and a relaxation of tension to be correct and consistent with the interests of socialism. We hailed the Moscow Treaty on the partial banning of nuclear tests. Furthermore, we reject as groundless, the attacks made on the CPSU and the Soviet government for their striving to improve relations with the United States, seeing that such an improvement has a fundamental bearing on the relaxation of international tension.

Their aggressive criticism by no means deters the CPC leaders from seeking compromise and agreement with imperialist countries whenever this involves China's immediate political interests, and they have no scruples about the way they do it.

By subordinating ideology to their current foreign-policy aims,

they have lately created a theory about a so-called intermediate (non-imperialist) zone, in which, along with the newly-free countires, they include such lands of monopoly capital as France, Britain, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany.

At the present time the struggle for socialism depends largely on the outcome of the competition between the two systems. In the final analysis, the peoples will choose the social system ensuring them a rapid rate of economic growth, a higher living standard, and enduring peace. The economic achievements of the socialist countries serve to stimulate the working-class struggle in the capitalist countries and the struggle of the peoples for complete liberation from colonial and neo-colonialist domination.

It is only by the common efforts of the world socialist system, the working-class movement and the national-liberation movement that we can achieve victory over imperialism, and, to be sure, the chief place in this struggle falls to the world socialist system. This is the reason why our Party opposes the policy of the Chinese leaders who are seeking to counterpose the national-liberation movement to the socialist system and to the working-class movement in the capitalist countries.

The socialist countries consider it their duty not only to support the peoples fighting against imperialism, but also to develop economic co-operation with the newly-independent countries and to give them every kind of fraternal assistance to consolidate their independence and self-sufficiency.

It is the main purpose of socialist construction to secure an all-round development of the productive forces and an improvement in the living conditions of the working people. The Chinese leaders, on the other hand, consider the efforts to continuously improve living conditions as a "petty-bourgeois" departure, or even as "restoration of capitalism" in the USSR and other socialist countries. The accusation that the CPSU is restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union is to be classed under the same head as the accusation once made by Professor Revilo Oliviera (of the notorious John Birch Society) that President Kennedy and the American government were conspiring to surrender the United States to international communism.

Our Party considers the development mapped out by the CPSU in its Program and approved by the 22nd Congress, to be entirely correct. Also, our Party supports the struggle which the CPSU has been waging ever since the 20th Congress against the personality cult and for the development of socialist democracy. A society in which violence is idealized and democracy restricted, in which the personality cult flourishes and the needs of the masses are ignored, cannot be a model of socialist society.

As in the aforesaid questions, which are of fundamental import for the strategy and tactics of the socialist countries and the working-class movement, the CPC is departing more and more from the jointly framed positions and slipping to positions of sectarianism and dogmatism in many other important problems. This is evidenced by the large number of articles written in a coarse tongue and insufferable in the relations between Communist parties and socialist

countries. This applies particularly to the attacks on the CPSU leadership, on Comrade N. S. Khrushchov.

Our Party has come out strongly for the ending of public polemics, which it believes to be extremely injurious to the socialist camp, to all the Communist parties, and to the forces of progress and socialism throughout the world. These polemics are a violation of the fundamental principle set forth in the 1960 Statement, which requires that all Communist and Workers' parties act in solidarity and unity with regard to imperialism, that the socialist countries carry through the jointly adopted foreign policy, and that the Communist parties pursue their jointly framed strategy.

Each Party handles its domestic problems on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles in conformance with the conditions and requirements of its country, and is responsible first and foremost to its own working class and its people. At the same time, each Party is responsible to the world Communist movement as a whole for the common cause of socialism and peace. No party should oppose the narrowly-conceived interests of its own country to the interests of the socialist community of peoples, and of the Communist movement as a whole. A policy that under-rates historical and common interests and over-rates narrowly-conceived goals and transient interests, tends to weaken the world positions of the Communist movement and jeopardizes the vital interests of each socialist country.

The CPC leaders have gone against these principles. Not only have they turned down the proposals to end the polemics, but have, under the pretext of struggle with so-called modern revisionism, set out to create factions and groups in individual Communist parties and taken action to disrupt the unity of the world Communist movement. That sort of activity calls for the most severe and determined condemnation, since it is aimed against the unity of the basic forces of the world anti-imperialist front, the socialist camp, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement.

The CPC leaders have also embarked on disruptive activities in the international organizations of the peace movement, and in trade union, youth, women's and other democratic bodies. The practical steps of the CPC leaders, who are turning these organizations into a battlefield against other Communist parties, are extremely harmful. This, in effect, narrows the possibilities of democratic world organizations.

The unity of the international working-class movement and of the socialist camp is very greatly imperilled. Unity of our movement and cohesion of the socialist countries is one of the basic sources of our strength and the position we now hold in the world. This unity has always been, and remains, an essential condition for the solution of the basic problems of peace, of the victory of socialism and of the national liberation of the oppressed peoples. It is the common duty of the socialist countries and Communist parties to cement this unity in every way and in all fields. None but the imperialists can gain from a deterioration or disruption of this unity.

Today practically all the centres of the imperialist world are making capital out of the differences in our movement. They hope that

these differences will retard the revolutionary process in the world, and suit their actions to this goal. It is the duty of all the Communist parties and all revolutionary forces to come out against this danger and to do their utmost to cement the world Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Particularly great harm is done by irresponsible charges of treason, capitulation, flirting with imperialism, and by all other attempts at "excommunicating" the Marxist parties.

That the working-class movement has a common historical goal constitutes an enduring foundation for its unity. It is essential to work out, through mutual consultation such principles of policy as would guarantee joint action and solidarity on issues of crucial importance for the whole of our movement, with full observance of the equality and independence of individual parties and socialist countries.

International unity of the Communist movement, which is the source of its strength and influence in the world, must be restored and strengthened through adherence to Leninist principles. In common with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, our Party will work tirelessly for the solidarity of the world Communist movement and the unity of the socialist community of nations.

WE EMPHATICALLY CONDEMN THE ANTI-MARXIST POLICY OF THE CPC LEADERSHIP

*Speech by A. Novotny**

Our Party is following with grave concern the policy of the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the Government of the Chinese People's Republic, which in the past four years has been sharply at variance with the norms governing relations between fraternal parties and the conclusions set forth in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings of Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960. The situation has lately sharply deteriorated when in their speeches, statements, official articles and propaganda by radio as well as through the activity of diplomatic representatives the leaders of the Communist Party of China began openly striking at the international unity of the Communist movement with the object of sowing discord and splitting its ranks.

Numerous facts show that the leadership of the Communist Party of China is openly seeking to split some Communist Parties in Asia, Latin America and Europe and supporting the anti-Party splinter groups in them which threaten and undermine the political unity of these parties and their unity of action in the struggle against imperialism.

The attacks of the CPC leadership are spearheaded mainly against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Leninist leadership, whom Chinese propaganda is calling "revisionist" and a "sworn enemy" of the revolutionary Communist movement. With unheard-of impudence it accuses the CPSU and the Soviet Union of "brotherhood-in-arms" with the U.S. imperialists. This is alleged because the Soviet Union has signed the partial test-ban treaty, which in the distorted view of the Chinese leaders is some sort of "conspiracy against all countries" and, according to their fantastic notions, the outcome of a situation where allegedly "capitalist forces" are beginning to speak out in the Soviet Union.

They say the same about other socialist countries, where the high living standard is allegedly pushing the policy of the Communist parties away from class positions. On February 4, 1964, *Jenminjihpao*, the central organ of the Communist Party of China, demanded a split in the Communist movement, and the monstrous accusations and insults that it hurled against the CC, CPSU and the Soviet Government have had no parallel in the history of the Communist movement since the attacks made by Trotsky against Lenin and the

*Speech at a regional conference of Communists of Central Slovakia. Published in **Rude Pravo** on April 7, 1964.

Leninist policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the twenties.

It is not without interest to note that when they began their talks with the de Gaulle Government, the CPC leaders, who love to boast of their "revolutionary" Communist principles, suddenly retreated from these principles. Naturally, we welcome the establishment of diplomatic relations between France and China because it signifies progress in the development of peaceful relations between countries and upsets the U.S.A.'s reactionary and absolutely unrealistic and senseless concept of China's international isolation.

However, the way this is handled by Chinese propaganda evokes nothing but surprise. Early last year the Chinese leaders vigorously attacked the French comrades, accusing them of slackly struggling against the imperialist and colonialist policy of the de Gaulle Government. But on January 21, 1964, following the establishment of diplomatic relations, the *Jenminjihpao* unhesitatingly associated de Gaullist France with the anti-imperialist front of all countries and excluded from it the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for having principled reservations with regard to the non-Leninist views of the Chinese leaders. At the same time, using some of the statements of the British Prime Minister Douglas Home and the West-German Chancellor Erhard directed against the U.S.A., the newspaper made it understood that these imperialist powers can play the role of an anti-U.S. force.

There even are signs at present that in the future it will supposedly be possible to count on a London-Paris-Peking-Tokyo line directed against both the U.S. and the Soviet Union. These reports are being circulated, nobody in China is denying them and it seems that they are not distasteful to the Chinese leaders.

As we all know, the CPSU, our Party and other fraternal parties occupied a restrained positions with regard to the attacks of the CPC leadership and in the autumn of last year repeatedly called upon the Chinese leaders to stop open polemics. Recently the CC, CPSU took the initiative in proposing to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China a number of measures aimed at expanding economic and trade co-operation and ensuring unity of action in international democratic organizations and at talks on important international issues. But all this was ignored despite the fact that the CC, CPSU and the other fraternal parties that supported this initiative of the Soviet comrades took this step in the expectation that in the interests of the unity of the international Communist movement the Chinese leaders would stop their attacks and deprive the imperialists of further opportunities of utilizing the differences between the Chinese Communists and the international Communist movement for their own purpose. Regretfully, this did not happen. On the contrary, the Chinese leaders have lately become even more vehement in their attacks.

As you all know, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sat in plenary session early in February and, among other things, discussed the attacks of the CPC leaders against the leadership of the CPSU and the over-all activities of the Chinese

leaders aimed at splitting the unity of the international Communist movement. A report, which was published a few days ago, was made by Comrade Suslov.

Our Party's Central Committee is in full agreement with the analysis made by the CC, CPSU, which gave an accurate and objective assessment of the harmful and adventurist policy that the Chinese leaders are aspiring to impose upon the international Communist movement to replace the Leninist platform that was approved in the documents of the international Meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties in Moscow in 1957 and 1960. We fully subscribe to the criticism levelled by the CC, CPSU at the profoundly erroneous views of the Chinese leaders and their factional activity in the Communist movement. We endorse the efforts the CPSU is making to strengthen the international unity of all Marxist-Leninist parties and surmount the differences between the CPC and the international Communist movement.

We declare that this stand of the CC, CPSU fully concurs with the stand taken by our Party, and we consider that it is the only correct policy and that it harmonizes with the principles of Leninist tactics and strategy, with the interests of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. We consider that it promotes the further unity and solidarity of the international working-class movement in complete conformity with the conclusions of the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960.

A public statement on the position with regard to the moves of the Chinese leaders was inevitable and necessary because in the past few weeks they have not only rejected all proposals for stopping open polemics but also gave full rein to their splitting activities. Further testimony of the fact that the CPC leadership is steering towards a split in the unity of the international Communist movement is contained in an article carried by the *Jenminjihpao* on March 31, 1964. In addition to venomously attacking the CPSU, the newspaper slanders our Party and grossly distorts the policy it has been following since 1945. This newspaper misrepresents the course of events in our country, trying to prove that in February 1948 the working class seized power not by peaceful means but by force. Regretfully, in the past 16 years the same slander has been spread about our February events by reactionary imperialist propaganda. It goes without saying that we shall give the Chinese leaders a fitting reply to this lie whenever we find it necessary. Moreover, we shall give our principled judgment of the demand, formulated openly for the first time by the Chinese leaders, who consider it necessary to change the wording of the Moscow Statement on the ways of transition to socialism and revise its "weak points and mistakes".

At the same time, in the past few weeks the Chinese leaders have stepped up their splitting activity at meetings of international democratic organizations. This is shown by their actions at the recent sittings of the executive bodies of the World Student Union in Budapest, the World Peace Council in Warsaw, the World Federation of Trade Unions in Sofia and at the meeting of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization in Algiers.

In the interests of the international unity of the Communist movement it is therefore necessary to wage a determined struggle in defense of its Leninist policy, and the Chinese leaders must be given to understand that the majority of fraternal parties condemn their perniciously harmful policy and that any rapprochement is possible only on the condition that they recognize and observe the principles and conclusions recorded in the documents of the Meetings of representatives of 81 Communist and Workers' parties in 1960. This is the only way a rebuff can be given to the Trotskyite, sectarian aspirations of the CPC leaders to isolate the Soviet Union and the socialist countries from the national liberation movement, and their attempts to place the internationalist policy of the Soviet Union on the same level as the imperialist policy of the United States of America and to tie up a split in the Communist movement with their claims that Peking should become the new centre of the international Communist movement and the centre of the national liberation movement of Africa, Asia and Latin America. At the same time, every effort must be made to prepare the ground for a new international conference of Communist parties (it would be best if it could be held this year), which would uphold and strengthen the united position of all Marxist-Leninist parties in the struggle against any attempts to launch upon international factional activity.

Such is the stand taken by our Party and by tens of other fraternal parties, which are not for a moment relaxing their efforts to make the leaders of the Communist Party of China occupy a correspondingly Communist stand. The fraternal parties, including our Party, will therefore always wage a determined struggle for what is the most sacred and cardinal duty of all Communists—for ideological and effective unity, for the revolutionary militant solidarity of all fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and socialist countries in the world struggle for peace and communism, for the freedom of the peoples.

* * *

Naturally, Antonin Novotny said, we cannot hide the fact that the splitting policy of the CPC leadership not only weakens the unity of the international Communist movement but also dangerously plays into the hands of the imperialist circles in their struggle against the socialist countries.

We are living, Antonin Novotny emphasized, in a period of a great ideological clash, which reflects the international class struggle between capitalism and socialism, between the forces of reaction and progress. This makes it our duty to know where our place is, firmly to uphold and vigorously champion the stand of the Party, the positions of socialism, and through the policy of peaceful coexistence to spread the truth about the achievements of socialism throughout the world.

FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

EDITORIAL IN *NEUES DEUTSCHLAND**

The Fifth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, held from February 3 to 7, 1964, stated once again the attitude of the SUPG to the activity of the leadership of the Communist Party of China directed against the unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement, against Marxism-Leninism, and against the documents collectively adopted by the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960. It unanimously approved the report of the Political Bureau, which indignantly condemns the CPC leaders' disruptive activity and anti-Leninist views, reaffirms the unbreakable bonds between the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the CPSU and its Central Committee headed by Comrade N.S. Khrushchov.

The Political Bureau's report to the Fifth Plenum of the CC, SUPG states:

"To our great regret, we are compelled at this Plenum to state once again our attitude to the position adopted by the Chinese leaders. It will be recalled that the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Central Committees of other Communist and Workers' parties proposed to the Chinese leaders that all public polemics between fraternal Communist parties be discontinued. In fact, the CPSU and other Communist and Workers' parties of the People's Democracies have refrained during the past two months from all public polemics over the differences called forth by the Chinese leaders.

"The leaders of the Communist Party of China have throughout this period persisted in public polemics. Moreover, on February 4, 1964, they published—in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi*, organs of the CC, CPC—a seventh article concerning the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU. This article not only continues the polemics but directly advocates a split in the world Communist movement.

"The article contains the most infamous attacks on the general line of the world Communist movement collectively formulated and approved by the Communist and Workers' parties in their documents of 1957 and 1960, as well as on the Central Committee of the CPSU and its First Secretary, Comrade Khrushchov. The Central Committee of the SUPG indignantly rejects that article. The publication of that article is an unseemly move violating the standards of relations between Marxist-Leninist parties. The opinion expressed in the article speaks of a complete departure from a real, earnest discussion.

"A few weeks ago the Chines leaders published in CC, CPC organs some writings on the Sinification of dialectical materialism. These materials, which are in the nature of official Party documents, show

*Statement by the CC, SUPG, published in **Neues Deutschland** on April 4, 1964.

that the Chinese Party leadership has departed from the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

"The Socialist Unity Party of Germany reaffirms its indestructible bonds with the CPSU and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Khrushchov. The Political Bureau declares that our Party will do all in its power to achieve the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement."

After the 5th Plenum, on February 18, 1964, the Political Bureau of the CC, SUPG gave its estimation of the activity of the CPC leadership. In particular, it stated the following:

By implementing the general line approved at the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960—a line which the practice of revolutionary struggle has proved correct—the world Communist movement and particularly the world socialist system were able to make further progress in socialist and communist construction and in the struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation. Credit is due to the CPSU and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Khrushchov for the fact that through the policy elaborated by the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU it showed the world Communist movement as a whole the way forward and indicated its goals. The resolute and principled struggle of the CPSU went a long way towards developing Marxism-Leninism in a creative spirit, fully encouraging the initiative of the mass of the people, and promoting the vast spread of the ideas of peace, democracy, the national liberation struggle, and socialism all over the world.

The CC, SUPG constantly strives to strengthen the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties. This is why we welcomed it when delegates from the Presidium of the CC, CPSU and from the CPC leadership discussed their differences at length in Moscow. Unfortunately, the discussions were broken off and have so far not been resumed. At our 6th Congress Comrade Khrushchov, speaking on behalf of the CC, CPSU, proposed to the CC, CPC stopping public polemics. The Congress approved the proposal. Unfortunately, the CPC leaders, far from answering the proposal, published seven articles intensifying their attacks against Marxism-Leninism and Communist and Workers' parties, and in their article of February 4, 1964, they openly called for disruptive activity.

The CC, SUPG is still of the opinion that public polemics should be stopped and that discussions should be held between the CPSU and the CC. However, discontinuance of public polemics would serve a useful purpose provided the CPC leaders immediately renounce the further dissemination of the article of February 4, 1964, stop the circulation of their articles directed against the CPSU and the other Communist and Workers' parties, and discontinue their disruptive activities within the Communist and Workers' parties.

It is necessary to study the measures that may be needed to pave the way for a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties of the same composition as the Meeting of 1960.

The CPC leaders are pursuing a different, un-Marxist general line. The Political Bureau report to the 5th Plenum already pointed out

that the CPC leaders continued public polemics and that the publication of the Seventh article had created a new situation with regard to the differences called forth by the CPC leaders.

This new situation is characterized by the fact that the CPC leaders are publicly and explicitly advocating a split in the world Communist movement and have in their propaganda and their practical actions gone over to an open offensive against the unity of the world Communist movement. The Chinese leaders stated their platform in sufficient detail in their "Proposals for the General Line of the World Communist Movement" of June 17, 1963, in Chou Yang's speech "The Combat Tasks of Philosophical and Social Science Workers", published on December 26, 1963, and in the seven articles concerning the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU. That platform is in the form of infamous attacks on the CPSU, its CC and, in particular, Comrade Khrushchov, as well as on all the parties which consistently adhere to a policy based on the documents of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960.

Their platform may be appraised as follows:

1. The CPC leaders deny the further development of Marxism-Leninism under the new balance of forces that has come into being since the end of the Second World War. They deny the colossal contribution which the CPSU, its 20th and 22nd congresses, and other fraternal parties have made, and continue to make, to the further development of Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, they are out to revise the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism, which they frankly replace by the so-called Maoist ideology. They insist on all the fraternal parties repudiating Marxism-Leninism, and call on all to submit—as they put it—to a Sinified Marxism, which they make out to be true Marxism-Leninism.

Their departiure from Marxist-Leninist principles expresses itself, specifically, in the following:

(a) they falsify the general line of the world Communist movement as approved by the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960;

(b) they reject the conclusions drawn by the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU;

(c) they falsify Marxist-Leninist dialectics and replace it by sophist, un-Marxist and anti-Leninist views;

(d) they falsify the history of the world Communist movement.

2. They advocate the "necessity" and "legitimacy" of a split in the world Communist movement and in the various Communist and Workers' parties if these parties refuse to submit to the line followed by the Chinese leaders.

3. At present the Chinese leaders demand that all the parties forming the world Communist movement should recognize the leading role of the CPC. They insist on each particular party renouncing its Marxist-Leninist policy and submitting completely to the political line pursued by the CPC leaders. They present to the world Communist movement special conditions which amount to nullifying the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, renouncing the policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful economic competition, and denying the leading role of the world socialist system and the

working class. This signifies a departure from the common general line laid down in the documents of 1957 and 1960.

In advancing these conditions, they call for the removal of the leaderships of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties opposing the Chinese line.

The CPC leaders' policy means an unprincipled, petty-bourgeois nationalist departure from Marxism-Leninism, a departure which is Trotskyite in content and in methods of struggle. It is nothing but Trotskyism in new historical conditions, which in the case of the leaders of the CPC, a party in power, expresses itself in great-power chauvinism, racialism, Left-radical adventurism, an anti-Soviet attitude, and factional, disruptive activities.

In an effort to maintain the unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement and induce the CPC leaders to stop their harmful, splitting activities, the CC, SUPG sent the CC, CPC a letter in the middle of March. In that letter we again proposed discontinuing public polemics and stated that the SUPG supported the proposals of the CPSU for talks between the CC, CPSU and the CC, CPC and for a conference of the Communist and Workers' parties, to be held not later than the autumn of 1964. It is most characteristic that we have so far received no reply to that letter.

Instead of answering the proposal of the CPSU, the SUPG and many other Marxist-Leninist parties, the CPC leaders continued, even more uncompromisingly than before, its public campaign against the general line of the Communist and Workers' parties, and in the end, on March 31, resolved to publish a new editorial in the Peking newspaper *Jenminjihpao* and in the journal *Hungchi,* an editorial which goes beyond the bounds of all polemics. That editorial contains incredible calumnies against the Soviet Union, the CPSU and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Khrushchov, against our Party and all the other Communist and Workers' parties adhering, in accordance with the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism, to the documents collectively approved by the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960. This absolutely undisguised slanderous offensive against Marxist-Leninist principles and against the policy of all the socialist countries and Communist and Workers' parties opposing the line of the CPC leaders calls for a public reply.

The publication of the records of the February Plenum of the CC, CPSU will help to promote the unity of the world Communist movement in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism. It will help to expose the anti-Leninist platform and disruptive activities of the CPC leaders. The CC, SUPG declares that it fully agrees with the measures taken by the CPSU and fully supports these measures. The indestructible unity of the SUPG and the CPSU, its Central Committee and Comrade Khrushchov is, and will be, a true earnest of friendship between our peoples and a guarantee of peace. Together with all the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is fighting with unshakable resolve for the purity and integrity of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, for the unity and peaceful solidarity of the world Communist movement, for peace and peaceful coexistence, for the victory of socialism.

REPLY TO SPLITTERS OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

EDITORIAL IN *KANSAN UUTISET**

The many attempts made by the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and some other countries to persuade the leadership of the Communist Party of China to negotiate a solution of the ideological differences that have for some time existed between them, have yielded no results. Day by day, the Chinese Communist Party leadership intensified its attacks on the CPSU and the other Communist parties that faithfully follow in their policy and activities the Marxist-Leninist principles endorsed by the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings of the world Communist movement. The Chinese leadership turned down every one of the proposals of the CPSU and other Communist parties on discontinuing open polemics and normalizing relations, and disseminated its foul slander and accusations all over the world. In the meantime, the CPSU and other fraternal parties refrained from the polemics and strove with utmost patience to remove the differences by negotiation.

Clearly, this situation could not last forever, especially after the CPC leaders projected their attacks to the province of China's interstate relations with the socialist countries and embarked on an open political struggle against cooperation among socialist countries and against the unity of the world Communist movement. These concrete facts prompted the decision made by the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 15 in response to the provocative attacks and disruptive activities of the Chinese Communist Party leaders. The decision was made public only two days ago, because, even after it had been taken, the CPSU leadership acceded to the suggestion of the fraternal Rumanian Party, which proposed to try and convince the Chinese leaders to agree to new negotiations. But the proposal of the Rumanian Party delegation was turned down in China. It was not until this happened that the Central Committee of the CPSU decided to break its long silence. The Central Committee of the CPSU decided to take measures against the dangerous disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders in the world Communist movement and to expose their political goals, which have nothing in common with socialism. It is not only the interests of the CPSU, but also the interests of the whole Communist movement, and the interests of its unity, that call for this move, points out the CPSU resolution, which also contains the proposal to convene an international conference of Communist parties.

We in Finland, where the anniversary of the Finnish-Soviet Treaty

*Translated from the text published in the newspaper, **Kansan Uutiset,** April 5, 1964.

of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance is now being marked, know from our own experience that the peaceful coexistence policy pursued by the Soviet Union is beneficial and effective. That is why the foul propaganda which the Chinese leaders disseminate in our country against the Soviet Union, against socialist construction and Soviet foreign policy, falls on barren soil. In our country, the attacks and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders may at best comfort those anti-Soviet and anti-communist Right-wing elements who do not shrink from the foulest of actions in pursuance of their reactionary aspirations.

The Communist Party of Finland, which has repeatedly and firmly denounced the dangerous disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders and, like the other fraternal parties, striven to prevail upon the Chinese to abandon open attacks and accept the proposal of fraternal discussion, will fight hand-in-hand with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist parties for the unity of the world Communist movement, in defense of Marxist-Leninist principles.

SOME QUESTIONS OF THE UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

Mario Alicata

The Council of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization, which convened in Algiers last week, was the scene of a violent attack by the Chinese delegation on the Soviet Union, which, as is known, is also an authorized member of that Organization, inasmuch as Soviet territory extends far into Asia and a part of the Soviet population consists of various Asian nationalities.

This latter fact should be recalled and emphasized, because Comrade Kuo Tchien, the head of the Chinese delegation, kept repeating in her attacks on the Soviet Union that the USSR was an "alien force" to the Afro-Asian peoples and nations, and, consequently, also ultimately to the anti-colonial and national liberation movement. A factual error, and in fact a misrepresentation of the truth, thus combined in the Chinese attacks on the USSR with an error of principle and, in fact, with an absurd distortion of principle.

After all, even if the Soviet Union had not been a partially Asiatic state, and if the establishment, after the victory of the October Revolution, of a multi-national Soviet state — and, I would even like to add for the sake of accuracy, of an inter-continental state—had not represented a decisive force in the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle, the description of the first and strongest socialist state, which has always stood in the vanguard of the revolutionary struggle, as a "force alien" to the anti-colonial and national liberation movement, still signifies that an ideological and political basis obviously opposed to Marxism-Leninism and to the realities of the historical process is being given to this struggle. The contemporary revolutionary movement, which is primarily an anti-imperialist movement, has always considered, and now considers the alliance of the class and political forces, and the countries fighting for socialism, with the class and political forces, peoples and countries fighting for their national independence to be the fundamental condition of victorious advance.

If People's China and the Chinese comrades cast doubt on this alliance and if they go to the length of working for its disruption, they are thereby assuming a grave responsibility. It means that once more the conscience of the international proletariat and the democratic masses of the whole world is confronted by the serious question about the causes and purposes of such an attitude. And the chief thing is that, far from helping, it impedes the very necessary

---

*Translated from the text published in the newspaper **l'Unita,** Central Organ of the CC, Communist Party of Italy, April 1, 1964.

effort of revealing the deficiencies which undoubtedly exist in the strategy of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle of the Communist and Workers' parties. These deficiencies could be, and should be, quickly eliminated, in order to ensure a new upswing of our movement, and of the revolutionary movement in general, not only in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, but also in the Western capitalist lands.

The Chinese comrades' rejection of a sober discussion, so useful in the joint search for the truth, and their attempts to oppose their own position beforehand in an acutely polemic form to the position of other Communist parties, particularly that of the Soviet comrades, were again strikingly evident at the conference in Algeria.

Comrade Kuo Tchien described in a slanderous manner the disarmament policy of the Soviet Union (the sole purpose of which, the Chinese delegation said, was to compel the oppressed peoples to disarm and cease their armed struggle against imperialism). She branded the Moscow Treaty on the partial banning of nuclear tests as an "Anglo-American-Soviet intrigue" harmful to the oppressed peoples, and went to the length of calling the Soviet Union a "reactionary force", stating that it has for some time been an "accomplice" of imperialism, from which it was now no longer distinguishable.

It seems to be quite superfluous to protest the absurdity of such statements, as well as the statements contained in the latest article in *Bandiera Rossa*, which accuses Comrade Khrushchov of leading the USSR along the path of "return to capitalism". Such claims cannot possibly fail to anger not only Communists, but also the more politically conscious masses throughout the world. Nor can they fail (deplorably) to cause smirks of satisfaction among our class adversaries. On this score, too, we ought to ask why and wherefore the Chinese comrades go so far in the matter.

Indeed, it is not enough to explain it away by mere dogmatism, schematism and sectarianism. If it were only dogmatism, schematism and sectarianism, the Chinese comrades may have failed to realize the worth and importance for the whole revolutionary movement of the search begun at the 20th Congress of an adequate revolutionary strategy that would correspond to the evolution of reality, a search which is by no means as yet conducted with the necessary speed and audacity. They may not have agreed with some of the conclusions arrived at in this search (assuming, in our opinion, a profoundly erroneous position, and one that should be openly combated). If it were only dogmatism, schematism and sectarianism, and only a special point of view that they would have to keep to in their analysis of the balance of world forces, the Chinese comrades may not have understood and not have accepted (though, I repeat, in our opinion this would also be a deeply erroneous position, and one that should be openly combated) all the aspects and features of the foreign poicy of relieving tension pursued by the Soviet Union, by its present leading group, and by Comrad Khrushchov with so much energy and vigour.

But what kind of dogmatism and sectarianism could compel them to describe as an "imperialist intrigue" the nuclear agreement that

peace-abiding people throughout the world have desired for so many years, and for which scientists called as being indispensable to mankind's security?

And what kind of dogmatism, schematism and sectarianism could make them describe the Soviet Union as a "reactionary" power and to accuse its leaders of complicity with imperialism?

We thought that after the exposure and denunciation of Stalin's mistakes no one would ever again employ such ridiculous caricatures of attitudes and comrades one disagrees with. Regrettably, by acting that way the Chinese comrades demonstrate that they do not confine themselves to a verbal defense of Stalin. They are repeating the worst of his mistakes in practice. They are trying to re-introduce methods and forms of political struggle in the international working-class movement which we thought should have been for ever buried, never to return.

In the circumstances, the grave danger faced by our movement is that it may be driven, even if unintentionally and unconsciously, on to the path chosen by the Chinese comrades, and that our movement may return to the times when it was thought that the ideological and political differences always liable to arise on certain issues between Communist parties and even between socialist countries, could be resolved by marshalling each other's necessary support in order to "excommunicate" the party or country with which one has come into dispute, to "expel" it from the movement or the family of socialist states, or yet to accuse it of objective or subjective "complicity" with imperialism.

Frankly speaking, a return to such methods would, in our opinion, be a dangerous step backwards for the whole world Communist movement — one that we cannot accept, because it would be, in effect, a departure from the principles triumphantly proclaimed at the 20th Congress of the CPSU and carried to victory thanks to the historical efforts of the present Soviet leading group, and particularly Comrade Khrushchov.

For this reason, we believe that it is important today not only to prove publicly, point by point, that the strategic positions of the present leaders of the Chinese Communist Party are incorrect. It is also important to show that their method of political struggle is intolerable and, of course, does not contribute to the creation of the proper climate for the new system of relations between Communist parties, based on the new conception of unity and mutual solidarity, but rather drives the movement towards a disastrous split and an organizational consolidation of this split.

At the same time, we should not, in our opinion, let ourselves be intimidated by such accusations, pressures and slanders of the CPC leadership, and should not rest on our oars. We should follow the path of a bold development of theoretical and practical work, essential for a conclusive analysis of the contemporary world and for an exhaustive definition of the prospects implicit in it for the revolutionary struggle against imperialism, for peace, for the national liberation of the peoples and for socialism.

This prospect cannot fail to include a just solution of the problem (of which we spoke earlier) of the forms along which relations between Communist parties and between socialist countries should be organized today, or, in brief, the problem of securing new unity and solidarity in the world Communist movement, which would put an end to the existing differences and would be based on a recognition of the autonomy of each individual party.

It appears to us that this would be the most effective way of combating the erroneous methods of the Chinese comrades. It appears to us that only if the necessary conditions will be thus prepared, can we eventually think about convening an international conference of all the Communist and Workers' parties. At the present moment, however, we cannot but reiterate — also in the light of the aforesaid ideas — the reservations regarding its usefulness expressed a few months ago by our Central Committee.

DOCUMENTS ON SPLITTING ACTIVITIES*

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE EXPOSES INTRIGUES OF SPLITTERS DIRECTED AGAINST POPULAR MOVEMENT

The Communist Party has submitted the following statement for the press:

On October 12 the Communist Party expelled seven of its members from its ranks for violating the most elementary norms of discipline. These people are openly acting against the Party; they took part in forming a group which follows a course that is absolutely at variance with the line democratically adopted by the Communists at their national congresses; they have dragged into the open the polemics with the Party; they took part in a manifestation ostensibly to celebrate the 14th anniversary of the Chinese revolution, but actually aimed at distorting our line and preventing realization of the policy charted by the popular movement.

The Communist Party of Chile is solidly united around its political line and its Central Committee. Its position on national and international issues of the day has the full and conscious support of the members of the Party. It is only natural, however, that in a party which has tens of thousands of members there should be members who have their doubts or hold a different opinion. This is quite natural in the life of a party. On this score Clause 5, point "A" of the Party Rules states that every member of the Party has the right "to take part in free and concrete discussion in the respective political bodies of the Party", and points "F" and "H" add that he has the right "to raise any questions that contribute to the implementation of the Party's political line, to submit them to any Party body, including the Central Committee, and to start a discussion on any point of the Party's policy". The Rules, of course, specify that it is the obligation of all members of the Party to fight for the realization of the Party's line, to propagandize its policy and to strictly observe discipline. The philosophy, if one may put it that way, underlying the organization of the Party, is the philosophy of democratic centralism which combines the broadest inner democracy in relation to views expressed with iron discipline as regards the subordination of the lower bodies to the higher bodies and individual opinions to the opinion of the collective. Such are the Leninist standards which enable the Communist parties to be solidly united in thought and deed, which has enabled them, inspired by a single will, to withstand the most severe trials.

---

*From the theoretical journal of the C.C.; Communist Party of Chile, **Principios**, No. 98, November-December, 1963. Document of Political Commission and National Control and Codres Commission Communist Party of Chile, adopted in Santiago, October 19, 1963.

They Put Themselves Above the Rules

With regard to every one of the expelled, the Party, showing the greatest patience, gave them all a chance to express their views.

The Party leadership even met them half-way and afforded them the possibility to express their standpoint to the leadership. As a result of the talks in the Central Committee two of them, Benquis and Vasquez, promised to observe the norms of Party discipline. As things turned out, however, all the efforts of the Party were in vain. They united in order to covertly carry out factional activities which ended in their openly coming out against the Party and forming the so-called MARA group. A proletarian party like ours could not tolerate such actions.

The measures against them were taken not because they held different views which is permissible in the Party, as earlier stated. The reason for these measures was that they set themselves above the Rules, did not keep faith with the Party. It is incompatible with unity of the Party to permit a situation where some of its members attack it from the outside.

The expelled tried to justify their indiscipline on the grounds that the orientation of the Party and the popular movement was not sufficiently militant. But that was simply a subterfuge. The popular movement in Chile is a militant movement and we aim to increase its militancy. The only way to achieve this is to work with the masses, to organize and stimulate their struggle. The expelled, however, did not set an example in this respect. Berchenko, Vasquez and Benquis, for example, for a long time already had been absent from their branches; Barahona, who as a student joined the Communist youth and who for nearly 20 years had no contact with the Party joined it last year only to disappear from his branch three months ago; Palacios, one of the champion advocates of militancy beat a hasty retreat when his organization—the Association of Faculty and Staff Members of the University of Chile—went on strike.

The Campaign Against the Popular Movement

The hostile actions against the Party on the part of the aforementioned elements is part of the campaign directed against the popular movement. Simultaneously with them other groups are operating who have set themselves the same aim and who are operating with the same arguments. We have in mind here the Trotskyite and affiliated groups which are the bitter enemies of the Party and whose sole purpose of existence is to try to split the popular and working-class movement. It is relevant to note here that one of these groups, the so-called Marxist Revolutionary Vanguard, was formed by old and recognized Trotskyites like Enrique Sepulvéda, who has been joined by Reinoso, Cares and Palma who were expelled from the Party more than ten years ago for forming a factional group and for attempting to get the Party to pursue an adventurist policy and to split it when it was being subjected to brutal repressions for its fidelity to the people and its courageous struggle against North American imperialism and the dictatorship of Gonzales Videla. Then

there is the group which calls itself the Revolutionary Communist Movement which has attracted various anarchist and Trotskyite elements. Still another group is the old and discredited POR which recently reappeared on the scene to join the others in their anti-unionist activities.

All these groups, beginning with MARA and ending with POR, conceal their real aims and parade as the ardent supporters of Salvador Allende's candidature. But the facts, which should not be ignored, show that they are opposed to his candidature.

The so-called Revolutionary Communist Movement writes on the walls "Elections—no! Revolution—yes!", and in its pamphlets it deefnds the thesis that "armed insurrection by the people is the only path that will not disappoint the revolutionary striving of the working class to conquer power."

POR declares in *Polémic* through Tito Stéfoni that "the presidential candidate Salvador Allende is more and more moving on the downgrade and this will lead not only to the defeat of his candidature but to the defeat of the proletariat and the masses as a whole, to the defeat of all this candidature represents at the present stage of the fight of the working people for political power." In its newspaper *El Robelde* ("Insurrection"), the so-called Marxist Revolutionary Vanguard published a "Political Letter to the Chinese Communist Party", in which it comes out against "electoral idiocy", declares that "it is staunchly resisting the electoral opium that is being used to drug the people of Chile", and asserts that some one is "trying to convince our people that power will be won in a peaceful, idyllic way at the presidential elections in 1964". MARA, for its part, which includes elements recently expelled from the Party, also comes out against what is called "electioneering" and "illusions regarding the elections". By raising these questions accompanied as they are by bombastic revolutionary statements and hypocritical manifesttions in support of Allendism, all they are doing is to throw cold water on the hopes of the people, to prevent the launching of a mass campaign in support of Allende, to sow the seed of distrust, to discredit the efforts being made by the popular parties and the people to win the 1964 elections. And all this, objectively speaking, is benefitting reaction.

They Help the Splitting Trends

The afore-mentioned groups direct their fire particularly against the Communist and Socialist parties.

They have launched an all-out attack on the political line of these parties in an attempt to start splitting trends in them. In its letter to the Chinese Communist Party the so-called Marxist Revolutionary Vanguard states that it is considering the possibility of uniting with other groups and admits that it "has constantly been proposing to the members of the Communist Party and to the Communist youth of Chile, to the members of the Socialist Party and other popular organizations to take joint action and thus pave the way to this integration which would make for the establishment of a United Party of the Chilean revolution".

Pursuing the same aims Stéfoni, the leader of POR, after attacking all the parties in FRAP, which in his words have "a purely electoral opportunist strategic concept", then goes on to say that "critical tendencies are constantly making their appearance" in the Socialist Party; he does not conceal the hopes he pins on them. Armando Cassigoli, MARA's representative, speaking in the Baquedano Theatre openly appealed for the establishment of what he called a revolutionary organization which would include different kinds of people "which does not mean, of course, that they would have to withdraw from their own parties".

All these groups attack the parties in FRAP.

Pretending to be a supporter of Allende, Stéfoni at the same time viciously attacks the National-Democratic Party which is one of the parties that supports the people's choice, and which he qualifies as a "decaying and foul mosaic of the bougreois factions". As for the independents who support Allende he exclaims: "this is the most senseless myth invented by opportunists. Independents do not exist! Those who are called independents are waverers, neutrals who stand aloof from social life, those who have every reason not to trust the political election game."

It is clear what they are driving at. The afore-mentioned groups are trying with the help of all kinds of stratagems to cause a split in the Communist and Socialist parties and deprive them of allies, to isolate and narrow the social and political basis of support for the candidature of Salvador Allende and thus doom it to defeat.

They Do Not Scruple to Distort the Truth

For several decades now the Trotskyite groups have been trying to cause a split and sow confusion. They have been joined by new crusaders in this unsavoury cause. Although at times it might seem that they hold different views, objectively they have all dedicated themselves to the same aim. They were quick to join hands when the Chinese Communist Party began to cause differences in the international Communist movement.

They take advantage of these differences to further their main aim: to attack the Communist Party and the popular movement. In doing so they do not scruple to distort the truth, to present our policy on the national and international scale in a false light.

Speculating on the fact that revolutionaries should always be willing to discuss the complex issues of the contemporary world and the basic problems connected with the Chilean revolution they would have the people believe that we want to prevent any discussion inside the popular movement and impose our own opinion, that we want to have the monopoly of the truth.

Far from fearing discussion we Communists have time and again called for discussion. Our allies know with what respect we treat any opinion different from ours, and of numerous occasions when we have accepted their proposals. What we have opposed and will continue to oppose is giving the title of revolutionaries to Trotsky-

ites and splitters whose activities are directed against popular unity and revolution.

The line of the Communist Party of Chile which these elements attack was elaborated democratically. It was endorsed by our National Congress held in March 1962. Before it was endorsed it was discussed at 26 regional congresses, 56 local conferences and 1,500 branch meetings. Regarding the charges made by the Chinese the Party made its position clear on this issue at its plennary meeting in November 1961. The Party's position was subsequently unanimously endorsed by its congress. The more delicate aspects of the question were examined by the Central Committee on repeated occasions. The entire membership was informed of them as the differences sharpened. Most of the Communist parties, including the Communist Party of China, acted in this way.

The Line of the Communist Party is a Revolutionary One

The position of the splitters, encouraged by the leadership of the Communist Party of China, is incompatible with the line pursued by the Communist Party of Chile in the international and national scene. It is the duty of every party to defend its line and to fight for its implementation. It cannot therefore allow ideological anarchy or even a situation where some of its members oppose the Party line.

The line of our Party is the revolutionary line of the masses. Together with its allies the Party pursues revolutionary aims which have been summarized in its Program and have been made public The Party's motto is to unite in struggle the bulk of the population around the working class. Its immediate aim is to secure a People's government for Chile at the presidential elections in 1964.

The Communist Party considers that the conditions for revolution are maturing. These conditions are both objective and subjective. The objective conditions are determined by the entire course of social development. The subjective conditions are created by the popular movement and first and foremost by its vanguard. The Party shares the view that we cannot sit back and wait until the subjective conditions mature of themselves. The Party therefore considers it necessary to organize and activize the struggle of the masses, to stimulate their militancy, for it is only through their own experience that the masses will come to realize the need to change the system and seize power. But for all that, there are certain weaknesses and reformist tendencies in assessing the elections, which have their sources in the erroneous view that all that is needed is to canvass the votes and on election day go to the polls. Fully aware of these weaknesses the Party is working to overcome them, but it believes that the way to overcome them is by giving concrete guidance to all the actions of the people, everywhere and in the most diverse forms. Once we have advanced along this path the full maturing of the subjective revolutionary conditions will no longer be something of the distant future; it might come very soon together with a profound crisis. But this will never happen as a result of wishful thinking or reckless actions, and least of all as a result of the activities of the splitting elements

who have broken away from the masses and fallen into petty-bourgeois despair.

In Defense of Peace and the Fight for National Liberation

On the international scene the Communist Party pursues a policy of decisive support for the struggle for peace and against imperialism. The policy of peaceful coexistence is an integral part of the fight for peace; it is the only sensible policy and, from the Marxist viewpoint, the fight for it begun by Lenin is in our time a supreme expression of the class struggle on a world scale. The defense of peace and the fight for national liberation are components of one and the same process, two streams of one and the same world-wide revolutionary torrent. The struggle for national liberation calls for the broadest alliance of all anti-imperialist forces and, at the same time, for the most decisive support to the liberation movements, irrespective of whether they resort to arms or not. In Latin America this idea finds expression, and will continue to find expression, in the most vigorous support for the glorious Cuban revolution and in the fight being waged by all the peoples of the continent against imperialism and the internal oligarchies.

The movement for peace and national independence has its strongest bulwark in the socialist system and especially in the Soviet Union. As has already been demonstrated the Soviet Union, by its policy of peace and its vigorous stand against the export of counter-revolution, represents the best guarantee that the struggle of all the peoples who are battling for their independence will not be crushed. The attacks made on the policy of the Soviet Union do not further this struggle.

The Communist Party has considered it necessary to dwell at length on all the above-mentioned facts for they show that it is a question of a conspiracy against the Party and the popular movement. The indiscipline and, later, the expulsion from the Party of seven people, not one of whom was even a member of the secretariat of his branch would have been a matter of secondary importance were it not for the fact that other Trotskyite groups and their supporters are acting along the same lines and that they are supported, politically and materially, by one and the same hand. What is behind this conspiracy is obvious to all who care to see it. The reactionary press gives wide publicity to their activity. *El Mercurio* openly places its hopes on them to cause a split in FRAP, and *El Diario Illustrado* applauds them.

The Political Commission and the National Control and Cadres Commission calls on all Communists and all fighters in the popular movement to unite still more closely around their parties and mass organizations, to step up the fight to meet the demands of the masses and to develop in every possible way the popular movement which should ensure the victory of Allende, the victory of the people at the elections in 1964.

NOTES

NOTES

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

PUT MONOPOLY UNDER CONTROL by Tim Buck
(now in preparation)

Outlines a new economic policy for Canada.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75
393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75
404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50
735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST,
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues,
single copies are 35 cents,

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

11

Included in this issue

FROM A PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS TO A PARTY OF THE WHOLE SOVIET PEOPLE

REPORT BY P. TOGLIATTI

ARTICLE BY R. PALME DUTT

STATEMENT OF COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 11

contents

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA 5

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY
—Against the Disruptive Policy of the Chinese Leaders, for Strengthening the Unity and Solidarity of the Communist and Workers' Parties 8

FROM A PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS TO A PARTY OF THE WHOLE SOVIET PEOPLE 20

LETTER OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY, TO CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA 36

MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO STRENGTHENING OF WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT
—Statement of CC, CPG, on the Report of Comrade M. A. Suslov at the Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU, on February 14, 1964 39

UNITY OF INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
—Report by Comrade P. Togliatti to the joint plenary meeting of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Italian Communist Party 41

RESOLUTION
—Adopted at Meeting of CC and CAC of the ICP held April 21-23, 1964 63

FIGHT FOR UNITY OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
—R. Palme Dutt 64

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONFERENCE
—Statement of the NC, CP of India 73

STATEMENT OF COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A. 75

COMMUNIQUE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF ECUADOR 77

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
June 6, 1964

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA*

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has issued a statement on the present-day situation in the international Communist movement, which reads in part:

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia discussed at its meetings, notably in December 1963 and March 1964, the situation which has developed in the international Communist movement in connection with the splitting activity of the leaders of the Communist Party of China, who are departing more and more from Marxism-Leninism and have openly set themselves the task of dividing the world revolutionary forces and establishing a factionalist centre in Peking. With a view to achieving hegemony in the world Communist movement the Chinese leaders have worked out an ideological platform which is nothing but revision of the general line of the international Communist movement as laid down in the documents of the Moscow Meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960.

Already at the Bucharest meeting, but especially at the Moscow conference of the Communist and Workers' parties, the delegation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia opposed the incorrect views of the Chinese leaders. In the statement released in June 1963 the Central Committee of our Party expressed its concern and apprehension with regard to the policy of the Chinese leaders and at the same time it categorically renounced their attacks against the Leninist policy of the CPSU, pointing out that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China would not hesitate to use demagogy, falsification and slander in order to discredit the policy of the CPSU and other fraternai parties. In due course, the leaders of the CPC deliberately and steadily stepped up their attacks against the fraternal parties. They are pursuing a policy of false charges and subversion against them, impose on them an anti-Leninist line, which today is the main danger to the world-wide revolutionary front, to the international struggle for peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism.

The fact that the Chinese leaders provocatively misinterpret the goodwill of the Marxist-Leninist parties, their calls for an end to the public polemic in the interests of unity, and ascribe them to the lack of arguments of the fear to suffer defeat in the open struggle, only betrays their desire to cause a split. To the numberless proposals of the fraternal parties to halt the pubic debate the Chinese leaders .e-

*Rude Pravo, April 13, 1964

plied by intensifying their hostile and factional activities aimed at dividing the Communist movement and laying down the foundation for their platform on an international scale. For that purpose they are banding together the various anti-Party and Trotskyite elements, all sorts of social scum in the various countries, and are forming factional groups, trying to present them as "new Communist parties".

Objectively they are helping world imperialist reaction, which regards these actions as a welcome aid to its efforts to weaken the activity of the Communists and undermine their prestige and which supports these splitting actions in every way.

The harmful activities of the Chinese leaders have also affected the relations with our Party and even the relations between our countries. That trade between China and us has dwindled is not our fault. The Chinese side was guilty of gross violation of our laws which led to the closing of the headquarters of the *Hsinghua News Agency* in Prague. It is highly regrettable that the Chinese officials regard the interference of Chinese citizens into our affairs and violations of our law as creditable and that they publicly commend the culprits.

We cannot agree with the arbitrary assessment of the transition of Czechoslovakia to socialism, given in the Chinese press, which contradicts the facts of history. This assessment distorts Lenin's idea of transition from the democratic to the socialist revolution.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China, blinded by megalomania, have lost all sense of proportion and stop at nothing. It is they who bear the full responsibility for weakening the unity and causing a split of the international Communist movement.

Czechoslovak Communists and all working people of Czechoslovakia are particularly indignant at the violent attacks launched by the Chinese leaders against the CPSU and the Soviet Union, attacks which, in tone and content, are reminiscent of the invective used by imperialist circles. The Chinese leaders demonstrate their political and moral unscrupulousness by urging world public opinion to oppose the policy of the Soviet Union—the policy of peace, of support for the progressive and revolutionary forces and of friendly relations among the nations.

Our Party highly appreciates the position of the CPSU and its numerous constructive steps timed at averting the dangerous course of events and cementing the unity of the international Communist movement. The Central Committee of the CPSU, supported by the other fraternal parties, has displayed the maximum patience, goodwill and calm in the effort to overcome the differences and to explain to the leadership of the Communist Party of China, the danger of its actions. However, the proposals made by the CPSU and other Communist and Workers' parties went unheeded by the Chinese leaders.

In agreement with many other fraternal parties, we have arrived at the conclusion that, the disruptive activity of the Communist Party of China which has repeatedly rejected all the proposals for ending public polemics, has resulted in a situation where resolute and open action on behalf of the unity of the international Communist movement and its Leninist general line is the direct internationalist duty of the Communist and Workers' parties. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, unanimously supported by the recently held regional Party conferences fully approves of the actions of the CPSU Central Committee which gave a principled answer to the Chinese leaders by publishing the materials of its February meeting.

By its theoretical and practical activity the CPSU invariably shows that it consistently implements the general line of the Communist movement jointly elaborated in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960; today this is the main criterion of the Marxist-Leninist approach for any Communist or Workers' Party.

The Central Committee of the CPC fully endorses the proposal of the CC, CPSU, for convening another conference of the Communist and Workers' parties at the earliest date. In our opinion, this conference should discuss, from positions of principle, the situation in the Communist movement and such questions as strengthening the unity of the world Communist forces on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and in conformity with the jointly elaborated general line of the world Communist movement.

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY*

AGAINST THE DISRUPTIVE POLICY OF THE CHINESE LEADERS, FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITY AND SOLIDARITY OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

In 1957 and 1960 the representatives of the world Communist movement, meeting in Moscow, drew up and unanimously adopted two historical documents—the Declaration and Statement of the Communist and Workers' parties.

The Communist and Workers' parties undoubtedly owe their signal successes of recent years largely to this jointly adopted general line. Life itself has thus confirmed the correctness of these decisions.

Our Party and the working people of the German Democratic Republic wholeheartedly endorsed these documents. And inasmuch as our words do not diverge from our deeds, we have contributed much to their realization. Nor could it have been otherwise, for the documents of 1957 and 1960 gave a scientific assessment of the present epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Proceeding from the new balance of forces in the world, they drew the correct conclusions for the fight for peace and social progress, and charted the way to the realization of the basic tasks of our time.

These basic tasks are the building of socialism and communism; removal of the danger of a new world war and pursuance of a policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems; complete abolition of the imperialist colonial system, and struggle for democracy and social progress in the capitalist countries.

The Socialist Unity Party, like the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, is guided by this jointly elaborated and unanimously adopted general line which has been corroborated by experience, our experience included. This is evident from our consistent peace policy, the vigorous effort towards the building of socialism in the GDR, the application of Leninist principles in planning and economic management, the deepening of socialist democracy and the development of our socialist national culture.

Anyone endowed with clear vision and common sense can now see that the way taken by our Party was, and is, the right way. That the republic has grown economically stronger is clear not only to us in our day-to-day life; even our opponents have to admit this. Politically

*Neues Deutschland, April 15, 1964.

too our republic has become stronger. Its international prestige has grown. Its contacts with other nations and states have become broader. Telling blows have been dealt to West-German imperialism and militarism. The aggressive policy of the Adenauer group met with failure, and if Erhard were to continue this policy, he would be no more successful.

Hence it is perfectly clear that in the future as well we shall not allow either circumstances or individuals to divert us from the correct general line of the Communist and Workers' parties, or from the program adopted by the Sixth Congress of our Party in which the principles of Marxism-Leninism are creatively applied to the complex conditions of struggle in Germany.

I

This general line to which we owe our success has been assailed by the leaders of the Communist Party of China. Time and again our Party has rejected the viewpoint of the CPC leaders: It is in full agreement with the CPSU, which published materials of the February plenary meeting of its Central Committee a few days ago, as well as with the overwhelming majority of the other fraternal parties.

The Central Committee of the SUPG knows that the people of the GDR are indignant at the policy of the CPC leaders. Their indignation is quite understandable, for this policy is causing grave harm to the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. It is now clear that the leadership of the CPC is out to disrupt the unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement.

Let us recall the period preceding the 1960 Meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties in Moscow. Already at that time the Chinese leaders objected strongly to any condemnation of factional and splitting activities, activities which are utterly incompatible with the Leninist standards of Party relations. Since then the CPC leaders have gone still further. They have departed on all basic issues from the Moscow documents of 1957 and 1960. They have counterposed to these documents their own unprincipled platform, which is an unsavoury hodgepodge of the most diverse anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist views. Moreover, when they realized that the Marxist-Leninist parties, and primarily the tried and tested vanguard of these parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under the leadership of its Central Committee headed by Comrade N.S. Khrushchov, resolutely rejected every attempt to falsify the jointly elaborated general line and were determined consistently to carry on the fight for peace, democracy and socialism, the CPC leaders unleashed, using all the means of factional struggle, a campaign against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

We should like to recall that the SUPG, like the CPSU and other

Marxist-Leninist parties, pointed out to the leaders of the CPC in good time that their policy was anti-Marxist and urged that the public polemics be stopped and the discussion conducted in a sober and comradely way. But the leaders of the CPC ignored this good advice. Instead they replied to the comradely suggestions of the fraternal parties with even cruder attacks, insults and slander. More than that, they went so far as to openly urge the removal of the tried and tested Marxist-Leninist leaders of the Party of Lenin and of many other Communist parties. In this way they went over to open attacks against the unity of the world Communist movement. They set up anti-party factions in the fraternal parties. They mounted a blatant campaign under the odious slogans of factional struggle to rally unprincipled and corrupt careerists and Trotskyite, anarchist and sectarian elements to their banners. They carried their disruptive activities and pernicious factional struggle even into the international democratic organizations and movements, for instance, the Afro-Asian solidarity movement.

Their main blow is directed against the Soviet Union, against the socialist community, the greatest achievement of the international working-class movement and all other revolutionary forces. The CPC leaders evidently hope that racist, nationalist and chauvinist slogans will help them to realize their claim to the leading role.

Their ideology and policies are a mixture of petty-bourgeois nationalism, adventurism, great-power chauvinism and racism. This orientation has become the greatest danger to the unity of the international Communist movement.

The CPC leaders have sought "theoretically" to justify their splitting policy as "inevitable". But how do things stand in reality? The truth is that a split in the revolutionary working-class movement is not inevitable. Moreover, the lessons of history show that the forces which betray the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and break away from the revolutionary movement are sooner or later bound to suffer defeat.

What is natural is the growth of the forces of peace and socialism. It is natural for the socialist countries to cement their unity in struggle for their common goals. Natural too is the growth of the forces of the Communist and Workers' parties, of their unity and solidarity.

Our Party and the working people of the GDR know full well what the division of the working class means. We also know that unity multiplies our strength tenfold. The working class and its allies in the GDR have advanced from success to success precisely thanks to their unity. The SUPG which is the embodiment of the unity of German Socialists on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, has always worked for the unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement.

Underlying this unity is the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin and

the decisions of the Communist and Workers' parties based on this teaching. For the sake of strengthening this unity it is imperative to expose and refute the erroneous anti-Marxist views of the CPC leaders. Our slogan is: clarity cements unity!

II

It is natural for people in the GDR to want to know the reasons for the anti-Marxist views of the CPC leaders and the struggle they are waging against the general line of the world Communist movement. The views and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders bring to mind primarily the struggle which the Communist and Workers' parties, our Party included, had to wage in the past against similar tendencies stemming mainly from petty-bourgeois nationalism.

Owing to the predominantly agrarian nature of the country, the relatively small numbers of the working class, and the social composition of the Party, petty-bourgeois nationalist influences are particularly strong in China. Gradually these petty-bourgeois nationalist views came to predominate in the policies of the CPC leaders.

Today petty-bourgeois nationalism and great-power chauvinism are the characteristic features and the driving force of the policy of the leaders of the Chinese Party.

This, in particular, is evident from the fact that they underrate the achievements of other peoples and fraternal parties, arrogantly overestimate their own successes, strive for world leadership and want to lay their hands on nuclear bombs, and seek to domineer over the world Communist movement and other peoples. The leaders of the CPC have joined those who seek a revision of their frontiers with neighbouring states; they themselves carried their border dispute with the Indian Republic to the point of military clashes. Their attitude towards other peoples, which is determined not by class but race considerations, should be particularly condemned.

The policy and stand of the Chinese leaders reveal their inability to make a scientific assessment of the present situation, to elaborate a revolutionary strategy and tactics on the basis of such an assessment and to implement this strategy and tactics patiently and systematically in struggle against all manifestations of subjectivism and petty-bourgeois anarchy. This was particularly clearly evident when the leaders of the CPC were confronted with the complex task of going over from the armed anti-imperialist liberation struggle and economic rehabilitation to planned building of socialism. As the decisions of the CPC show, it was faced with the task of guiding the country not by means of general slogans but by paying due attention to economic upbuilding and the deepening of socialist democracy. These tasks were then as urgent in China as they are today. The Eighth Congress of the CPC in 1956 adopted decisions which basically corresponded to

objective laws. Later, however, these decisions were somehow replaced with the policy of the "big leap", which hindered and complicated the consistent building of socialism, damaging the interests of the industrious and ingenious Chinese people.

In examining the reasons why the CPC leaders adopted such a position, our Party cannot ignore the fact that they have taken up the defense of the Stalin cult, which is utterly alien to Marxism-Leninism. For it is clear to all that the eradication of the consequences of the Stalin cult in the sphere of theory as well as in practice helps further to develop and consolidate socialist democracy and to create guarantees precluding any possibility of arbitrary rule by individuals. Only those who do not want this can defend the personality cult.

III

Steadfastly following the general line of the Communist and Workers' parties, the peace-loving forces of the world have achieved major successes in the fight to preserve peace.

Thanks to the superior strength of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and their consistent policy of peaceful coexistence, the ultra-reactionaries of the U.S.A. were prevented from invading socialist Cuba. The annals of history will testify for all time to come that it was the peace-loving forces of the world who prevented a thermonuclear war. And it is to the credit of the very same forces that the Moscow treaty terminating the radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, outer space and the seas was signed. The Moscow treaty gives all mothers new hope that their children will grow up healthy and will themselves bear healthy children.

Today, when thermonuclear weapons hold the threat of physical annihilation over entire nations, war can serve less than ever as a political means of settling disputed international issues. Because of this we say: since the survival and happy future of the German people depends on the preservation of peace, the only possible way to order the relations of the two German states is by pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence.

This policy alone is in the interests of our nation. Therefore our Party, government and National Front has again and again taken the initiative in seeking normalization of relations between the two German states and between the G.D.R. and West Berlin, and in pursuing a policy of common sense and good will. The historical mission of the G.D.R., the contribution which the working class and all other working people of our state are destined to make, is to create, through all-out building of socialism, the prerequisites for the victory of the forces of peace and progress in all of Germany.

Take the question of peaceful coexistence. What is the good of all the diverse declarations of the leaders of the CPC if they reject the

policy of peaceful coexistence as the foreign policy line of the socialist states? By doing so they place themselves in sharp opposition to the will of the peoples and the objective dictates of history. True, they pose as ultra-revolutionaries, but actually they are poor revolutionaries who in their heart of hearts are utterly lacking in faith. They do not believe, in effect, that the liberated peoples will be able to create their own new world by peaceful labor and to defeat imperialism in economic competition. Because of this they seek to impose on the Marxist-Leninist parties a policy of local wars against imperialism which are fraught with the danger of a global nuclear catastrophe.

It is easy to visualize what the consequences would be for the German nation if the Socialist Unity Party were to fall in line with these ultra-Left, adventurist and anti-human views. Such a policy would play into the hands of the West-German revenge seekers, who are out to unleash aggression. It would be impossible to ensure in the G.D.R. the peaceful building of socialism, in which we engaged for a long time with our frontiers wide open. To follow the line of the CPC would mean encouraging the aggressive forces of West-German imperialism to stage new and bigger provocations. Such a policy would inevitably lead to war; it would spark off a thermonuclear world war; which would endanger the very existence of the German nation.

One must therefore ask oneself: why do the leaders of the CPC not wish to see this, and that, after all, is their purpose? Are they really concerned with the victory of the world revolution? Perhaps they are mistaken only as regards the ways and means of achieving this end?

The answer is clear: prompted by their narrow selfish interests stemming from great-power chauvinism, they stop at nothing in gambling with the future of the international revolution and the destinies of the peoples. It is in this light that their rejection of the idea of stage-by-stage disarmament and their striving to gain possession of nuclear weapons is allegedly a criterion of national sovereignty, a guarantee against a country being classified as a "second or third rate power". This of course has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and the international revolution, nor has it anything to do with security requirements, since the Soviet Union's missile and nuclear power ensures the security of all the socialist countries. Whether they want to or not, the Chinese leaders are thus playing into the hands of the West-German militarists who are clamouring for for nuclear weapons.

The leaders of the CPC advise the socialist countries and the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries to concentrate their struggle exclusively against U.S. imperialism. This thesis too is garbed in ultra-revolutionary phraseology and "substantiated" by the argument that West-German, French, British and Japanese imperialism is merely a relatively insignificant "intermediate zone", a "shadow" of U.S. imperialism. This "theory" ignores the notorious aggressiveness of West-

German imperialism and tends to minimize the danger it presents. And this the CPC leaders have the temerity to offer to the German people, and to the other peoples which only too often suffered from the rapacity of German imperialism, as a revolutionary policy! This policy also explains why the leaders of the CPC, who are so eager to pose as champions of the national-liberation movement, say nothing about the neo-colonialist policy of such an imperialist country of the "intermediate zone" as Western Germany.

As for our Party, it stands for the complete and final abolition of the anti-human colonial system. It renders assistance to the people still oppressed by imperialism, not by pseudo-revolutionary slogans and "intermediate-zone" theories but by colonialist policies, the West German brand of neo-colonialism in particular. The entire experience of the national-liberation movement shows that it is the community of socialist countries, and especially the great economic and military strength of the Soviet Union, that is the best source of support and aid to the just cause and the development of the newly-emerged national states.

IV

Our Party is channelling its efforts in all-out construction of socialism. Socialism is a social system which ensures people peace and social security, human dignity and fraternity, freedom and justice, a happy full-blooded life.

Now that the socialist relations of production have finally triumphed in the GDR and its frontiers have been made secure, social progress in the republic and the living standard of its people depend primarily on how effectively the economic laws of socialism are used to ensure the maximum growth of the productivity of labor. In elaborating the new system of economic planning and management, the SUPG is steadfastly pursuing a Leninist economic policy. Aimed at advancing the scientific and technological revolution, improving the quality of output and reducing production costs, this economic policy of our Party and the government of the GDR calls for the use of all the advantages accruing from socialist production relations in order to make that contribution to the economic competition between socialism and capitalism which is required by national and international interests. We all know that this is a policy which makes our life finer and richer. It is a truly revolutionary policy understandable to the working people.

Yet the leaders of the CPC describe this successful policy of all-out building of socialism in the G.D.R. as a revisionist policy allegedly leading to the "restoration of capitalism".

What, indeed, do the Chinese leaders hope to achieve by fabricating such fables? Do they expect the working people of the G.D.R. to re-

nounce the planned, consistent economic policy pursued for years now? Do they expect us to follow their example and ignore the objective laws of socialist construction and embark on a "big-leap" policy? What would have happened if our Party had tried to by-pass essential stages of social development? We could not have risen from the ruins of 1945. Every sensible person knows by his own experience that you cannot build a sound economy by "big leaps". Only those aims can be set in building a national economy for which the prerequisites exist. Were we not to take this into account, our revolution would merely amount to spreading out poverty equally and the ideas of socialism and communism would lose their attraction for the millions of working people. A cult of backwardness and primitive equality has nothing in common with the building of socialism. The Chinese leaders, however, think and act differently. Now that their policy of the "big leap" has set the economy of the Chinese People's Republic years back, they, contrary to the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin, are seeking to elevate poverty to a virtue under socialism. Such "virtuous socialism" can hardly find many adherents. The working class and its allies have not taken the path of the socialist revolution to make life worse than it was.

They have taken this path in order to develop the productive forces and thereby satisfy their material and cultural requirements better than under capitalism.

The leaders of the CPC only discredit the lofty ideas of socialism when they repeat over and over again that those who steadily improve the people's living standard, who are evolving a higher form of organization of social labor than that existing under capitalism, and who are extending socialist democracy and developing new social relations among the working people are "sinning" against the socialist revolution, "halting half-way" and giving themselves up to the "bourgeois striving for well-being". One need not be a philosopher to see that this is an utterly erroneous interpretation of socialism.

How can people call themselves Marxist-Leninists who claim that the just principle of remuneration according to work performed leads to "a growth of bourgeois individualism" and "causes damage to the socialist economy". In the early years of the Soviet power V.I. Lenin opposed similar arguments advanced by the so-called "Left Communists", who labelled Lenin's economic policy as a "Right-wing Bolshevik deviation" and "evolution towards state capitalism". This absurd "Left Communist" position was completely annihilated by Lenin in his *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*. Only the leaders of the CPC are apparently unaware of it to this day.

Already n 1960 our Party gave a rebuff to attempts to propagate the Chinese "people's communes" in our republic. Had we departed from the tried and tested path of gradual development of co-operatives and adopted the way of the "people's communes" as a "ladder to paradise"

our position would undoubtedly have taken a turn for the worse.

Deepening of socialist democracy is an indispensable aspect of the building or socialism. But in none of the statements of the Chinese leaders is there any mention of socialist democracy or the need to promote it. Instead they are increasingly making use of military and bureaucratic methods of leadership, resorting more and more to orders from above. Since the beginning of 1964 the military methods and forms of organization practiced in the People's Liberation Army are being implanted in all spheres of public life.

Our Party has always rejected the idea of fitting socialism in any "procrustean bed" and allowing administrative compulsion to eclipse persuasion. Nor will it in the future allow itself to be diverted from the Marxist-Leninist teaching concerning the party of the working class, it will not cease its efforts to deepen inner-Party democracy or give up its close links with all sections of the people. Our Party has always existed and will continue to exist for the people. Hence it is the true champion of the interests of the working class and the entire German people, their recognized and tested leader.

V

The solidarity and unity of the international Communist movement and all other progressive forces is the decisive factor of victory in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Because of this the Communist and Workers' parties, the Communist Party of China included, pledged themselves at the 1957 and 1960 meetings to educate the working people in the spirit of unity, internationalism and patriotism. They pledged themselves to wage a resolute struggle against all survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

Our Party has long worked along these lines. One of its greatest achievements is the complete extirpation in the G.D.R. of nationalism, chauvinism and fascist race hatred. The whole world knows this, and hence the peoples regard with respect our republic, whose population has been imbued with the spirit of international solidarity, humanism and friendship among the nations. The 15 years of the existence of our state have clearly shown that socialist patriotism combined with socialist internationalism promotes both the national interest and the interests of all other peoples.

Why, then, do the leaders of the CPC seek to replace internationalism, the tried and tested jointly adopted general line of the international Communist movement, with their own "25-point general line," the salient features of which bear the odious stamp of great-power chauvinism, national arrogance and claims to autocratic leadership? Have not the peoples of all countries suffered enough from nationalism and great-power chauvinism? At any rate our

people know full well that neither has ever tended to strengthen friendship betwen peoples or to promote peace.

How can the CPC leaders' professions of loyalty to proletarian internationalism be reconciled with their anti-Soviet policy? Indoctrination of the Chinese people in an anti-Soviet spirit is a flagrant violation of proletarian internationalism inasmuch as the Soviet Union is the centre of the international working-class movement, the bulwark of Marxism-Leninism and peace. The attitude of the Communist and Workers' parties and the socialist countries towards the Soviet Union is now more than ever before the touchstone of their policy.

The Soviet Union is the starting point and the base of the socialist world system, which is the greatest achievement of the international working-class movement. Can Marxist-Leninists ever forget what they owe to the heroic accomplishments of the Soviet peoples? Can they forget that the People's Democracies were able to lay the foundations of socialism so rapidly primarily because they could draw on the material aid selflessly extended by the Soviet Union and the vast experience of the CPSU? Can they forget that it is the economic might of the Soviet Union which above all ensures the peoples peace, the prime condition for the successful building of socialism. Can they forget that in forging ahead from socialism to communism the CPSU is blazing the path to this lofty goal for all humanity?

Our Party and our people always bear this in mind. Not to remember it would mean scorning not only socialist internationalism but all the lessons of German history.

Our Party resolutely rejects the non-Marxist view that each country should build its own socialism relying on "its own forces" in isolation from the fraternal parties. If this view were to be accepted, our progress in the economic competition between socialism and capitalism would be retarded, the community of socialist countries would be weakened, and in the final analysis, the victory of socialism in general would be endangered. Socialism, like the socialist doctrine, is international, not national.

All true internationalists know that the faster the strength of socialism grows in the course of peaceful economic competition, the greater the influence exerted by the socialist community on the march of history and the more favorable the conditions for rendering effective support to the peoples who have been the object of imperialist exploitation and oppression for centuries. Our Party will therefore work indefatigably to promote co-operation among the socialist countries and to strengthen the socialist community, for this serves best of all both national and international interests.

VI

The working people of the German Democratic Republic have long been linked with the Chinese people by close friendship and splendid traditions of joint struggle against imperialism.

Many of us remember well the slogan "Hands off China!" with which the revolutionary forces of our people rallied to the support of the emancipation struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants. We remember the moral and material support given to starving strikers in China; Ernst Thaelmann's speeches in support of the Canton commune in 1927; the mass meetings sponsored by the Communist Party of Germany to protest against the supply of arms by the German imperialists for the suppression of the Chinese revolution; and Walter Ulbricht's speeches in the Reichstag exposing the imperialist war against China.

And after 1945 our Party consistently combated the attempts made by the Bonn reactionaries to stab the Chinese people in the back at a time when they were fighting the foreign imperialists and the Chiang Kai-shek regime. It condemned Adenauer's chauvinistic anti-Chinese sallies. In the course of these years the bonds of friendship between the Chinese and German peoples grew stronger. This friendship entered a new stage in 1949 when the Chinese People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic were established almost simultaneously.

True to their proletarian traditions, our Party and the government of the GDR promoted close relations with the Chinese People's Republic. These were relations of friendship, fraternal aid and co-operation, relations that were beneficial to both our peoples. Our Party consistently pursued this policy even after disagreements appeared between the leaders of the CPC and in the international Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders carried the ideological differences over to inter-state relations. They deliberately sought to worsen relations between our two states. By curtailing trade and discontinuing the supply of important raw materials, they caused considerable difficulties to our economy. At the same time the Chinese leaders had no qualms about strengthening their economic relations with capitalist countries.

Despite this regrettable stand taken by the leaders of the CPC, our Party, true to socialist internationalism, is consistently adhering to its policy of friendship with the Chinese people. It seeks not only to maintain but to promote state relations between the two countries. The SUPG hopes that in this question at least the Chinese leaders will see reason.

VII

The disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders have given rise to justified concern on the part of the members of our Party, the citizens of our republic. What will happen now, they ask.

The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany considers it necessary to convene another meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties. It therefore supports the suggestion made by the CPSU that a new meeting of the delegations of the CC, CPSU, and the CC, CPC, be held in May, that a meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties which took part in 1960 in the editorial committee preparing the Moscow meeting be called in June-July, and a meeting of all Communist and Workers' parties in the autumn of 1964.

Summarizing the foregoing, we declare with all responsibility: the general line adopted by the Communist and Workers' parties, the living, history-making spirit of the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, will triumph, and not the anti-Marxist dogma and practices of the Chinese leaders. This is the conclusion to be drawn from the rich experience of the past, from the entire history of the revolutionary working-class movement, which has always swept aside the splitters and factionalists. This is a law of history. For peace and social progress accord with the basic interests of all peoples, the Chinese people included.

The achievements of the commonwealth of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union and of the entire international Communist movement are exerting a growing influence on the thinking and actions of the working people in all countries. Under the leadership of the CC, CPSU, headed by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, the Soviet people are carrying out their program of building communism. Under the leadership of their Marxist-Leninist parties the working people of other socialist countries are achieving new substantial successes. By building up our economy and strengthening our worker-peasant state in every way, by carrying out our program for the all-out building of socialism, we too are making our contribution towards cementing the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries and the international Communist movement. Who can doubt that our struggle and labor, the creative powers of the masses guided according to a scientific plan, will continue to enhance the attractive force of socialism! Ours is a just and good cause, it is the right cause, and hence it will triumph!

FROM A PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS TO A PARTY OF THE WHOLE SOVIET PEOPLE*

The leaders of the Communist Party of China have launched a desperate campaign and are stepping up their undermining activities against the policy (agreed on and expressed in the documents of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960) of the international Communist and workers' movement in all the basic theoretical and political problems of our times. The essence of this campaign is to oppose leftist adventurist, petty-bourgeois and nationalistic ideology to Marxism-Leninism. Aspiration to hegemony of the world Communist movement is their political aim. The methods they use, which they have borrowed from the Trotskyites, are unbridled demagogy and pseudo-revolutionary phrase-mongering, designed to disguise their departure from the cardinal principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They also slander the fraternal parties, urge the formation in their ranks of anti-Party and near-Party factional groups and carry on open splitting activities.

The credo of this modern "left-wing" opportunism which found its fullest expression in the notorious 25 points of the CPC Central Committee letter of June 14, 1963, has been duly appraised in the documents of the February CPSU Central Committee Meeting and in the statements of fraternal parties. Taking just one theoretical and political problem we would like to show the real worth of the "theoretical" inventions of the Peking leaders and the purpose these inventions pursue.

The Chinese leaders, in gradually increasing the range of problems in which they are trying to impose their viewpoint on fraternal parties, have now selected as the object of attack the internal affairs of the Marxist-Leninist parties and especially the CPSU, concentrating their fire on our Party's Program adopted at the Twenty-Second Congress. The Peking ideologists who are trimming Marxism-Leninism "to suit the Chinese fashion," do not agree, among other things, that a proletarian Party can become a Party of the people. They reject our Party Program conclusions that the CPSU has become a Party of the entire people. They allege that this conclusion is nothing but "organizational and moral disarmament of the proletariat" and even a "service rendered for the restoration of capitalism."

Naturally they cannot adduce any proof on this score and try to

*Partiinaya Zhizn, No. 8, April 1964.

compensate for the absence of argument by slander and lies. They are careful enough to avoid a serious study of the real state of affairs. But since these lies are being disseminated on a grand scale through all possible channels, we are obliged to take up the issue.

DIALECTICS OF PARTY DEVELOPMENT

Marxists have never doubted that the development of a Communist Party, like the development of every social organism, follows the laws of dialectics. A Party, like everything else in the world, has its past, present and future.

The specific features of the development of parties in different countries notwithstanding, it is not hard to see some common features in this development. Usually beginning as a small group of closely united like-minded people, a Party, on joining the workers' movement, turns into a force capable of guiding the broad popular masses. This is borne out by the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of many other Communist and Workers' parties.

A Marxist-Leninist Party passes through three stages of development: 1. gathering strength, preparing the working class for struggle, overthrowing the exploiters' rule and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat; 2. building socialism, the first phase of communism; 3. building communist society. These stages are distinguished not only by the tasks confronting the Party and the conditions in which it has to operate, but also by the place of the Party in society.

When a revolutionary Marxist Party was being formed in Russia, Lenin attached special importance to a precise definition of its class nature and of the immediate and ultimate goals of the workers' struggle. Lenin insisted that "it is necessary, *first of all*, to fence off ourselves from all, to single out only and *exceptionally* the proletariat, and *then* declare that the proletariat will liberate all and that it appeals to all and invites all to action" (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 132).

Only the working class can set itself, and what is more can attain, the goal of abolishing all forms of exploitation of man by man and building communist society, a *classless* society. No other class can lead the struggle of all the working and exploited people and weld their efforts together. Only the working class in fighting for power is not interested in the subsequent perpetuation of its class domination, for it aims at abolishing all classes and all domination. This special role and position of the working class also determines the place in society of its political party as a party of the proletariat, a party of struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Yet, though it emphasizes its class nature, the Party does not in the least isolate itself from other, non-proletarian working groups of the population. On the contrary, it considers that the vanguard of

the working class can express its class interests only if it voices and defends the interests of an overwhelming majority of the people, of all working men. The idea of narrow guild interests is alien to it. The working class becomes genuinely revolutionary only to the extent that it comes out in all activities and in all spheres of life as leader of all working and exploited people.

Already in its first Program, which was worked out with Lenin's direct participation, the Party declared that it undertook to represent the interests of all working people. This by no means implied that the Party renounced its proletarian class position; on the contrary, this implied profound understanding of the *special* historical role of the working class and of its special position in society. *"The Party of the working class, the Social Democrats,"* said the Program, *"urges all sections of the working and exploited people to join its ranks inasmuch as they come to adhere to the viewpoint of the proletariat"* (*The CPSU in Resolutions,* Part 1, 7th edition, p. 39, Russ. Ed.)

On the eve of the October Revolution in Russia the Party of the working class came out as a true champion of national interests. This was one of the reasons for the mass support given to the Party's policy, and for the success of the socialist revolution. The October Revolution, developing as it did under the guidance of the Communist Party, was a proletarian and socialist revolution and at the same time a popular revolution: the working class tackled the decisive issues of the life of society "as the representative of the *whole* nation, of all that was virile and honest *in all* the classes" (Lenin, *Works,* Vol. 26, p. 75).

Describing the changed position of the Party after it became the ruling party, Lenin, in his *Message to All Party Members and to All the Toiling Classes of Russia* published on the next day after the revolution, called the Communist Party a "Party of Soviet majority" and stressed that it reliably guarded the interests of the workers, soldiers and peasants who followed the Party and were ready to win the victory for peace and socialism (Lenin, *Works,* Vol. 26 p. 273). In that period the "Soviet majority" comprised the workers, the peasants and all other working men who constituted the Russian people. In many of his writings Lenin emphasized that the Party's strength lies in that it correctly expresses the consciousness of the people.

Marxists have never confused the social composition of the Party with the interests of the different social groups it expresses. The broader the following of the social forces which the Party leads the more essential is the need to preserve its proletarian essence as a guarantee of firmness and consistency in the implementation of revolutionary changes.

With the victorious socialist revolution begins a whole period of

radical reorganization of society on socialist lines, eliminating all the exploiting classes and creating conditions for a gradual erasing of distinctions between the toiling classes. As the proletariat remoulds itself in the course of revolutionary change, many things change also in the Party itself, in its composition and methods of work.

At the beginning of the transition period the Party takes all necessary steps to protect its ranks from penetration by non-proletarian elements, but when the basic problems of the transition period have been solved, it makes admittance easier for all those sincerely wishing to apply themselves actively to the building of socialism and communism. The accomplishment of the tasks of socialist construction brought about a change in the class structure of Soviet society, the political awareness of the people grew, the Party became nearer and dearer to all groups of the working people, and its ideals were accepted on an ever greater scale by people as their own ideals.

The Party, which came into being as the vanguard of the working class, steadily turned into the vanguard of all working people, of the Soviet people as a whole. This was recorded in the Constitution of the Soviet Union adopted in 1936. The Constitution says that "the more active and politically-conscious citizens among the working class, working peasants and working intellectuals voluntarily unite in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is the vanguard of the working people in their struggle to build communist society..."

It took the Party almost 20 years to overcome the difficulties of the transition period and embark on the path leading to the completion of soscialist construction and gradual development of socialism into communism. Because of this, the terms of admission to the Party were different for workers and for other groups of the working people from the first years of the New Economic Policy until 1939. But at its 18th Congess, in 1939, when the transition period was over, the Party lifted the different terms of admittance (depending on social status) and introduced equal terms for all—workers, peasants or intellectuals. This was an expression of the historical fact that the non-proletarian groups of the working people had undergone radical change not only in their socio-economic conditions but also in their ideological make-up. It was also a result of the Party's assessment of the new situation which had developed as a result of the victory of socialism; and paved the way for a gradual transformation of the Communist Party into a Party of the whole people.

A terrible and devastating war had interrupted the process of development of socialist relations into communist relations, the building of the material and technical basis of communism. The process of the Party's development into a Party of the whole people was slowed down also by the Stalin personality cult and the accompanying methods of leadership alien to a Leninist Party, and by violations of the democratic rules of Party life.

However, when the country had recovered from the last war, and the Party, enriched with new experience, had worked out and substantiated the way for building communism, when resolute measures had been taken for overcoming the Stalin cult and its harmful consequences, the natural tendency of the Party to gradually develop into a Party of the whole people became especially strongly marked.

The outstanding achievements in the construction of socialism, the tremendous growth in the Soviet Union's economic and defense power resulting from this, and the formation and strengthening of the socialist world system made the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. both complete and final. Because of a growing affinity between the public property and collective-farmer co-operative property, the higher cultural standards of all the people, the process of erasing class distinctions between the workers and peasants gained momentum as did the process of erasing the distinctions between these two classes and the intellectuals. This consolidated the social homogeneity of Soviet society. The ideology of the working class and of the Party, its vanguard, became the ideology of the whole people.

These changes were bound to be reflected in the nature of the Party, in its composition and role in the life of society. This found expression in the Program and the Rules of the Party adopted at the 22nd CPSU Congress. Both the Program and the Rules emphasize that in the conditions of full-scale construction of communism the Communist Party has become a Party of the whole people.

Having embarked upon full-scale construction of communism the Party reviewed the results of its work in the years of Soviet power and was able to draw, in its new Program, the following conclusion: "As a result of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the consolidation of the unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, a Party of the whole people, and has extended its guiding influence to all spheres of social life." This theoretical conclusion is not a slogan, projected into the future, but a declaration of the actual state of our Party. It sums up the stupendous socio-economic changes which have taken place in the country. It is the concentrated expression of the many years of the Party's struggle for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the results of its work in organizing the building of a new social system, socialist reconstruction of the economy, remoulding the social relations and the world outlook of millions of people, the struggle for the consolidation of the socio-political unity of the Soviet people. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union *has not ceased to be* a Party of the working class, for it continues to represent its communist ideals. Yet, the Communist Party in our country *has become* something more than the Party of the working class alone. It is now a Party of the whole people because all Soviet people have accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook

of the working class and its ideals. These are the vital dialectics of the development of Soviet society.

In the period of socialist construction in our country there were classes and social groups that were hostile to the working class, groups that wavered between socialism and capitalism, between the working class and the bourgeoisie. At that time the Party which embodied the class positions of the proletariat waged a long and difficult struggle to win first the majority of the people, and then the *entire* people, to the side of the working class. The conclusion that our Party has become a party of the whole people is an acknowledgement of the fact that this struggle has been crowned with complete success.

All Soviet working people—the peasants, former artisans and working intellectuals—gradually took the side of the working class and came to realize the community of their interests with those of the working class as expressed in the fullest possible way by the Communist Party. In the course of the struggle for the triumph of socialism all Soviet people came to accept the policy of the Communist Party as their own, to accept the Party's guidance and today regard the Party as the sole champion of the common interests of all working people. That is why the party of the working class has become a party of the whole people.

Our Party is definitely a party of the people in its goals, its policy to achieve these goals and in its composition (the best people from all sections of Soviet society are represented in it: the workers, the peasants and the intellectuals). *The entire Soviet people are interested in the attainment of the ultimate goal—communism, and this is the firmest foundation for a party of the entire people, the organizer and leader of the work of building communism.*

The democratic methods of its activities also conform to the nature of a party of the whole people. The CPSU is backed by the moral prestige of its policy and leadership and the acknowledgement of this by the broadest mass of the population. The Party invites the people to discuss the most important economic and political problems of development and takes guidance from the people's collective reason. "The strength of our Party lies in the fact," says N.S. Khrushchov, "that it acts jointly with the entire people and that non-Party working people work side by side with Party members" (*The Construction of Communism in the USSR and the Development of Agriculture*, Vol. 4, p. 102, Russ. Ed.).

The new Program has recorded what has already become a reality and will become more and more apparent in the future. The conclusion that there are no longer any classes or sections of society hostile to socialism and, consequently, no class struggle in Soviet society, that the Soviet state is a state of the whole people and that the CPSU is a party of the whole people, are not abstract formulas.

They spring from the life of our society, the Party's realistic policy, which corresponds to the new historical period, and is aimed at enlisting all Soviet people in building communism and the management of society, at promoting the people's activity and extending socialist democracy.

Marxism-Leninism does not regard the transformation of the CPSU into a Party of the whole people as a single act; it views this transformation as a process begun a long time ago and calling for a further improvement in the methods of Party guidance and for the Party and the people drawing still closer to one another. In the past our Party was a party of a single class, now it is a party of the whole people, and in future—mature communism—it will gradually develop into a new type of organization of society.

Theoretically it can be assumed that the Communist Party will not exist for ever as a political organization: there will be no need for it when a mature communist society has been built. But it will remain as a public organization necessary for managing the affairs of society. Lenin expressed this idea in one of the most important documents of the Second Congress of the Comintern, in the resolution "The Role of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution." This document drew the conclusion that towards the final victory of communism there may take place a gradual merger of the three main types of organization—the Soviets, the trade unions and the Party—into a single type of organization. It is hard to say now how this process will proceed in actual life. But the theoretical direction given to it by Lenin is already being borne out by life.

These are the dialectics of the development of the Communist Party and it is natural that the conclusions set forth in the documents of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU should have met with the complete understanding of Marxist-Leninists all over the world. They were accepted by all who, in studying the life of society, proceed from Marxism-Leninism which demands that one should "take cognizance of actual events, of the precise facts of *reality*, and not cling to a theory of yesterday, which, like all theories, at best only outlines the main and the general, and only *approximates* to an inclusive grasp of the complexities of life" (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 26).

MAIN ARGUMENT OF THE CHINESE THEORISTS

What is apparent to every Marxist-Leninist who accepts the laws of dialectics not merely in words, but wants to use them as a guide in analyzing social phenomena, evokes sharp protest on the part of the Chinese leaders.

The Chinese leaders do not take up the theoretical problems of Party development. They are clearly unwilling to disclose their obvious departure from the basic or, as they like to put it, "general"

Marxist truths. As the initial prerequisite for their attacks on the CPSU Program the Chinese "theorists" set forth this sole argument: "the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable until a country enters a higher phase of communist society." They assert that the "withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the withering away of the state," and as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, the Party should also be a party of the proletariat. Not in the least abashed in asserting this, the Chinese leaders ascribe their own inventions to Marx and Lenin and "defend" them from "modern revisionists." Let us see, however, from whom the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State and the Party should be defended.

Perhaps it should be guarded against those who see no difference between the bourgeois state, the state of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the state of a mature socialist society advancing to a higher phase of communism? Perhaps it should be defended from those who apply the same old formulas to all periods of history?

The Chinese leaders deliberately impose the laws of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism on socialist society in general. In their articles they cite only those quotations from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin in which communism is regarded as a socio-economic formation generally. Anyone who has taken the trouble to study conscientiously the works of Marx and Lenin knows full well that they distinguished different phases in this formation: the first phase—socialism, and the higher phase—complete communism.

In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme,* Marx wrote: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the first into the second. This period conforms also with the political transitional period and the state of this period cannot be anything but a *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat"* (Marx and Engels, *Works,* Second Ed., Vol. 19, p. 27, Russ. Ed.).

It is actually this quotation, snatched out of context of Marx's exposition, that is used as a theoretical basis for "rejecting" the CPSU Program's thesis about the state of the whole people. The Peking propagandists do not anywhere quote the following two lines from the same work, which says this apropos the Gotha Program: "But the program does not concern itself with either this last (i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat—*Ed.*) or the future *statehood in communist society."* (Our emphasis—*Ed.*)

If one were to follow the logic of the Chinese "theoreticians," Marx should be declared an anti-Marxist for expressing this idea. Indeed, what statehood *will follow* the dictatorship of the proletariat, the withering away of which, in the Chinese theoreticians' opinion, is the withering away of statehood in general?

The "Chinese-style Marxists" stubbornly deny that when Marx

spoke about the period of transition from capitalism to communism he had in mind the first phase of *communism—socialism.* They also remain silent about Lenin's conclusion in *"The State and Revolution* and other works, where he carefully summed up *everything* Marx and Engel had said on the state, namely that: "What is usually called socialism was termed by Marx the 'first' or lower phase of communist society. Insofar as the means of production become *common* property, the word 'communism' is also applicable here, provided we do not forget that it is *not* complete communism" (*Works,* Vol. 25, p. 442).

Lenin clearly defined also the essence and aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a special form of class alliance between the proletariat and the numerous non-proletarian groups of the working people aimed at complete overthrow of capitalism, suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and their attempts at restoring capitalism, an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism (*Works,* Vol. 29, p. 351). Removal of the danger of capitalist restoration signifies, in his opinion, also "the cessation of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (*Works,* Vol. 33, p. 75). Lenin did not ignore Marx's profound idea of "the future statehood of communist society," which emerges after the dictatorship of the proletariat has fulfilled its historical mission.

Developing Marx's views on this question, Lenin writes:

"Thus, even '*communist* society' will have statehood!! Isn't there a contradiction here?

"No, there is not:

"*I*—in capitalist society—the state in the proper sense

"*II*—transition (the dictatorship of the proletariat): the state of a transitional type (not the state in the proper sense)

"*III*—communist society: the withering away of the state

"Full consistency and clarity!!

"Otherwise:

"*I*—democracy as an exception only, never a full one . . .

"*II*—democracy almost full, limited only by *suppression* of the resistance of the bourgeoisie

"*III*—democracy genuinely full, becoming habitual and *therefore* withering away . . ." (*Marxism on the State,* pp. 53-55).

In our country the first two periods noted by Lenin above are already things of the past. A state of the whole people has emerged and is developing in the Soviet Union—*communist statehood,* the statehood of *the first phase of communism.* This new communist statehood is destined to develop gradually into communist public self-government, and this development is not a theoretical forecast any longer, but something that is taking place in Soviet life.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is indispensable for the transi-

tion to socialism. It is necessary in state form for the complete and final victory of socialism. But by virtue of the laws of its internal development, at a definite stage—the stage of mature socialism—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat turns into the state of the whole people. And the latter is a most important landmark on the way to the development of socialist statehood into communist public self-government, on the way to the withering away of the state in general.

Powerless to prove anything in substance, the Chinese "theoreticians" resort to the following argument. They assert: "Anyone with an elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the so-called state of the whole people is nothing new. Representative bourgeois figures always called the bourgeois state a 'state of the whole people,' or a 'state in which power belongs to all the people'."

A strong argument, indeed! By this logic, Communists would have to renounce socialism because there exist many different anti-Marxist "socialist" doctrines. They would also have to abandon the realization of such slogans as freedom, equality, fraternity, democracy for the sole reason that they were put forward by the bourgeois revolution and subsequently perverted and debased by the bourgeoisie on coming to power. Communists, on the contrary, maintain that the true meaning of these slogans should be revived, that these slogans should be carried into practice, and that this is possible only under socialism and communism. The same applies to the state of the whole people. When Lassalle spoke about such a state, or when imperialist ideologists speak of it today, the Marxists rightly reply: this is deception of the people. A state of the whole people or a party of the whole people cannot exist in a society split into hostile classes. A state of the whole people that develops out of the dictatorship of the proletariat which has accomplished its historic mission with the complete and final victory of socialism and the country's entry into the period of full-scale communist construction, is an entirely different matter.

Having got tied up in the importunate repetition of quotations snatched out of context and seeing the senselessness of the attempt to palm off distortion of Marxism as genuine Marxism, the Chinese propagandists are trying to make believe that the Soviet Union is still going through the transitional period, that the question "who will win" has not yet been solved completely and finally in our country, that "there still exists the danger of restoration of capitalism," and that therefore there is still need for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian Party. These ideas are given wide publicity by the Chinese press. Specifically, they are contained in the briefing speech Chou Yang, assistant head of the propaganda department of the Central Committee of the CPC, made before social science workers on October 26, 1963.

The Chinese leaders would like to see the Soviet Union not as it is today, but in the conditions which obtained some 35 years ago, during the NEP period. Can one argue with people resorting to such methods? Perhaps, they should be referred to pronouncements of the man whose ideas they accept unreservedly and whose name they readily use in the struggle against the CPSU and the international Communist movement.

For some reason the Chinese leaders pretend that they have not read Stalin's report on the New Constitution, or his report to the 18th Congress of the Party, or his other speeches in which it is pointed out that already in the mid-thirties the question "who will win" was solved in the Soviet Union once and for all, the exploiting classes were liquidated, and socialism scored a complete victory. To believe the Chinese leaders, the Soviet Union has made no progress since then, and, what is more, the country still faces problems that were solved long ago.

That classes still exist under socialism is axiomatic. The important thing is what kind of classes. Socialist society in the U.S.S.R. consists of friendly classes—the workers and peasants, and the social group of the people's intelligentsia. They are welded together by the community of vital interests, by Marxist-Leninist ideology, and by a common goal: the building of communism.

Whereas the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is characterized by the existence of overthrown but not yet liquidated exploiting classes and, consequently, by class struggle, the transition from socialism to communism takes place in the condition of socio-political and ideological unity of society. The Chinese leaders do not want to reckon with this. Evidently they believe that the CPSU should pursue a policy of class struggle in the country, artificially foment enmity between the workers and collective farmers, egg on the workers and the collective farmers against the intelligentsia.

Why does the CPC leadership, despite self-evident facts, fabricate concoctions about class struggle in Soviet society? The purpose of these specious and at the same time very naive methods is not hard to guess. Their heads turning from outstanding victories in the national-liberation revolution, which chiefly accomplished anti-imperialist, bourgeois-democratic tasks, the leaders of the Communist Party of China clearly underestimated both the difficulties of the transitional period and the time needed for it. The mania of hegemonism drove them onto the path of adventurist leaps in the economy. Take the question of Party building. Already at the Eighth Congress in 1956, i.e., only seven years after the victory of the revolution on a nation-wide scale, equal terms for admission into the Party were introduced, irrespective of social status. And this in an incomparably more petty-bourgeois country than Russia used to be. The first successes in

economic development and in uniting the peasants in co-operatives turned the heads of the Chinese leaders, gave them the idea that the transitional period was already past and that, through the communes, China would be able to attain communism rapidly—sooner than the socialist countries of Europe, the Soviet Union included.

Objective reality hits back cruelly when disregarded. The economically unsubstantiated, maximalist slogans fell through and the country's economy paid dearly for them. Then, seeking to conceal its miscalculations, the Chinese leadership launched a noisy propaganda campaign designed to make believe that not only in China, but also in the U.S.S.R. and all socialist countries the tasks of the transitional period had not been accomplished, that the U.S.S.R. was a country somewhat richer than China but as far removed from communism as China with respect to social gains.

This is tantamount to insisting at noon that it is only daybreak. Such statements show that the people who make them could not care less for what time it really is.

The CPC leaders declaim with shrill revolutionary zeal: "In the view of Marxist-Leninists, there is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class political party. All political parties have a class character. Party spirit is the concentrated expression of class character." This is a truism of Marxism-Leninism. But the Chinese ideologists are not inclined to ponder over problems raised by life: in what is the class character of a Marxist-Leninist party expressed in socialist society free from antagonistic classes, where the exploiters have been liquidated and exploitation of man by man abolished forever, where the socio-political unity of society has been consolidated?

Communists reply: the class character of a Marxist-Leninist party in such a society is expressed in its loyalty to communism—that supreme class principle of the international proletariat; in the building of communism—that ultimate goal of the international working class. It is expressed in its irreconcilable attitude towards capitalism and the exploiters and all forms of imperialist, national and political oppression.

"Sinified Marxism" treats all matters, regardless of place and circumstances, in a primitive fashion, following one stereotyped pattern, the same for all times and types of society: parties—antagonistic classes—class struggle. Why should our country revert to stages of life that are already past history, just because the Chinese leaders do not want to or cannot understand the life of our socialist country, the struggle of our people for communism, and just because they assess the situation in other countries only by the situation in their own. In order to understand class nature correctly, in the Leninist way, the Chinese leaders should go by the facts of life and not by primitive, stereotyped patterns, or, as they like to say themselves, "walk on both legs and not on one or on one and a half."

WHAT DO THEY NEED THIS FOR?

It is wrong to regard the Chinese leaders as people who are genuinely interested in having a discussion on questions of principle, in finding out the truth. The methods they use show clearly that there is a definite purpose behind all their fulmination against those who regard the transformation of a proletarian party into a party of the whole people as a logical process.

Historically, it so happened that the propositions on the nature of the CPSU as a party of the whole people were elaborated at a time when the Party was combating the effects of the Stalin cult and when objective possibilities had been created in the country for a fuller satisfaction of the people's requirements.

The Chinese leaders are highly sensitive about this. Denying the popular character of the CPSU, they are indignant over the fact that the Soviet Communists "tirelessly propagate such slogans as 'everything in the name of man, for the benefit of man'." In his briefing report, Chou Yang does not have the courage to admit that in the present conditions the level of productive forces in China and the adventurist, subjectivist course of the Chinese leaders do not allow them to pursue such a policy. Therefore the thesis is "substantiated" that the slogan "everything in the name of man" can be put forward "only with the advent of the epoch of communism all over the world." Carried away in briefing social science workers, Chou Yang "forgets" what is written in the Rules of the CPC adopted in 1956, when the Chinese leaders pursued a basically correct policy. Yet the Rules of the CPC say that "the chief aim of the entire work of the Party is to satisfy to the maximum the material and cultural requirements of the people" (see *Records of the Eighth National Congress of the CPC*, p. 509), which only differs verbally from the wording now being criticized by the Chinese leaders. This is yet another example of departure from correct positions, of a revision of even their own documents, revealing the theoretical and political inconsistency of the CPC leaders. Evidently China's internal situation does not enable Chinese leaders to speak of raising the well-being of the people now. That is why they clamp down upon a party which regards concern for the welfare of the people as the supreme principle of its activities.

The struggle against the Stalin cult launched by the CPSU was obviously unpalatable to the Chinese leaders, because it hit at the personality cult which has assumed truly unheard-of proportions in China. Having admitted, at first, that the 20th Congress of the CPSU "has given convincing explanations of the tremendous importance of strict observance of the principle of collective leadership and of the struggle against the personality cult," Peking declared soon afterwards that the struggle of the CPSU and of the entire international Communist movement against the personality cult was "erroneous"

and "harmful." The Chinese leaders use Stalin's name in order to laud fallacious methods of leadership, camouflage violations of the standards of Party life and, while extolling themselves, slander the leaders of other Communist parties who denounce the unseemly behaviour of the Peking splitters.

Visitors to China get a distinct impression that the study of Marxism-Leninism there is limited to the study of the works of one person only. At any rate nobody says that he reads works by Marx and Engels, that he has read at least one work by the founders of scientific communism. The infinitesimal number of copies of Lenin's *Works* published in China makes them practically inaccessible to readers at large.

But the works of Mao Tse-tung, issued in a printing of more than 380 million copies, are described everywhere as the sun illuminating the road, as the ultimate in wisdom. Party members are urged to keep Mao's works in three places—at home, in the pocket and at your place of work, and to recall Mao's behests at least three times a day. The pious attitude towards Mao's personality is also manifested in that he is thanked for the food the Chinese receive, for the health of the children, for a stroke of luck.

It is not hard to understand why the Chinese leaders ,having created such a mystical atmosphere around Mao's personality, oppose the CPSU, which has boldly exposed the Stalin cult and demonstrated the incompatibility of any personality cult with Marxism-Leninism.

The Chinese leaders are inculcating in the Party practices which have little in common with democracy, and cultivating morals notoriously known as an inevitable product of the personality cult.

The Eighth Congress of the CPC described it as a serious shortcoming that no Party congress had been convened in the previous 11 years. This self-criticism, however, was purely formal. According to the new Rules, congresses are to be convened once every five years, but nothing has been heard about the next CPC Congress, although more than seven and a half years have passed since the Eighth Congress. Furthermore, if one recalls that in the past four years the CPC leaders have made such a sharp turn in policy which only a Congress should have the authority to make, it will become even clearer why the Chinese leaders revile the proposition about the popular character of the Party and the broadening of democratic practices stemming from these propositions.

If the leaders of the Communist Party of China were more consistent, they would have "to expose" the documents of the 8th Congress of their own Party. For these documents speak of the fallaciousness of attempts to build socialism singlehanded, in isolation from the rest of the world (see *Records of the Eighth National Congress of the CPC*, Gospolitizdat, 1956, p. 132. Russ. Ed.); of experience having

shown that whenever leaders tried to set an unrealistic pace they have been brought up sharply—"more haste, less speed" (p. 224); of the great importance of the assistance rendered by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to People's China (pp. 4, 125, 164, etc.); of the impermissibility of arrogant, Great-Power attitudes and conceit because of the victory of the revolution and certain successes in construction (p. 5); of petty-bourgeois vices being like weeds which "are not completely burned down by the steppe fire and grow again at a whiff of the spring wind" (p. 374). All this appears today as sharp criticism of the present line of the Chinese leaders. The CPC leaders behave as if there had been no 8th Congress of the Party. Instead, they violently attack everything that is being done in the Soviet Union, and the criticism of the idea of the popular character of the Party is merely a part of their efforts to distract the Chinese people from the internal hardships resulting from their incorrect policy.

In recent years the Chinese press has been treating questions of Party life more and more sparingly, and has written very little about methods of Party leadership. This subject is being avoided, and treated as a kind of "military secret." An idea of the prevailing style can be gained from the persistent claims that "policy is the commanding force," a proposition serving as a theoretical substantiation, as it were of voluntarism and administration by mere injunction, and as an admission, made from time to time by provincial newspapers, that not a few Party workers have become accustomed to being sole taskmasters, whom the people call "living Buddhas," and that the provinces have acquired their own "cults of the individual."

It is common knowledge that the less Party democracy there is, the larger the Party apparatus. In no other Communist Party is the Party apparatus so colossal as in the CPC. For example, in 1960 there were more than 100 full-time Party functionaries for 3,500 Communists in the Fushun coal fields. In Anshan, there were 2,510 full-time Party functionaries and public organizations workers for every 24,000 Party members. There are 510 members and 25 full-time Party workers at the Shanghai diesel-engine plant. For 4,750 employees this plant has 600 full-time public organizations workers. Thus, there is one full-time Party leader per 25 to 40 Communists. What this means in practice can be gauged from Mao Tse-tung's injunction that a Party secretary should be a good "squad leader" (see the *Records of the Eighth National Congress*, p. 295). This view is referred to, daily guidance is taken from it, and a secretary is indeed regarded as a commander, a Party organization as a military unit, and Party life as army routine. Today one may also see the following maxim in the Chinese press: "Every first secretary is a commander-in-chief."

An idea of the relations between Party leaders and the rank and

file is given by the so-called *huipao* system which grossly contradicts Marxist-Leninist concepts of Party life. According to this system, every Communist regularly reports to his secretary on his work and life. In doing so he must abide by Mao Tse-tung's dictum: "If you know, say so; if you say, say everything. There is no reproach to him who cautions, but a precept to him who heeds." In other words, a Communist is demanded to confess everything, including his sentiments, doubts, etc., and not only his own, but also those of the people he meets. Advertised as the leaders' "solicitude" for Party members but in reality a legalized system of denunciation, *huipao* creates an oppressive atmosphere in Party organizations and produces adulators, slanderers and careerists.

The same aim is pursued by the method of educating people by the positive examples of those who are "boundlessly devoted to the ideas of Mao Tse-tung," a method designed to substitute criticism and self-criticism.

Only a few years ago the CPC leaders criticized the views and style of work, alien to Marxism-Leninism, that were current in the Party: "subjectivism in ideology, red-tape in work, and sectarianism in organization" (*The Eighth National Congress of the CPC*, p. 5). Today, no trace is left of the criticism of these vices, which have assumed incomparably greater dimensions. The CPC leaders prefer slander against fraternal parties to honest self-criticism. But this method has never helped to resolve internal problems.

Development of a Communist party into a Party of the whole people is an objective law. The socialist nature of the People's Republic of China will lead to a situation where, with the growth of the productive forces, with further changes in the social structure of society, this law will make its way in China as well. The present leadership of the CPC is hampering this process. But people cannot revoke the laws of social development of their own free will. The time will come when there will be inscribed, in the history of the CPC, pages wrathfully condemning those who in their time wanted to supplant Marxism-Leninism by a petty-bourgeois nationalist ideology, to reverse the march of history.

LETTER FROM CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY TO CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA*

Dear Comrades,

As you are no doubt aware, our Party has taken a firm principled stand on the question of the differences that have arisen between the leaders of the Communist Party of China and the world Communist movement. Our position rests on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, on the joint decisions of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960. At the same time, our attitude in this question derives from the experience of the German revolutionary working-class movement over the years, the experience of struggle against Right and Left-opportunism, the needs of our present-day struggle to combat West-German imperialism and militarism, and also our firm faith in the recognized vanguard of the international Communist movement—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee led by Comrade N. S. Khrushchov.

In the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement and in order to avoid exacerbating the differences unnecessarily, our Party has displayed maximum restraint in the public polemic. For this reason we welcomed the proposal to end the public debate made by Comrade Khrushchov on behalf of the CPSU at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in 1963—a proposal prompted by a high sense of responsibility for the unity of the revolutionary working-class movement and the socialist states—and we have abided by this proposal. Although the mounting attacks by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party against the general line adopted at the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960 have compelled us to ask ourselves again and again whether we ought not to reply publicly, our Party, even at its 1963 Congress, refrained from open debate.

It was only when the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party began to conduct the polemic in an increasingly virulent form and intensified its insulting sallies against the CPSU and many other fraternal parties, resorting to the open circulation of its materials through legal channels with the aid of the Federal German authorities which are persecuting our Party—it was only then that we felt compelled to come out openly against these sallies and to set forth

*Freies Volk, May, 1964

our viewpoint with utmost clarity; this we did in the Statement of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee issued in August 1963 and the decision of the Second Plenary Meeting of our Central Committee at th end of 1963. After all, you cannot fail to realize what it means for a party outlawed by a monopoly government to find its policy attacked by the leadership of a fraternal party in documents circulated with the aid of that very government.

In the decision of the Second Plenary Meeting of our Central Committee we once again endorsed the proposal to terminate the public polemic in the interests of the unity of the world Communist movement and to create a favorable atmosphere for thoroughly thrashing out the differences.

Exercising the greatest self-restraint, we refrained even in the past few months from conducting the controversy in public, for we hoped that the leadership of the Communist Party of China would finally heed the insistent appeals addressed to it by many fraternal parties, including our own Party.

However, our hopes were cruelly disappointed. We now find ourselves faced with the following situation: your documents containing attacks on the general line of the world Communist movement, outrageous slander against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and many other fraternal parties, and also attacks on the policy of our own Party, are being circulated on an increasing scale with the active support of the reactionary Bonn state machine. We are in possession of sufficient incontrovertible proof that the Department for the Protection of the Constitution, a police organization which specializes in the persecution of all peace-loving, democratic and socialist movements, is directly engaged in the planned distribution of your materials. This same department is also working to activize the few insignificent Trotskyite groups, which are being supplied with materials issued by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and are instigated to carry on disruptive and subversive work within our Party. We have evidence that the Department for the Protection of the Constitution has set up a special division to study the question of how to utilize the policy of the Chinese Party leadeship for the purpose of: (a) subverting the Communist Party of Germany; (b) preventing united action by Social Democrats and Communists and co-operation among all democratic forces; (c) stepping up psychological warfare against the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union.

This activity on the part of the political police of the Federal Republic has assumed such proportions and become so obvious that the liberal bourgeois journal *Der Spiegel* has commented on it in some detail.

In view of this situation the Central Committee of our Party has

once again examined the question of whether to continue to abide by our decision to end the public debate when you continue to attack the general line of the world Communist movement in a form that has long since exceeded all permissible bounds. It is with a feeling of deep outrage that we read in your materials the type of slanderous assaults on the CPSU and many other fraternal parties which have hitherto emanated only from the imperialist enemies of the working-class movement. We have also been greatly shocked by the attempt in your materials to justify a split in the world Communist movement as allegedly inevitable, openly to intervene in the internal affairs of the fraternal parties, and, with the help of Trotskyite and other elements, to create factions in the various Communist parties, including our own Party. We find equally reprehensible your undisguised support of the disruptive groupings which have long been waging a struggle against the Communist parties.

We should like to repeat here once again that we emphatically reject the slander which the leadership of the Communist Party of China is levelling at the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee and Comrade Khrushchov. Fraternal militant cooperation with the CPSU is a cherished tradition of the CPG and it will never allow the Party of Lenin to be vilified and insulted in its hearing. The decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU were an outstanding contribution to the creative development of Marxism-Leninism and gave new and powerful impetus to the entire international Communist movement. The significance of the 20th Congress was duly recognized by the entire world Communist movement in the 1957 and 1960 documents.

Dear Comrades! The Central Committee of our Party would like once again to make an earnest and insistent appeal to you to abandon the path of attacks and slander, the path of irrational exacerbation of the debate and interference in the internal affairs of fraternal parties. No one who is really concerned for the unity of the international Communist movement will interpret this appeal as a plea to avoid discussion of issues which are urgently in need of clarification. On the contrary, it is precisely in the interests of such clarification that the open polemic should be terminated and a businesslike atmosphere created free of irresponsible attacks.

As the leaders of a great socialist country you bear a very great responsibility for the preservation and consolidation of the unity of the socialist camp, for the unity and cohesion of the world Communist movement and all anti-imperialist forces.

We are firmly convinced that the leadership of the Communist Party of China will be guilty of a grave transgression against history and against the interests of their own people if it continues to carry on the open polemic and to persist in the policy of splitting the world Communist movement.

Therefore we earnestly appeal to you once again to end the open debate and the dispatch of materials to Western Germany which run counter to the line of our Party and the decisions of the Moscow Meetings in order that the differences of opinion might be thrashed out in a sober atmosphere and in the comradely form customary among Communists.

With Communist greetings,

MAX REIMANN,
First Secretary, Central Committee,
Communist Party of Germany.
February 27, 1964

MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO STRENGTHENING OF WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

STATEMENT* OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY ON REPORT OF COMRADE M. A. SUSLOV AT PLENARY MEETING OF CC, CPSU ON FEBRUARY 14, 1964.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany addressed a letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in which it set forth the principled standpoint of the Communist Party of Germany with regard to the differences between the Marxist-Leninist parties and the leaders of the Communist Party of China, suggesting once again that they desist from the public polemic and disruptive activity. This letter, prompted by a sense of high responsibility for the unity of the world Communist movement and the need to defend the jointly adopted decisions, was, however, left unanswered.

Contrary to common sense and to proletarian discipline, ignoring the dangers threatening the international working-class movement, and with the plaudits of the West-German reactionaries and revenge-seekers, the CPC leaders went on with the polemic and even developed it into an unbridled campaign of slander against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee and Comrade

*Freies Volk, May 1964.

Khrushchov, and against the Marxist-Leninist leadership of other Communist and Workers' parties.

Therefore the Central Committee of the CPG approves the publication of Comrade Suslov's report "Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement" and the resolution on this report adopted by the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on February 15, 1964. It recommends that all Party organizations thoroughly study these materials and distribute them among all sections of the population, especially among the Social Democrats and trade unionists.

The publication of these materials is a further major contribution enhancing the strength of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism and, therefore, an inestimable aid in the struggle of all Communist and Workers' parties against imperialism and war, for peace, democracy and socialism. These materials serve to promote the unity and solidarity of the international Communist movement and provide the Communist and Workers' parties everywhere with a new political and ideological weapon in the struggle for the accomplishment of their tasks.

These documents show once again that the CPSU, and its Central Committee headed by Comrade Khrushchov, is the most experienced and mature Marxist-Leninist Party which displays wisdom, competence, self-control and firm adherence to principle in all situations, and is, therefore, a model for all Communist and Workers' parties.

The strong ties between all Communist and Workers' parties and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, their fidelity to the jointly agreed decisions of 1957 and 1960, to the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU are the guarantee of victory in the struggle for peace, peaceful coexistence and socialism the world over.

UNITY OF INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

REPORT* BY COMRADE PALMIRO TOGLIATTI TO THE JOINT PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND CENTRAL AUDITING COMMISSION OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY.

As you know, during the closing months of last year there was a certain abatement in the polemics. During that period the leaders of the CPSU and notably Comrade Khrushchov on repeated occasions voiced the desire and proposed that an end be put to the bitter public polemic. This would have made it possible to discuss matters calmly, in the course of which agreement could have been reached, thus avoiding the danger of an open break and thereby reinforcing the unity of the international working class and Communist movement. In conformity with these proposals the Soviet comrades, from July 1963 onwards, abstained from publishing new polemical materials, confining themselves to the publication in December 1963 of a volume containing the materials that had been written in the previous months. We, like all the other parties in agreement with the position adopted by the Soviet leaders, likewise abstained for a certain time from continuing the polemics in the hope that this would open the way to contacts that would benefit unity, and that the dialogue between the parties would be conducted along reasonable and fruitful lines. It should be noted, however, that the Chinese comrades took an entirely different line of conduct. They expounded their positions in a 25-point program published in the summer of 1963. A fitting answer was given to them. Moreover, they continued to circulate materials criticizing and attacking the line of conduct of the Communist parties, to form small factional and disruptive groups in different countries.

All this notwithstanding, a kind of truce was reached, if only a partial one, at the beginning of the year. It was broken at the beginning of February, when a most violent article was published in the Chinese press and then broadcast and circulated in all countries, in which the leaders of the CPSU were accused of deliberately provoking a split in the world Communist movement by their "revisionist"

*L'Unita, April 23, 1964. Abridged.

policy. It all amounts to a repetition of the outworn arguments characteristic of the Chinese polemic, arguments which are far removed from the existing situation and tasks of the day. In the article in question, however, they are supposed to theoretically substantiate the necessity for a split in the revolutionary movement. Attacks are made accordingly against the Soviet leaders and especially against Khrushchov, which in their violence exceed all bounds, and the demand even made that the leadership of the CPSU be changed and also its policy.

It was necessary to answer this and Comrade Suslov did so at a meeting of the Central Committee on February 15. The other parties were informed of this report, but it was not published immediately because it was not clear just then whether the Chinese leaders would agree, or not, to end the public polemic.

It was then, in fact that the leadership of the Roumanian Workers' Party took the initiative and asked the Soviet leaders to postpone publication of Suslov's report and decided to send a delegation of their own to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in order to secure, through mediation, the termination of the open polemic. Their initiative did not yield positive results.

When, upon their return to Bucharest from Peking and after their meeting with Soviet leaders, the Roumanian leaders tried once again to follow up their initiative by making a new concrete proposal, the Chinese press renewed its violent attacks against the political line of the CPSU and the other Communist parties regarding the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolutionary working-class movement. We published a comprehensive resumé of this article which gives the comrades a chance to see that the Chinese as always, develop their polemics, not on the basis of a political analysis, an examination of the current situation and its perspectives in the different countries, but in accordance with their usual criterion, that of repeating quotations, falsifying our positions and repeating their accusations of revisionism, treachery, etc.

The publication of Comrade Suslov's report was therefore inevitable. As the comrades know, it contains a comprehensive, documented and reasoned confutation of the Chinese positions which were vigorously rejected. During his recent visit to Hungary and his meetings with the Polish comrades, Comrade Khrushchov exposed and denounced these positions. The report of Comrade Suslov should be widely circulated, studied, commented upon and discussed in the ranks of our Party. It contains a clear exposition of the line upheld by the CPSU in the international movement, in the dispute with the Chinese comrades. We are in agreement with this line in substance.

We might note here that we do not know what exactly was the position of the Chinese leaders regarding the proposals of the Soviet

comrades to terminate the polemics or the more recent Roumanian proposals. However on the basis of the documents known to us it is our conviction that the Chinese comrades are not acting in good faith towards the other parties. It seems to us that they are following the method of opportunist diplomacy, aiming to assure themselves positions of advantage by refusing or inexplicably delaying giving exact, unequivocal answers. This is a rather serious and significant matter. If the Chinese leaders had really wanted to wage a struggle to save, as they say, the revolutionary movement from opportunism they would have acted quite differently, would have rejected these fraudulent methods which are not worth anything.

All this has led to the aggravation of the situation inside the international working-class and Communist movement, has created a serious threat to its unity and struck a blow at the confidence the millions of working people have in the revolutionary movement. It is therefore right and necessary that we, like the other Communist and Workers' parties, should attentively examine this new situation and the dangers inherent in it, that we should take our decisions or reaffirm decisions already taken, both as regards the substance of the questions and the method we think should be followed to safeguard and, in the future, to restore the unity of the entire movement. As you know, the proposal is made again in Comrade Suslov's report to hold an international meeting similar to the 1960 meting of the 81 parties. Several parties, and in the first place the French Communist Party, favor convening such a meeting. Others, like us, have on the contrary expressed their doubts, or are still considering the question. It would be advisable once more to express our viewpoint about this meeting (about which incidentally we have already publicly stated our position) in the light of the present situation.

The Italian Communist Party and the Polemic With the Chinese Comrades

However before proceeding any further, we must rid ourselves of the accumulative effect of the anti-Communist propaganda spread by all kinds of opponents and enemies of the revolutionary working-class movement with the object of causing confusion, provocations and reactionary agitation, and who in their campaign pursue two aims: on the one hand to have people believe that the Communist movement is on the brink of a terrible crisis and, on the other, to speculate on the positions of our Party, falsifying them in order to discredit us. The ultimate purpose of this campaign is clear. By sowing confusion, through inventions and falsifications often of a shameless character, to strike a blow at the vanguard forces of progress, democracy and peace. . . .

We would like to draw the attention of the Chinese leaders to this

fact. It is strange that they do not see, or pretend not to see, that their activity, aimed at discrediting and splitting he Communist parties, that their violent struggle and smear campaign directed against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Comrade Khrushchov are being used today by the propagandists of imperialism. When Marx and Lenin took issue with the opportunist or extremist trends in the working-class movement, the press of the big bourgeoisie never became the mouthpiece for their polemics or gave publicity to their arguments, as the reactionary press is doing today in regard to the Chinese attacks. This is further proof that Marx and Lenin acted in the interests of the revolutionary movement and its unity, which cannot be said of the actions of the Chinese comrades.

It may well be that the reactionary groups and leading conservative circles with their social-democratic, clerical or pseudo-democratic fellow-travellers think that our present international debate signifies a great crisis in the Communist and Socialist movement. But something quite different is happening. What is happening is that the socialist and Communist movement has reached the stage in its development when it has to tackle not only the task of elaborating theory and determining the perspective or objective development, the task of action and advance in different countries and sectors; it also has to tackle the task of realizing its own perspectives and aims on a world scale, the task of advancing, facing and resolving the problems that are of importance to the whole world. History shows that all ideological and practical movements developed and drew inspiration in profound debates, particularly when they reached the stage of their affirmation and development on a world scale.

If fresh proof of this truth is needed let our enemies and opponents, and also our luke-warm friends, note the fact that our debate concerns not only the problem of the struggle for progress which is being waged in the most diverse spheres and in all parts of the world. Let them note the fact that in all these spheres, despite the diversity of positions and situation, despite the difficulties, the resistance, the sharp counter-attacks of the enemy, and despite even our weaknesses and mistakes, we, Communists, are in the van of the fight for progress and peace, in the fight to change the economic and political structure of contemporary society and have new classes head this society. Let them convince themselves through reality. Our movement, despite internal differences, despite the fact that it debates its problems, and very sharply at times, is a movement before which all the principal roads of historical development are open, a movement which wants to explore these roads thoroughly in order to advance along them with greater assurance. The support given us by tens and hundreds of millions of people, the sympathy and hopes with which we are regarded throughout the world, confirms us in our belief.

As concerns the clamor that has been raised, and which still con-

tinues, the strange inventions and falsification of our Party's position in the present international debate, I think that we can simply regard them with a sense of ironic tolerance. All kinds of things have been said about us. To Saragat we are the most Chinese among the revolutionaries of the West. To others we are the most abject servants of Moscow and Khrushchov. To others still we have become, strangely enough, "conciliators" with the Chinese position.

Let us make an honest attempt to see the situation in its proper light. Our Party, far from being conciliatory or confused, has always been among the first parties which most decisively combated and rejected the position of the Chinese comrades. This was proved first of all at the meeting of the 81 parties when we explicitly reserved our opinion regarding the propositions in the resolution adopted which made unjustified concessions to the Chinese positions. This is evident from the documents published by us and which everybody can obtain. Later, and especially after the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the polemic developed and the Chinese began their attacks, referring ambiguously to "certain parties" and "certain persons" who were accused of revisionism and much else. We therefore considered it necessary at our 10th Congress and, as a matter of fact already during the preparations for the congress, to put an end to this game, hardly a serious one, and unhesitatingly criticized and rejected the attitude of the Chinese Party on the most important points. The polemic was public and we subsequently became one of Peking's favourite targets for its attacks.

We replied to these attacks calmly and resolutely, reaffirming all our positions. At the same time, however, we openly raised the question of the unity of the international working-class, Communist and Socialist movements, stressing that this unity is precious and indispensable for the victory of our cause, and also that it must be achieved and defended regardless of the diversity of the situations and political developments in the individual countries, and without impinging on the autonomy of the Communist and Workers' parties whose duty it is to conduct the struggle for our common aims with due regard to this diversity. Our position was expounded and exhaustively argumented in public statements by our leaders and subsequently in the resolution adopted by our Central Committee at its meeting of October 24, 1963. The resolution criticized and rejected the strategic and tactical orientation endorsed in the documents of the Chinese comrades and expounded the correct Marxist-Leninist concept regarding the advance to socialism in present-day conditions. As for the ways of overcoming the present differences, we made explicit reservations regarding the proposal to convene an international meeting to condemn the Chinese position. On the contrary, we stressed the advisability of giving further consideration to the problems under discussion between the interested parties with a view to reaching effective unity on the basis of further critical examination and

political action, or at least on the basis of mutual understanding. This is the position which our Party unequivocally adheres to and will continue to adhere to even in the present circumstances.

Falsification of our Positions by the Chinese Leaders

At what stage of development is our movement today? The main perspectives of the struggle of the working class and the masses to establish themselves as the leading force in the new socialist society were outlined, on the basis of a scientific analysis of capitalist society in the classics of Marx and Engels. They were supplemented and further developed by Lenin on the basis of an exact analysis of imperialism, its nature and the laws of its development. In the space of a little less than a hundred years the prophecy of the *Communist Manifesto* and the subsequent precise precepts and prevision of Lenin, which to some might have seemed inconceivable, have become a reality in our day.

The working classes have established themselves as the leading force of the new society; imperialism no longer holds undivided sway; the system of colonial slavery has not been able to withstand the pressure and revolutionary onslaught of tens of millions of peoples. A large part of the world is still under the domination of capitalism and imperialism, but even in some of the capitalist countries rapid and profound changes are taking place, broad mass movements are under way through which the working classes seek to alter the economic and political structure of the old society and thus clear the way to becoming the leading force of society. A struggle is under way embracing all spheres of international life, politics, the economy and culture.

It is clear that this struggle pursues a single, common aim which unites the entire movement, namely, to end capitalist exploitation, defeat imperialism and achieve the triumph of socialism which henceforth is delineated in its historically concrete perspective. But it is equally clear that the spheres of struggle, of advance in the various parts of the world and in the various countries are different from each other, hence the immediate concrete aim must be diverse as must the forms of action and advance. Moreover, we are living in a world that is in constant change because the conditions of resolving many problems are rapidly changing, or have already changed.

In this situation the paramount task of the revolutionary movement is not to lose touch with this reality which is in constant change, to try to understand it in all its aspects, and to adapt our searches and views, to take issue with our opponents, determine our aims and trends of work accordingly.

This is the main point at issue in our differences of principal with the Chinese comrades. Their interpretation of our policy is, in fact, a

completely false one, for it is not based on an analysis and understanding of present-day reality. Everything is reduced to a schematic tedious and sterile repition of general truths; the revolutionary factor is reduced to a phrase, to a series of quotations . . . It is very easy in this way to accuse, as the Chinese are doing, all the other parties of treachery, revisionism, of abandoning the revolutionary line, etc. We fully agree with Comrade Gomulka when he says that what is stigmatized as revisionism by Peking is in reality creative Marxism which we need today if we want to advance, to be understood, if we want to measure up to the situation and achieve success.

We must recognize the fact that for many years our movement suffered from narrow-mindedness which restricted all creative capacities. Schematism, dogmatism, the refusal to think and do something new, admiration for scholastic formulations and stereotyped phraseology, fear of the new—all this caused us serious harm. The great impetus that was given to the working-class and Communist movement by the 7th Congress of the Communist International, and which as reflected in such great movements as the Popular Front in France, the defense of Republican Spain, the united action to smash fascism, did not receive further development after the war as it should and could have.

Many positions were lost. Many possibilities for further progress were not utilized. Stagnation set in which threatened to petrify the movement had not the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union struck a decisive blow at schematism and dogmatism, discussed in a new and correct way problems that could no longer be deferred or ignored. The 20th Congress marked the beginning of a process of renovation which was to start a general struggle against schematism and for the restoration of the creative character of our thinking and our policy.

As we see it that is precisely why the Chinese comrades directed their main blow against the 20th Congress. Today they reject all its positions which they had approved of only yesterday. In other words, they reject the process of renovation which has advanced despite everything, despite the uncertainties, the delays and mistakes that existed in some countries and which could have been the cause of a profound crisis. Here too insurmountable differences exist between the positions of the Chinese comrades and the positions of the international Communist movement and, in particular, our Party.

That is why we always demanded at all international meetings that this role of the 20th Congress should be reaffirmed and underlined, overcoming the hesitation displayed in this matter, particularly by the Chinese comrades. By its 20th Congress decisions, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union once again demonstrated its role as the beacon and vanguard of the entire working-class and Communist movement.

It is this refusal to recognize the fact that Marxism is being creatively developed in keeping with the present conditions of the struggle against imperialism and for socialism that explains, I think, most of the erroneous positions of the Chinese. This refusal is accompanied by an attempt to interpret the present conditions in a way that is completely at variance with the fundamental principle of Marxist theory and the concrete precepts of Lenin and also with the necessity for action which aims to be successful. Thus, we have here a strange mixture of pseudo-revolutionary Trotskyite phraseology and views that are of a directly opposite nature as, for example, the view that it is the peasant masses of the underdeveloped countries who should head the world movement for socialism and not the countries of socialism and the international proletariat. Incidentally, in their domestic economic policy the Chinese leaders swung from one extreme to another without explaining why—from a forced march to a system which is almost already a Communist one and whose industrial development is even more rapid than that of the Soviet Union, to the present subordination of the entire economic development to the needs of agriculture.

We are well aware that these are internal problems of the Chinese Party. But why does this Party, which chooses to judge and condemn all the other parties in its own way, take exception when it is asked to give an explanation of its policy? Why do its leaders not want to recognize their own mistakes, why do they not openly state what have been their mistakes, as the leaders of all Communist parties should do. The real reason is that the extremist agitation carried on by the Chinese leaders conceals their confusion, their deliberate falsification of the correct positions which we are today defending; it also conceals their weaknesses which are a direct consequence of their inability, even more, their refusal to take a realistic view of the situation in which we are living today. This is the case as concerns both the socialist world and the struggle against imperialism, as well as the development of the national-liberation movement. Even in those instances where the Chinese comrades do consider existing problems that need to be solved, they show their inability to abandon pseudo-revolutionary phraseology, to measure up to the conditions of objective reality and to propose solutions that are feasible.

The Autonomy and Sovereignty of Every Party are for us the Condition for the Development of the Movement in the Present Situation

We consider that the campaign which the Chinese leaders are conducting against the Soviet Union, against its foreign and home policy, against its leaders, and, especially, against Comrade Khrushchov

is inadmissable, shameful and dangerous for the entire working-class movement. There are no facts whatsoever that could justify this campaign.

As for the differences between the two states we do not know what bearing they could have had in deciding the Chinese comrades to renew their attacks; but we do know that it is the duty of these comrades as leaders of a socialist state to discuss these issues in a different way from the method used in the relations between bourgeois states: they should not have started because of this, a frenzied campaign of accusations and slander but should have, instead, patiently and calmly tried to find a solution through the necessary contacts and on the basis of mutual understanding. Otherwise ordinary people might ask, and rightly so, in what way are the socialist states different from the bourgeois states and should not the same basis and social structure make for the adoption of methods other than the method of attack which can only lead to a further sharpening of the differences. In fact, the behaviour of the Chinese comrades towards the Soviet Union undermines the confidence of the broad masses in the ideas of socialism.

It is impossible and absurd to deny the fact that the Soviet Union —the first socialist state achieved through revolutionary struggle, built, defended and made powerful by the labor of generations and at the price of incalculable sacrifices—occupies a special place and shoulders a special responsibility in the community of socialist countries and the entire working-class movement. But it is common knowledge that after the death of Stalin it was the Soviet leaders who insisted that every Communist Party should be regarded as autonomous and independent and held responsible for the development of its policy in its own country. That was the meaning of the decision to dissolve the Communist International approved in 1944. However, when the Soviet comrades made the solemn declaration rejecting the concept of the Soviet Party, being the leader and the state being the leader, which concept was to be approved by all the parties, it was the Chinese comrades who raised objections. Why have they changed their opinion? Maybe because they themselves would like to be the leader? The autonomy and independence of every Party are for us questions of principle, the condition for the development of the movement in the present situation. And they do not contradict international proletarian solidarity and its application in practice; they do not contradict the community of aims of the entire movement or the co-operation between the various parties, which is necessary and indispensable. They constitute the form in which unity in the struggle against imperialism and for socialism must be realized today.

The anti-Soviet campaign of the Chinese comrades who would

like to undermine the prestige of the first socialist state, which was a big gain in the minds of the masses, aims to cause a split and confusion among the socialist states, misunderstanding and hostility between these countries and the movement for the liberation and emancipation of the oppressed peoples, to destroy the indispensable solidarity and militant unity between the Soviet Union and the working-class movement in the leading capitalist countries. In every one of these spheres all attempts to create a dangerous and fatal rupture must be vigorously opposed.

In resolving their varied problems, in enhancing their economic potential and the general standard of well-being of their peoples, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are thereby acting in the interests of the entire revolutionary movement. They are thereby reinforcing the might of the socialist system and demonstrating its superiority. We venture to add here that this superiority, apart from the standard of well-being of the people, has its roots in the very nature of the socialist system, in the character of government, in the principles regulating the national economy, in the attitude to the individual, to his education, to his conscience, in the free and full development of his personality.

To the socialist countries, to the working class has fallen the task of building a society in which not only the well-being, but also the freedom and dignity of all its citizens are ensured to an equal degree. The development of the productive forces, technology, science and culture in all the socialist countries is making for this. This raises the task of the synthesis, the unity of the socialist countries among themselves, as well as with the national-liberation movements and the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries.

The Chinese comrades should always remember that their heroic struggle against imperialism and colonialism would most probably not have been crowned with such a sweeping victory had it not been for the existence of the might of the Soviet Union, the fact that it was thanks to this might that fascism was defeated in Europe and Japanese imperialism in Asia, the fact that the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union led to profound changes in the balance of forces throughout the world. This applies to all the other peoples formerly enslaved by colonialism and who have now won their freedom. The stronger the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will be economically and politically the greater will be the concrete aid and political support these peoples will receive in their struggle for complete emancipation. The same holds true for the working-class and mass movement in the more developed capitalist countries.

We know that in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries schematism and dogmatism which prevailed in the Stalin period caused considerable harm. That is precisely why we have es-

tablished, in the course of the struggle to remedy this harm, closer co-operation and unity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leaders. This unity should be further developed.

The concept of socialist democracy must be fully restored in our movement, by which is meant not only legality, equality and fraternity, but also the active participation of the masses both in economic and state construction. The socialist state cannot be something that exists apart from the working masses, which they obey as a benevolent but nonetheless alien power. That is why we hailed and approved the new Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which aims to create a state of all people. The Chinese criticism in this respect is unfounded and dangerous.

For the working-class movement of the capitalist countries it is important that the remnants of the past in this connection be rapidly eliminated. And we should not fear innovations, new forms of organization such as the self-government practised in Yugoslavia, for example, which gives the working masses new possibilities for displaying their initiative in the economic and social spheres, compels them to assume the effective function of control and direction in the economy and in society. If mistakes are made along this path there is always time and ways of rectifying them. The biggest mistake is inaction, clinging to organizational forms which no longer give rein to the animating and creative drive of the masses.

We, too, in our movement, in developing trade union activity and organizing workers at the enterprises, are faced with similar problems, which is a sign that a socialist consciousness is maturing among the working class. There is a certain connection between the progress achieved in the socialist countries and what we are working for. Hence, co-operation and unity are essential in facing these problems with courage and resolving them correctly.

It is in this that the indissoluble connection between democracy and socialism must be clearly established. When the Chinese comrades speak of the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat but in the same breath refuse to criticize the regime established under Stalin, they are thereby doing a bad service to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the final analysis they virtually identify it with that regime, thus preventing the full resoration, both in theory and practice, of the concept which, unless the development of the democratic character of the state and of the democratic life of the masses is consistently and fully ensured, will have nothing in common with socialism.

To Ensure the Intervention of a Powerful Mass Movement in Defense of Peace

As regards international policy and the struggle against imperialism I should like once again to note what happened when the Chi-

nese Prime Minister, Chou En-lai visited several Asian and African states. The statements he made in the capitals of these states correspond, in substance and form, to the basic policy and demands of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, as well as the international working-class movement, even though he assiduously took care not to refer to them.

What does this mean? Did the Chinese Prime Minister forget all the principal propaganda points of his Party; maybe he forgot that these demands are incompatible with the nature of imperialism, that to insist on peaceful coexistence is tantamount to plotting with leading American circles, that the atomic weapon must be diffused throughout the world and that the partial test ban was a mistake? No, he did not forget all this. But he realized that all this must be shelved if he wanted to discuss international issues as they need to be discussed with due regard for present-day conditions and the concrete objectives that can be attained by the co-ordinated efforts of the countries desiring peace, by a mass movement and by all who, whatever the reason, reject the perspective of a new world war. It means that we have here a profound contradiction, the collapse of all the propaganda the Chinese leaders have been carrying on for many years now on these international issues. But it is a collapse we greet as fresh confirmation of the correctness of the method which we hold should be followed in the fight for peace and against imperialism.

This struggle has its source in the premise that war is no longer inevitable, that a new world conflict and, consequently, the annihilation of entire peoples, and maybe the whole of humanity in the fire of a nuclear holocaust, can be averted. It is this premise that gives a concrete content to our policy and does not reduce it to mere agitation, for it establishes a real perspective and imparts positive meaning to all demands and partial gains.

The Chinese leaders sent Comrade Khrushchov a courteous telegram on the occasion of his birthday. We appreciate the call to unity in that telegram, but we think it does not present the question correctly. The Chinese comrades state that the Soviet Union and People's China, despite their present differences, will undoubtedly be united in the future in the event of imperialist attacks against them. Thus unity is linked, in effect, with the perspective of war, and a world war at that. But it is precisely this perspective that we want to reject because we believe it can be averted taking into account the balance of forces in the world today. However, to avoid war action is necessary, a struggle against imperialism is necessary. If this struggle is to be succesful, unity is necessary today not only between the Soviet Union and People's China, but of all the socialist countries, of the working-class movement and all peace forces, irrespective of what they adhere to.

Abstract discussion and quotation mongering regarding the nature of imperialism add nothing to what we have always known and constantly remember. But it is one thing to compile quotations and another thing to act, to move ahead in a world where a new world war can only be connected with the prospect of the destruction of our civilization, in a world whose structure has changed, in a world where imperialism is no longer the sole dominant force, in a world where profound new changes are maturing.

The enemies of a detente and peace are active, they are offering resistance, are trying to preserve the unity of their front, are kindling flames in many areas in order to start new fires. We cannot afford to interrupt our struggle, we must watch all those areas where peace is threatened, see to it that we are always in a position to ensure the intervention of a powerful mass movement in defense of peace.

We reject the harmful position which the Chinese comrades have taken on international issues, going so far as to play with the catastrophic idea of a nuclear war which could wipe entire nations off the earth. We reaffirm, in this connection, all our previous positions. But we agree to wage the struggle against imperialism vigorously and effectively on the basis we consider to be correct.

Democratic and Peaceful Advance to Socialism in the Developed Capitalist Countries

The problem to which we have paid the greatest attention when studying it and in an effort to apply and further develop the revolutionary theory of Marxism is undoubtedly the problem of the democratic and peaceful transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries. We tried to give the correct answer to this question immediately after the defeat of fascism and the conquest of a democratic regime, realizing that we would have to wage the struggle in conditions very different from those in which the conquest of power was achieved in other countries. Consequently this problem from the very outset laid its imprint on all the Party's activity. It was theoretically endorsed and concretely formulated at our last three national congresses. It is on this very issue that we have our greatest differences with the positions defended today by the Chinese comrades who have in this connection launched their polemic against us, which they are conducting in the most violent language.

An analysis of the nature of their polemics shows first of all a deliberate falsification to suit their ends, to enable the Chinese comrades to represent themselves as the defenders and interpreters of the elementary principles of theory and practice. The distortion is in the attempts to prove that we allege that open revolutionary actions no longer have any place in the modern world because all

political and social progress must henceforth take place everywhere only in peaceful forms. We have never said anything so preposterous. We are well aware what role violence has always played and continues to play in history, in the struggle of the peoples for their independence and in the class struggle.

But we hasten to add that not in all situations can there be a call to revolutionary violence and that the most profound revolutionary advances and transformations are possible without it. Cuba and Algeria liberated themselves as a result of a long armed struggle; but there are dozens of colonial peoples who won their independence without having to go through this ordeal, as a result of a mass movement which developed in more favorable conditions than in the past.

This question must therefore be studied; it can be resolved only on the basis of a correct assessment of the concrete conditions of the struggle determining both the aims and the forms of its organization and development. I should like to note here that I consider the rigid counterposing of the peaceful and non-peaceful path of development somewhat schematic and abstract. There exists the movement of the working class and working masses for their economic and political demands, for social transformations and reforms. This movement must develop in keeping with the situation. Its leaders must know how to orientate and direct this movement, must be fully prepared to measure up to changes and objective turns so as never to lose control over events. Between 1943 and 1945 we fought with arms in hand. It would have been sheer folly had we not after victory, passed to legal forms of struggle on a democratic basis, for the events taking place at the time tended to change the character of the struggle, without affecting its principal aims, however. What is essential is the link that unites into a single process all the phases of the movement, the existence of a large mass movement that is ready for action at all times. What is dangerous is any division or arbitrary and schematic counterposing which regards the peaceful struggle as stagnation or renunciation and condemns the struggle waged by non-peaceful means, when this is necessary, as adventurism.

The discussion conducted along these lines is still, however, far from being a concrete examination of present-day reality. But on this question too the Chinese comrades show their utter inability to make even a minimum positive contribution.

To allege as they do that we have slid down to opportunism of the social-democratic type because we think it possible to pass on to socialism by winning 50 per cent of the vote plus one more is another convenient falsification. Parliament is part of the political structure of the democratic type of society and it can, to a lesser or greater degree, be a representative body and perform democratic functions, which weaken or strengthen its importance and its possibilities to engage in activities other than mere agitation and making declara-

tions. At present we are not in a position to carry on an effective struggle of the working masses in Parliament. But we are carrying out this activity within the economic and political framework of capitalist society with the subject of winning progressive gains and reforms that will change this regime; constantly strengthening and securing the positions of the working classes and their organizations, weakening the power of the ruling capitalist classes, particularly of their most reactionary and decisive groups which today are the groups of big monopoly capital.

This may be said to be a new strategy which is being developed in the long struggle for democracy and socialism. But the conditions exist making this strategy possible and necessary: the broad development of the organizations of the working masses and their growing militancy, a widespread democratic spirit and the ability to mobilize the popular masses which make more difficult reactionary adventures on the part of the bourgeoisie; a notable shift among large sections of the middle-class in town and countryside towards the positions adopted by the working class in the fight against big monopoly capital, thus making possible broader social alliances; the existence of intermediary parties who accept a program of democratic and social reforms which, in turn, makes for co-operation of a new type; finally, a profound crisis in the traditional bourgeois order which is compelling the ruling classes to look for new forms of directing the economy and which, consequently, makes it possible to carry on a struggle for radical reforms in this sphere. All this makes it possible and necessary to find new ways of coming to power through the creation of a coalition of forces socially and politically progressive.

In fighting to advance towards socialism in conditions of democracy and peace, we do not only aim to exclude, as far as we are concerned, the hypothesis of an armed insurrection and civil war, but also to resolve, in a new way, the problems connected with organizing a socialist society. We feel it is necessary to impart a democratic content to this organization in all its phases; to avoid the mistakes, restrictions, and distortions that occurred elsewhere; not to reject the democratic gains already won and the method of struggle corresponding to it; to permit, therefore, the existence of several organized political forces and the possibility of co-operating with them, which was the exception at one time but which now from our viewpoint must become the rule. We by no means renounce our ultimate aim—the destruction of capitalist exploitation and the creation of a classless society—but we want to achieve this through a broad movement which supports and develops all that is positive in democratic institutions that the peoples have won at the price of a bitter struggle and great sacrifices.

We know it will not be easy to advance along this path, but it is a path that has to be traversed, if we do not want to confine ourselves

to preaching revolutionary action which afterwards we will not know how to effect and what concretely it should correspond to. For us revolution is a process that is being carried forward today by a combination of actions affecting all spheres of public life. We are working already today to give a new meaning to democracy, having in mind not restricted and controversial external forms but political and economic reforms, the direct participation of the masses in controlling and directing the economy, the extension of the rights of the workers' organizations when resolving new tasks, the renewal of the entire civil and social order.

Thus already today we inseparably link the cause of socialism with the cause of democracy and open the way to socialism. Our unflagging struggle for the unity of the working class and of all democratic and popular forces, like the character and forms of our Party's organization and internal life, are in conformity with our political concept and its basic elements. No objections, no criticism, no attacks by the Chinese comrades against us can in any way affect our line of action or disprove its correctness and effectiveness.

The Liberation Struggle of the Colonial Peoples and the Working-Class and Communist Movement

I think, we should approach in a similar manner another problem which is in the centre of the strategic and tactical platform elaborated by the Chinese comrades, that of the liberation movement of the colonial peoples who have recently won their independence, this movement's role in the struggle against imperialism and its further development. Also in this case the Chinese comrades proceed from completely erroneous positions. They turn this movement into the principal directing force of the entire anti-imperialist struggle, they isolate it from the rest of the movement and place it in opposition to it. This is not only a mistake; it is an exceedingly dangerous thing to do. The great successes achieved in the past twenty years by the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples are connected with the complex of changes that have taken place in the world; they are due, therefore, to a large extent, to the crisis of the capitalist structure whose chief factor was the victorious construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and the formation of the camp of socialist countries. The stronger these countries become the more clearly the oppressed peoples and the newly-emergent countries will see the perspective of complete emancipation. It is sheer madness to tell the oppressed people, as some of the Chinese do in their documents, that the socialist countries are imperialistic and resemble the bourgeois imperialists.

This shows a desire to want to undermine solidarity, the possibility of co-operation, the unity of intentions and aims which are one of the most important mainsprings in the fight against imperialism. These actions therefore make it still more difficult to fight the colo-

nialism of the old and new type and to expose it. Here, too, the Chinese comrades are causing confusion and a split where it is essential to fight for unity, for the preservation and extension of this unity.

Having said that, I think we must honestly recognize that in this sphere there are problems that need to be more profoundly examined. The working-class movement in the leading capitalist countries has by no means accomplished the task facing it in the struggle against colonial enslavement and in support of the oppressed peoples. There is no denying that mistakes were made here, even serious ones, that caused harm to the common cause. There has always been solidarity in the struggle for national emancipation and against colonialism and racism in Asia, Africa, Latin America and also in the United States itself. This solidarity was often expressed in vigorous actions. However, we think that there has not been adequate contact, understanding and mutual assistance between the various sectors of the wide front of struggle against imperialism. The old form of colonial domination has been defeated and practically disappeared; a new form is establishing itself in some of the former colonies which have now become free states. The initiators of this new form of enslavement are the leading groups of big monopoly capital who are at the same time the enemies of any democratic reforms and social progress in the capitalist countries. An objective basis therefore exists for waging a common struggle both in the one-time mother countries and the former colonies. It rests with the proletariat and the working masses to show the initiative in carrying on this struggle more effectively. But it is not enough just to talk about this initiative. It must be realized in the form of a clear program of concrete demands which affect the structure of the monopoly economy, thus preparing the ground for joint actions in the sphere of international relations and also with the peoples and even the governments of the newly-emergent countries.

But in order to accomplish this we must consider these people and their governments without prejudice; we must know their conditions of life and development, and their organizations; we must establish close contacts between these organizations and similar organizations of the working people in our countries; we must in this way lay the foundation for a truly joint struggle against the common enemy. If the parties in the big capitalist countries will will not be able to co-ordinate their effort and to advance along this path they will then not be able to accomplish one of their main tasks.

A great achievement of our theory and a very inspiring one for the future is the fact that the peoples and governments of the newly-emergent countries have openly proclaimed their desire to build a socialist economy and a socialist society. But here too we must avoid dogmatism and a superficial approach. We must realize

that the advance to socialism in the countries which only yesterday were still colonies and are therefore still backward will have its specific features, will be something quite different from what has taken place up to now. The popular movements and political forces effecting leadership in these countries will have to define their aims and stages of development most precisely. We must not allow a policy to be imposed on the Communists of these countries that does not correspond to the conditions under which they are working. The very organizational forms which are traditional for the capitalist and socialist countries, may under these conditions, be an obstacle to contacts with the broad masses and to playing a positive role in their political development.

The schematism preached by the Chinese comrades, their desire to reduce the liberation struggle to exclusively an armed struggle is also harmful and dangerous. Armed action is often inevitable in colonial conditions, but it would be a mistake to make it the only form of action, not to link it with the political activity of the masses, with the organization of the broad political alliances with all national, democratic and progressive forces. Errors of this nature are possible especially in the Latin American countries and, if we have been correctly informed, have been committed in some cases thus causing damage to the entire movement.

The Reasons for our Reservations Concerning an International Meeting

It could not be clearer, I believe, from everything I have said so far that we oppose the line which the Chinese comrades propose today to the international working-class and Communist movement. Our opposition is deep and can in no way be overcome by incidental and formal compromises, because it is rooted in our theoretical and political activities of many years, which have secured for our Party important positions among the working people, both on national and international terrain. We have never suggested that what we do should be regarded as a model for other parties; many of them function in conditions very different from ours. We ask, however, that our activity and experience be regarded as a serious contribution to the development of our movement as a whole, to the discussion and solution of the problems that exist and can be resolved only through free criticism, hard work and struggle.

We also strongly oppose the method used by the Chinese comrades to spread their views. It is not a method intended to strengthen the movement and, if necessary, to correct their own mistakes. It is a method that is intended to weaken and split the movement.

Their propaganda passed gradually from allegations of an organic rupture between large sections of the anti-imperialist struggle to

increasingly candid appeals for a split in the international working-class and Communist movement, for the establishment of small groups of dissenters within the existing parties, and for a struggle which, would result in the formation, in each country, of two opposed organizations. Some of the parties in Asia have accepted the Chinese positions or have fallen strongly under their influence. Elsewhere, small groups have abandoned our ranks, assumed the names of parties, and raised a certain amount of noise over it.

All in all, the great majority of Communist and Workers' parties are united and reject Peking's criticisms and attacks. If one takes a closer look at those on the margin of our movement, or in its ranks, who gravitate towards the Chinese standpoint or let themselves be influenced by it, one gets the impression that they are comrades who do not realize the basic motives of the complexity and the contradictions of the present situation, who feel the need for a revolutionary approach but are not yet able to see this approach in terms of concrete policy. They are allured by the extremist language of the Chinese, but it would be futile to look for concrete and practicable guidance to action in whatever they write or say.

We should, therefore, without any hesitation, condemn the disruptive intentions and actions of the Chinese leaders. Affirmation and defense of the unity of the working-class and Communist movement is an essential element of all our activities in our own country and on the international scene. However, we want this affirmation and defense to be carried through in harmony with all our political positions, in keeping with our idea of what the relations between individual parties and the character of the unity of the world Communist movement should be today.

Today, nobody doubts any longer that diversity is necessary in the actions of the different parties. This diversity stems from national peculiarities, from the level of development, from the different experiences and different problems facing each party. This applies equally to parties in the socialist and capitalist countries and to the backward areas and newly-independent countries. Unity cannot be secured by some centralized organization. Experience has shown this conclusively. Unity must spring from the common and key objectives of our activity and from our international solidarity.

Along with this unity, or, more precisely, as a condition of this unity, as a condition of the strength and all-round development of our entire movement, each party should have complete autonomy and independence; it should be fully responsible for its actions, above all to the working class and the other working people of its country. On due consideration you will see that it is the Chinese comrades who are today inclined to reject this principle by their importunate efforts to impose their views on us. We, on the other hand, do not depart

and will never depart from this principle which has been proclaimed for years by the leading bodies of our Party.

We realize that this makes the struggle against the mistakes of the Chinese comrades and the dissemination of these mistakes more complicated. In a centralized organization one could apply the method of, say, excommunication. Comrade Khrushchov defined and condemned this method rightly in his speech at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany in January 1963. "If we disagreed on certain questions and quarrelled," he said, "and then said at once that the socialist country whose leaders differed with us on something was not socialist, we would be demonstratng subjectivisim pure and simple. It would be as in the case of the Church: when a person ceases to keep religious vows and perform religious rites, he is excommunicated and anathemized. It does not befit us to proceed like churchmen and engage in 'excommunications' from socialism."

The method of excommunication was used in Stalin's time against the Yugoslav comrades. This has been a mistake which we all recognize today, and traces of which are still evident in the collective resolution of 1960.

When talk arose of a new international meeting of all Communist parties to examine and assess the attitude of the Chinese comrades, we thought at once that this was likely to end in another excommunication, in a different direction this time and it appeared to us unnecessary and dangerous. True, there are Party cadres and Communist leaders in the world who believe that official declarations made in a document approved by the overwhelming majority of the parties are more convincing and forceful than the positions taken separately by the parties comprising this majority.

But with regard to these cadres and, in general, as concerns the movement as a whole, we believe that conviction and firmness in the defense of a correct political line should be sought—and is likely to be found more easily—through closer and deeper study, and a better solution of the problems facing each party in any prevailing situation and in relation to the common objectives of the movement as a whole. This was why we suggested a series of bilateral or group meetings at which these questions could be thrashed out seriously and decisions arrived at, which without prejudicing the autonomy and sovereignty of the parties, would enable each of them better to understand its tasks and perspectives, and the ways and means of realizing them.

We would also like to meet the Chinese comrades in our country and to acquaint them at first hand with the situation in which we are working, with the big struggles we have waged and are waging today, and with the progress we have achieved.

Our attitude corresponds to our conception of the world Communist

and working-class movement as a movement united by profound solidarity but open to necessary differences, to an exchange of ideas, thanks to which the propositions of our doctrine crystallize and develop, and a collective effort is made to avoid errors of principle, while bringing our judgments and actions into conformity with the continuously changing reality.

On the other hand, the method of official excommunication may revive authoritarian and sectarian systems in the leadership of each party, and also imperil the activities, development and, partly the very existence of the international mass organizations, trade unions, etc.

As you know, the proposals we made could not be realized. Preparations were begun for a meeting of the parties of the capitalist West, but these too were suspended. Now, as I have said, the idea of an international meeting of all Communist parties has been advanced again, in order to examine all the problems created by the Chinese attacks and to reaffirm the general line of our movement.

In principle it is a legitimate idea, provided all the parties take part in the meeting. It remains to be seen whether or not it is the best way to surmount the differences, to combat the attempts of a split and, consequently, to reinforce the unity and cohesion of our movement. It is also necessary to see how it should be prepared in order to be able to attain these goals.

I wish to say at once that we do not consider it opportune at this time to suspend the polemics, including the open polemics. We have come to a point where this would serve no useful purpose. It would only create illusions. The debate cannot but continue. So we propose that it should be conducted in the most opportune forms, even with those groups of workers or comrades who have fallen under the influence of the Chinese ideas. Discussion is indispensable, and should be conducted continuously and patiently, so as not to alienate any of the forces who can contribute to the struggles we have to wage.

But the debate must always be based on objective arguments, rooted in the facts, it must avoid summary and insulting qualifications and, consequently, avoid any exacerbation of the differences. It would be good if we could get the Chinese comrades to follow this principle. For one thing, it would be a big step forward if ideological differences were in a way separated from differences between the states.

It is therefore necessary, before calling an international meeting, to prepare for it more concretely and deeply than for the 81-Party Meeting in 1960. Provisions should be made for bilateral or group meetings, and for possible mediation, so as to try and determine more specifically those questions which can be examined with the hope of reaching agreement, and those questions which seem to be insurmountable.

As for the results the meeting may yield, our hesitation stems not only from a desire to avoid summary excommunication, but also from the fear that in a discussion at this level, inevitably too general in character, it may prove very difficult to make any serious advance in the creative elaboration of our policy. If things then go to the length of a rupture, the repercussions may be extremely grave for our whole movement. Once two opposed centres arise, we may be running the risk of all our future work being concentrated on a struggle between these two centres; it is almost inevitable that small pro-Chinese parties will appear in each country. Both sides will be more rigidly strict as to organization and discipline than the present situation and present needs warrant, causing us almost inevitably to abandon the creative search for new development in all the major sectors and all fields of our activity.

To sum up, we are not yet convinced that it is not worthwhile to continue the discussion and to work perseveringly for a correct political line and for the unity of the international movement in the present conditions, using methods which, as I have said, may at least give some hope of attenuating the political differences, establishing fruitful contacts, and gradually returning to complete unity.

We will set out and reason our considerations to the leading comrades from other parties, above all the comrades from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We are sure that, at least, we will be able to convince them that our considerations are prompted by the desire and intention to contribute to the struggle in a manner we believe to be the most effective, and to overcome all forms of schematism and dogmatism, to defend and restore the complet unity, the internal solidarity and co-operation of the whole Communist and working-class movement.

The views which I have set forth correspond to what has already been expressed in the Party, at meetings where these questions were discussed. Besides, they correspond to the state of mind, the opinions and concerns widespread among the working people. As we formulate these propositions, we are deeply conscious of the responsibility devolving on us not only on account of our past, our long struggle and our experience, but also on account of the strength of our Party, our deeply internationalist spirit and the determination with which the Italian Communist Party has for years, using all the necessary forms of action, waged a difficult struggle for the interests and aspirations of the laboring classes, scoring major victories and successes.

We are inviting all our organizations to examine once more the problems facing the world Communist movement, to discuss them at branch meetings, and at open meetings with the participation of our Socialist comrades, our sympathizers and even our opponents. It is also our desire that, as regards these problems, the unity of the

Party should be based on a reasoned and comprehensive conviction, and not merely on discipline. We do not want to give anyone the opportunity to say that our comrades were not informed, that the decision was made at the top. What we do want, particularly in this case, is to give an example of an exchange of views and of internal democracy that should, in our opinion, be the rule for all Communist parties and for the international movement as a whole.

RESOLUTION*

ADOPTED AT MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND THE CENTRAL AUDITING COMMISSION OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY HELD APRIL 21-23.

The Central Committee and the Central Auditing Commission heard and approved the report of Comrade Togliatti on the unity of the international working-class and Communist movement.

At the same time they reaffirmed the resolution of the CC of October 24, 1963.

They instructed the leadership of the Party to conduct, in the discussion and the contacts taking place in the international Communist movement, consistent activity based on the line laid down in this resolution and in the report of Comrade Togliatti.

They invite the Party organizations to conduct, both in the Party and among the working people, an extensive and deep-going discussion on problems concerning the unity of the international movement in order to ensure complete clarity about these problems, so that there is deep conviction and unity in our ranks and so that we are able to combat anti-communist propaganda ever more effectively.

---

*L'Unità, April 24, 1964.

FIGHT FOR UNITY OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

R. Palme Dutt

Member of Political Committee of the British Communist Party

The fight for the unity of the international Communist Movement and of every Communist Party on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, set out in the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist parties, is now fully joined. However much we may all dislike to be involved in an unjustifiable and harmful internal controversy in the international Communist movement at a time when the fullest united strength of all is needed against the common enemy, no Communist can be on the sidelines in this fight.

Let there be no mistake. We are not fighting "for Russia" or "for Khrushchov", "against China". It is the enemy press which seeks to confuse the issue by treating it as a "Sino-Soviet controversy" in which sides are taken with one or another country according to preference.

We are opposed to all abusive language in this controversy, from whatever side it comes.

COMMUNIST UNITY

We are fighting, as throughout this controversy, for international Communist unity; for the unity of every Communist Party against disruption and factionalism; for the principles of Marxism-Leninism as set out in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement; for the principles and program and Congress decisions of our own Party.

When we repudiate outrageous charges set out in Chinese documents that the Soviet Government and leadership of the CPSU have "betrayed the Soviet people, the socialist camp and the peoples of the world" (*Hungchi,* No. 17, 1963), and are "allied with imperialism to oppose socialism" or "allied with the reactionaries of all countries to oppose the peoples of the world" (Statement of the Chinese Government, July 31, 1963), we are not declaring that "the Soviet Union is always right" or that "the CPSU is infallible". No Party has been more unsparing in self-criticism than the CPSU.

AGAINST SLANDER

But slanders of this type we have known and fought every year and every month since 1917, equally when made against Lenin, against

*Comment Supplement, No. 1, April 18, 1964.

Stalin, and now against the present leadership of the CPSU. Our Communist Party, which was founded before the Chinese Communist Party, has been fighting these slanders ever since its foundation. Those of us who joined in founding our Communist Party, who were fighting publicly on the side of the Bolsheviks before the Bolshevik revolution, from the moment of the Bolshevik revolution, we had to rebut these foul charges from enemies and renegades ever since 1917. We are shocked that these same slanders should now be repeated by leaders of the Communist Party of China. But we shall continue to rebut them from whatever source they come.

We love and honour the great Chinese Revolution, the second greatest socialist revolution in history, just as we have loved and honoured always the Soviet Revolution. We honour the brilliant role of the historic Communist Party of China, which led 600 million of the Chinese people to victory against imperialism and its allies. Whatever the ideological differences, we stand in unbreakable solidarity with the Chinese People's Republic as a great socialist country against every assault of imperialism. We showed our solidarity when Anglo-American imperialism sought to take advantage of the border conflict in the autumn of 1962, and we shall always maintain such solidarity wherever and whenever imperialism dares to threaten China. We fight for the rights of China in the United Nations, for the ending of the illegal American occupation of Taiwan and for the removal of the American blockading force of warships and planes from the coasts of China.

It is our deepest regret that the manifest strategy of U.S. imperialism to drive a wedge between the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union, should have won a temporary success in this present controversy, and that the leadership of the Communist Party of China should have adopted a line which thus suits the strategy of U.S. imperialism.

FOR CLOSE CO-OPERATION

We desire to see the friendship and close co-operation of the two great socialist powers, the Soviet Union and China, as of all socialist countries and all Communist parties, in the common cause of international communism and for the aims of socialism, national liberation and peace.

It is precisely because of this concern for the unity of the international Communist movement and for the principles of Marxism-Leninism that we have taken our principled stand on these issues as set out in our successive Executive Committee statements, Congress decisions and the latest E.C. statement of September of last year.

Now a new and still further dangerous stage has been reached in this situation by the last document of the Communist Party of China

of March 31, openly repudiating the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist parties and openly calling for splits and factions in all Communist parties.

In face of this challenge no Communist can stand aside or take refuge in declaring that this quarrel of big parties is no concern of his, that it is "six of one and half a dozen of the other", or that he wishes to be neutral, blame both sides, and get on with his job in this country.

COMMON FIGHT

We should indeed deeply like to be free to concentrate on getting on with our job in this country, to unite the fight against British monopoly capitalism and imperialism, the common fight of all Communists and supporters of socialism and national liberation and peace.

We have repeatedly made clear that in our view any issues of internal, ideological controversy in the international Communist movement — and it is quite understandable that in the complex modern international situation questions of difference on current tactics and estimations should arise — should never become the subject of the present type of public polemic between parties for the delight of the enemy, but should be settled by comradely, collective discussion along the lines indicated in the 1960 Statement. It is with the utmost reluctance that we have put out the public statements we have issued only when compelled by the publication of slanderous allegations and charges in documents printed in English and circulated among our members challenging the basic principles of our Party and of the international Communist movement and of the 1960 Statement.

We have, therefore, been compelled to make clear our principled position on these questions; but we have always sought to state our views in the most moderate tone, and continuously laying the main stress on the need to end this type of harmful public polemic and proceed to the methods of international consultation to resolve the differences and restore international Communist unity.

Now that the *People's Daily* article of March 31 has been published, following the "Splitters" article of February 4, and followed by the *Pravda* editorial of April, with the Suslov report of February 14, all the facts and issues are set out plainly for every Party member and reader to judge.

It is not a question of "only" an "ideological controversy" between two great parties, in relation to which differences individual Communists may hold their varying opinions on the rights and wrongs. An ideological controversy can be settled by comradely, collective discussion. But here the language is no longer the language of Communist ideological controversy. The Communist Party of China

has charged the leadership of the CPSU with "betrayal" of communism, denounced the Soviet Union as a fortress of counter-revolution comparable to the "Holy Alliance" of the Tsar and the Kaisers of the early 19th century ("The New 'Holy Alliance' Will End Up No Better Than The Old"), and described the economic system in the Soviet Union as dominated by capitalism (*People's Daily*, March 31, 1964). This is not an "ideological controversy". The same type of slanderous abuse was previously spread through all these years from the sewers of counter-revolution. Every serious Communist can only be indignant that the leadership of the Communist Party of China should descend to repeating such slanders.

SERIOUS FEATURE

It is a serious feature of this controversy that it has been extended to the sphere of state relations. But the issue is not, as the commentators in the capitalist press frequently assert, a battle of "power politics" reflecting the problem of relations of two great socialist powers. Certainly there are such problems. There may be rights or wrongs in these relations. But all these problems can be solved, provided the political basis exists of comradeship in a common cause and the desire for mutual understanding. Only if the political basis is poisoned can such problems dangerously explode.

In face of outrageous charges, the CPSU exercised the greatest patience and restraint. The letter of November 29 to the Communist Party of China, now made public, was couched in the most conciliatory terms; avoided any polemical expression; emphasized that the public division was creating harmful effects and difficulties for the international Communist movement, and especially for smaller Communist parties struggling under difficult conditions in capitalist countries; urged that concentration should be turned on to the main aims on which there was unity, while issues on which there were differences should be held over for further consideration; and suggested that the co-operation of the Soviet Union and China should be publicly manifested by agreements in the economic and cultural spheres, and for this purpose offered to consider any forms of economic co-operation, trade agreements or aid which the Chinese comrades would like to suggest.

"SPLITTERS" ARTICLE

No reply was received to this friendly and conciliatory letter for three months. Instead, on February 4, the provocative and slanderous "Splitters" article appeared. The reply was only sent on February 29.

The *People's Daily* editorial of March 31 has now brought out two new and dangerous elements in the position at present adopted by the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which should open the eyes of all to realize the challenge raised.

First, the Chinese Communist Party now for the first time openly attacks the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, and demands their revision. On the question of the peaceful transition to socialism, they say that "there are serious weaknesses and errors" in the agreed Statement of the 81 Communist parties. Therefore

> *"it is necessary to amend the formulation of the question in the Declaration and the Statement through joint consultation of Communist and Workers' parties."*

It is obvious that only a world conference of the 81 Communist parties would have the right to make any amendment of their previously agreed statement. But the above formulation calling for amendment through joint consultation of Communist and Workers' parties, could be interpreted to mean that the unilateral repudiation of the agreed document now made by the leadership of the Communist Party of China, would be followed by a unilateral attempt at amendment by a few parties or groups.

Previously every Chinese Communist statement has professed fidelity to these agreed documents of the international Communist movement, and accused others of violating them.

What can be thought of those professions in the light of this new statement of the Chinese comrades themselves?

PEACEFUL TRANSITION

Whereas the 1957 and 1960 documents affirmed the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in certain countries, and this was agreed by all the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party now declare that there is only one path, the path of violent revolution, and demand the revision of the international documents in this sense.

The Chinese comrades allege that this theory of the universal law of "violent revolution" and of the rejection of the possibility of peaceful transition in any country, is the true story of Marxism-Leninism. They quote the statement of Lenin in *The State and Revolution* that *"as a general rule"* the proletarian revolution can take place "only through a violent revolution". This statement demonstrates that even at that time, Lenin explicitly rejected the dogma of universality, even half-a-century ago, at the height of the imperialist war, before there was a world system of socialism, before the change in the world balance of forces. But the Chinese comrades then proceed to distort this concrete, careful and dialectical statement of Lenin into the dogmatic assertion that"violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution".

They allege that the conception of the possibility of the peaceful transition to Socialism in certain countries as a result of the change in the balance of forces in the modern world situation, is an invention

first put forward by the Report of Comrade Khrushchov at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956.

"THE BRITISH ROAD"

This is incorrect. The conception was already set out in the Program of our Party, *The British Road to Socialism*, adopted in 1951. This Program was reprinted in *Pravda* and in Communist organs all over the world, and was recognized as winning the approval of leading international Communists, including the leadership of the CPSU, with Stalin at their head. Thus the abuse directed by the Chinese comrades against Khrushchov in this respect is in reality directed against Stalin.

The Chinese comrades allege that the conception of the peaceful transition to socialism is the same as the bankrupt and long discredited reformist conception of achieving socialism by a parlamentary majority, independently of the class struggle and of the extra-parliamentary mass movement.

This is an indefensible distortion. The definition of the conditions for the realization of this peaceful transition (unity of the working class, broad alliance of the working class and the majority of the working population, rising class struggle, alongside the winning of a parliamentary majority, etc.) was set out with complete clearness in our Program, in the Report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and in the 1957 and 1960 documents. There is no possible excuse for misunderstanding.

In support of this revision of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the question of revolution, the Chinese document of March 21st quotes with approval the declaration of Comrade Mao Tse-tung as a supposed tenet of Marxism-Leninism, "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun".

"FORCE THEORY"

This caricature of Marxist-Leninist theory ignores all the teaching of Engels in his *Anti-Duhring*, repudiating the "force theory" of Professor Duhring, and showing that, so far from military force being the original creator of social-political institutions, as Professor Duhring had argued, it is the economic stage of development and corresponding stage of social-political forces which governs the forms and role of military force. This profound teaching of Marxism-Leninism has been abundantly confirmed by the present stage of nuclear weapons, whose possession and use depends on the most advanced economic, scientific and technological development of an entire society.

Similarly the document of March 31st seeks to find an economic basis for the charge of "revisionism" against the leadership of the CPSU and other leading Communist parties. Previous documents were content to quote at scholastic length Lenin's diatribes against

Bernstein, Kautsky and the revisionists of the Second International, and to draw a parallel from this with socialist countries.

BASIS OF REVISIONISM

But Lenin never failed to show that the economic basis of revisionism was the alliance of an upper section and leadership of the Labour movement with their own ruling capitalist class. Since the rule of the capitalists and landlords in Russia was ended nearly half a century ago, and socialism established, the charge of "revisionism" remained hanging in the air without any visible economic basis. The document of March 31st has now tried to repair this omission by declaring that capitalism is dominant in the Soviet Union:

"The capitalist forces in Soviet society have become a deluge, sweeping over all fields of life in the USSR, including the political, economic, cultural and ideological fields."

This also is the old song of anti-Communist and Social Democratic calumny. Lenin used often to express hearty derision of these absurdities, even in the period of NEP when the existence of permitted small-scale capitalism could provide some concrete facts on which to build the Western fables about the alleged "restoration of capitalism" in the Soviet Union. But at the present day, in the era of the mighty triumphs of the long established socialist system in the Soviet Union, this kind of fantasy is only an expression of theoretical bankruptcy.

The second new and grave feature of the March 31st document is that the general incitement to factionalism and splits, already contained in previous documents, notably in the "Splitters" document of February 4th, is now carried to the point of explicitly calling on the CPSU to remove Comrade Khrushchov from his leading position as General Secretary:

"Khrushchov's revisionism has inflicted very great and grave damage on the Soviet Union . . . we would give the leading comrades in the Soviet Union a piece of advice: since so many opportunists and revisionists have been thrown on to the rubbish heap of history, why must you belatedly follow in their wake . . . When Kautsky became a renegade the German Communist Liebknecht could only appeal to the working class in this way to 'push aside such leaders'."

What is here involved is no mere question of an individual, but of the basic relations of Communist parties.

But no party has the right to issue instructions to another party as to whom to choose for its leadership. It is the democratically elected Congress of a Communist Party which elects its Central Committee and its Central Committee which appoints the comrades to leading positions. This sovereign, democratic independence applies equally to the smallest Communist Party as to the largest.

All fraternal relations between Communist parties would be destroyed if this principle of independence and non-intervention in internal affairs as between Communist parties were not recognized and if, instead, the principle of factional intervention by any Communist Party to promote disruption within another Communist Party were to become recognized as the principle of relationship between Communist parties.

AGAINST FACTIONALISM

Factionalism has nothing in common with the essential principle of the fullest and freest discussion within a Communist Party.

Factionalism, or the formation of counter-posed groups around opposing platforms within a Communist Party was condemned by Lenin and on Lenin's initiative prohibited by the Tenth Congress of the CPSU in 1921, as incompatible with the principles of democratc centralism of a Communist Party. Factionalism is no less impermissible on an international scale. During the thirties Trotskyism tried to organize factionalism on an international scale, with the customary call to "All true Marxist-Leninists", or "All true Bolsheviks" to form their grouplets or "would-be parties" in each country in opposition to the Communist Party and the international Communist movement (portrayed as hopelessly corrupted, bureaucratic, betraying Marxism-Leninism, and jumping obediently to "the orders of Moscow"), and on this basis erect a so-called "Fourth International". The attempt was an ignominious fiasco from the outset; and the latest phase of the myriad convolutions of the fragments of the so-called "Fourth International" has been their further disintegration into three rival mutually squabbling "international centres" in different continents—a feat surpassing the splitting of the atom.

Nevertheless even this puny and unsuccessful example of the attempt to promote factionalism on an international scale, did harm by providing the capitalist press with rich material for denunciation of the international Communist movement, or for presenting the most honoured and fearless revolutionary working class fighters all over the world with long records of devotion and integrity through every ordeal, as "jumping to the orders of Moscow".

Thus the international Communist movement has long experience of the harmfulness of factionalism and of the use of it made by the enemy. It is all the more serious if any established Communist Party, and still more leading Communist Party, gives direct countenance and even incitement to such attempts. Any attempts at factionalism require to be met with the united opposition of the entire international Communist movement. This is the emphatic warning of the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties:

"Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as a law of their activity strictly

to observe Leninist standards of Party life in keeping with the principles of democratic centralism and to cherish Party unity like the apple of their eye."

The Communist Party in this country will continue to oppose all factional activities and disruption, equally in Britain or internationally, at the same time as carrying forward the struggle for the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, as set out in the 1960 Statement.

WORLD CONFERENCE

The problems of the present situation are serious and unprecedented. To overcome them will require the united efforts of all sincere Communists. Our Party has advocated a World Conference of Communist and Workers' parties to meet this dangerous situation. At the same time our Party has also declared that such a World Conference should be adequately prepared by preliminary consultations to ensure that the conference shall serve the purpose, not of deepening or perpetuating a split, but assist to resolve differences by comradely discussion and to restore the unity of the international Communist movement.

This remains our aim. Whatever the difficulties and obstacles still before us, we shall continue these efforts in the cause of the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

We remain confident that, grave as is the present situation, the international Communist movement will, in the end, solve the problems set by the present critical developments and emerge finally as it has emerged in the past from every preceding ordeal, with renewed strength and unity, to new triumphs in the cause of communism.

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONFERENCE

RESOLUTION* OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL, COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA, APRIL 15, 1964.

The National Council of the Communist Party of India views with grave concern the new stage of aggravation of the open controversy and conflict in the world Communist movement reached since February 4, 1964 when the leadership of the Communist Party of China in their editorial in the *People's Daily* and *Hungchi* (Red Flag) gave an open call for organizing splits in the Communist and Workers' parties of every country in the name of fighting alleged "revisionism" of the CPSU.

From an attempt to give an alternative interpretation of the basic new appraisals and conclusions regarding the present-day world situation reached by the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties through their collective effort and incorporated in the Declaration and Statement of 1957 and 1960, the leadership of the Communist Party of China proceeded, on the eve of their bilateral talks with the leadership of the CPSU, to put forth unilaterally an entirely alternative line for the world Communist movement.

After the breakdown of the bilateral talks, the leadership of the Communist Party of China launched an unprecedentedly venomous campaign of open polemics, distorting the guiding principles laid down in the aforesaid collective documents, the Declaration and Statement of 1957 and 1960, on the role of the world socialist system, on the possibility of averting a World War, on peaceful coexistence of differing social systems, on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist states and in the countries which have newly won their independence from imperialism.

In these open polemics, they resorted to such gross vilifications and slanders against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, including our Party, violating all norms of behaviour and relations between fraternal parties—which are equal among themselves and sovereign in respect of their own people.

Passing from acrimonious words to disruptive deeds, the leadership of the Communist Party of China at the time of the Caribbean crisis, instead of lending support to the great peace initiative of the Soviet Union calculated to prevent a thermo-nuclear war and protect

---

New Age, April 19, 1964.

the Cuban socialist revolution, foully attacked the Soviet action and utilized the crisis to launch a massive invasion across the Mac-Mahon Line in a bid to intimidate India and to solve the border dispute in its favour.

CHINA PURSUES ALTERNATE LINE

This action, as well as its opposition to the Test-Ban Treaty, and its opposition to the Soviet move to achieve world agreement to settle all border and territorial disputes peacefully, clearly shows that the leadership of the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China are bent on extending the pursuit of their alternative line to the stage of conflict on the State plane, thus causing division in the great united front of the progressive forces of the world socialist countries, of the great labour movement of the capitalist countries and of the mighty national liberation movements of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America— the front for peace, democracy and socialism.

They are extending their splitting activities to all the great world organizations of peace, of labor, of women, of youth and of Afro-Asian solidarity. They are openly encouraging the organization of rival Communist and Workers' parties in a number of countries including ours, and grossly interfering in the affairs of fraternal parties in an attempt to force their line on them.

FOR AN END TO DISRUPTION

In the face of this serious situation in the world Communist movement, created by the unilateral actions of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, which threatens the solidarity and unity of the progressive forces of the peoples of the world, and above all of its advance detachment, the Communist and Workers' parties of various countries, and which only bring grist to the mill of imperialists and reactionaries, it is of the utmost importance to make a determined and united effort based on the broadest possible consultations among fraternal parties to overcome these difficulties and reforge the unity of the world Communist movement and to bring about the end of all divisive activities and disruptive polemics.

The National Council of the Communist Party of India reiterates its former resolution calling for the convening of a World Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties as soon as possible.

This conference is necessary to preserve the unity of the world Communist movement, to ensure the victory of the great ideas of the Moscow Meetings of 1957 and 1960, which have advanced the cause of peace, of democracy, of the national independence of nations and of socialism.

UNITY OF WORLD'S WORKERS MUST BE GOAL OF COMMUNISTS

STATEMENT* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The historic mission of our working class is not only to free itself, the Negro people, and all deprived strata of this capitalist society from exploitation and oppression at the hand of the monopolists, and to make a rich and new life for the masses, but it also bears the responsibility of safeguarding all that is worthy in the national heritage and all creations of civilization.

Its destiny is to lead the nation to new heights of international fraternity and service to humanity. It cannot fulfil its duty to itself as a class nor attain its rightful status as leader of the nation, save on the basis of preserving all mankind from a holocaust that would result from the outbreak of thermonuclear war.

The preservation of peace is the first task of honour of our working class and of the workers of the whole world. It is a task which the working people of the whole world assume in association with all people who treasure the life and achievements of humanity.

* * *

The Communist Party of the United States understands the grave responsibilities which our Party, our class, and the workers of the whole world bear before history in this epoch when an ascending socialism is lighting the way to freedom from economic and cultural want, and freedom from fear of political tyranny yet, when at the same time the thermonuclear and rocketry instruments of war have been brought to an earth-crumbling destructive calibre.

It is on these grounds of responsibility to our class and our nation, and in conformity with the interests of humanity the world over, that we reaffirm our criticism and rejection of the course being advocated and pursued by the leadership of the Communist Party of China on a wide range of questions which bear upon policies in connection with the struggle for peace, democracy, economic development, national freedom, and socialism.

The attempts of leaders of the Communist Party of China to propagate their views over the heads of the leadership of the Communist and Workers' parties of the various countries have brought about a situation of divisions and confusions of serious proportion.

*The Worker, April 19, 1964.

It is the obligation of Marxist-Leninists to take all necessary measures consistent with principle to re-unify their ranks as speedily as possible.

Therefore, it is our judgment that the earliest convocation of a conference of the representatives of each of the Marxist parties of the respective countries of the world, consistent with adequate preparation, be held to arrive at a concensus concerning the departures from the scientific line of Marxism-Leninism on matters of universal principle and for setting forth the required recommendations for effecting the necessary self-corrections and for the strengthening of the all-round unity of the international Communist movement, of the world working class, and of the fellowship of its respective national parties.

COMMUNIQUE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF ECUADOR

BAR THE WAY TO SPLITTERS IN THE COUNTRY AND OUTSIDE.

For some time now the Communist Party of Ecuador has been waging a fight against a small group of factionalists headed by Rafael Echeverria, Carlor Rodrigues and Jorge Arrellan who have deliberately placed themselves outside the Party, ignoring its discipline, its political line and the Marxist-Leninist approach to national and international problems.

Their adventurist methods, their inconsistent and unprincipled theses were in too obvious contradiction with the realities of life and, naturally, they were emphatically rejected by all true members of the Party and by the Party as a whole. Seeing their operational base inside the country smashed, they carried their activities beyond its frontiers in an attempt to discredit the Party in the eyes of the fraternal parties and also before the Latin American revolutionary movements. They thereby are objectively playing into the hands of U.S. imperialism which seeks to weaken the fraternal parties of our continent and split the revolutionary movements fighting for the social and national emancipation of our peoples.

Those who use these methods have long shown themselves as a miserable group of petty-bourgeois, adventurist, corrupted and ambitious elements to whom the policy of the Party expressing the interests of the masses is alien and who do not recognize the historical mission of the proletariat and the vanguard role of the Party. These are ambitious opportunists, supporters of Caudillism, who tend to follow pseudo-revolutionary trends. In their activity they have always sought to undermine the Party's influence in the mass movements, and did not hesitate to join hands with the elements expelled from the Party and with its open enemies.

These elements have lost all positions from which they could attack the Party. Hence it was not fortuitous that when differences set in between the leaders of the Communist Party of China and the world Communist movement, they came out as zealous supporters of what they call the "Chinese line", using every opportunity to smear, distort and slander the positions of the CPSU and the CPE. At first we could not believe their boast that their activity had the support of the Communist Party of China—a thing which is inconceivable in the relations between fraternal parties. However, the events that have occurred in our country since June-July 1963

demonstrated that the splitters indeed received direct support from the Chinese leaders in their campaign of slander directed against our Party.

Operating from abroad, enjoying support which by no means comes from the fraternal parties upholding the unity of the world Communist movement, and using slanders and fabrications, these elements are not only combating the CPE but are encroaching on the unity of each and all Latin American parties, on the unity of the world Communist movement.

The CPE therefore considers it urgent to issue a call to all members working in the country to bar the way to the disruptive activity of those few splitting elements, both inside and outside the country, who have not yet been fully exposed. We also urge those members who have had to leave the country because of the persecutions by the dictatorship, resolutely to oppose and expose those elements abroad, and to combat the splitters' attacks against the world Communist movement, as in the case of Jose Maria Roura and Jorge Rivadeneira who have been expelled from the Party.

Executive Committee, Communist Party of Ecuador,
Guayaquil, March 6, 1964.

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

12

Included in this issue

SPEECH BY MAURICE THOREZ

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF PARTY LIFE IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

APPEAL OF SPANISH COMMUNIST PARTY

THREE ARCH-ABSURDITIES OF CHINESE LEADERS

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 12

contents

UNITY—FOR DEMOCRACY, FOR SOCIALISM
Speech by Maurice Thorez at the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party **5**

DOCUMENTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF DENMARK **15**

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NORWAY TAKES ISSUE WITH CPC LEADERSHIP
Documents **22**

WORLD COMMUNIST CONFERENCE UNLIKELY TO YIELD RESULTS NOW
Statement of the Communist Party of Sweden **28**

RESOLUTION OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF FINLAND **30**

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF PARTY LIFE IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
Reprint from **Pravda** **32**

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Statement of the Communist Party of Portugal **51**

APPEAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN **53**

AKEL CONDEMNS STAND OF CPC LEADERSHIP
Statement **55**

THE THREE ARCH-ABSURDITIES OF THE CHINESE LEADERS
Khaled Bagdash **58**

HISTORY WILL NOT FORGIVE THEM
Statement of the Communist Party of India **68**

ON THE SPLITTING ACTIVITIES OF THE CPC LEADERS
Statement of the Communist Party of Argentina **74**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA

July 2, 1964

UNITY—FOR DEMOCRACY, FOR SOCIALISM

SPEECH* BY MAURICE THOREZ AT THE 17th CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

Comrades, our 17th Party Congress is coming to an end. The debate on the Central Committee report delivered by Waldeck Rochet, our General Secretary, and on the new Party Rules was of a high political standard and culminated in unanimous approval The draft resolution was also unanimously approved.

The scope and content of the debate, the good knowledge shown of the issues on hand, prove that it was not just a formal approval, but a genuine identity of opinion, deriving from a serious and thorough study of these issues when preparing for the Congress at thousands of branch meetings and hundreds of sectional and federation conferences.

Friends and enemies alike had an opportunity to learn from these four days of free and extensive discussion that our Party is solidly united.

The whole Party, as represented by its delegates, voted unanimously for the documents defining our policy. The whole Party approved the composition of its governing bodies.

This reveals the deep-going cohesion of our ranks. So, in this respect we can proudly say that our 17th Congress has been a striking manifestation of unity.

The idea of unity was also advanced by the Congress in a broader context.

The Congress has issued a strong call for working-class unity, for the unity of the democratic forces, for the unity of the social strata victimized by the policy of the monopolies, a call to combat the regime of personal power and establish a genuine democracy.

Ever since 1958, in spite of the painful defeat suffered by the working class and democracy, we have stood firm. At once, we made the right appraisal of gaullist power, and it did not take long for the course of events to confirm it. We showed that both domestically and externally the contradictions would come to a head and the camp that had voted "yes" would fall apart.

We expressed our unshakeable faith in the masses, and predicted that struggles would be sure to arise in all spheres—the economic, political and social. We demonstrated the necessity of organizing these struggles and of preparing their convergence for a general battle against the authoritarian system.

Soon after the 1958 referendum we declared our confidence that all working people, and above all the socialists, would join hands with us in this battle.

---

*Supplement au No. 5 du **Bulletin de Propagande et d'Information,** May-June, 1964.

It was in this spirit that we worked at our Congress for four days. We occupied ourselves with the condition and future of the working class and of all the other working people, and discussed what the best conditions would be for the struggle to end a political system that embodies the increased domination of finance-capital and furthers with all its powers the super-exploitation of the masses. What would these best conditions be? They may be summed up in one word: unity.

Unity is essential in the daily struggles of the working people. It is essential between the trade union organizations. It must be achieved between the Communist and the Socialist parties. Our resolution emphasizes that it is highly important to develop joint action by the two parties and that this joint action should be more fruitful than in the best days of 1934 and 1945.

Before parting, the delegates at this Congress will reaffirm their pledge to fight tirelessly to achieve accord with the Socialist Party despite the existing differences. If the Socialists and Communists wage the daily struggle together and keep developing their common activities, they will be better able to overcome the difficulties and reach agreement on the more essential questions.

In this connection, we consider the following statement by Guy Mollet extremely important. "Does not a certain form of economic democracy," he said, "lead to new forms of political democracy? Are not some of the aspects of what we call political democracy quite useless ones?"

If the militant Socialists give this problem due thought, as the General Secretary of their Party urges them to do, we shall succeed in putting one of the main differences between us out of the way. The question of democracy will then stand on a Marxist foundation, a class foundation, rather than abstractly, on a liberal foundation.

In other words, formal democracy is no longer being opposed to the economic and political gains of socialism.

Comrades, if we are conscious that the strength of gaullism derives chiefly from division in the ranks of workers and democrats, then, obviously, unity is the cardinal task to which all others must concede precedence. If we know that a united working class can and must be the pole of attraction for the realignment of all the other sections of society that cherish progress, democracy and peace, should we not place working-class unity above all else?

This is why we hear the call for alliance between the Communist and Socialist parties at the factories and offices, in the countryside and at the universities. We shall spare no effort to translate this great hope into reality, and our energy will redouble from the knowledge that unity is gaining strength.

It is a few weeks since a very thorough common educational policy has been worked out and adopted at a conference of all the democratic parties and organizations. There is no reason why we should not achieve for the whole program what we have so successfully achieved for one of its parts. If the democrats have reached agreement on questions that have long been controversial, such as the

nationalization of education, should this not encourage them to tackle the political, economic, social and other sections of a common program?

Unity is developing, too, in order to protect and extend municipal freedoms. Elected republican office-holders come together, reach agreement and fight jointly against authoritarian concentration of power and paralyzing tutelage, which tend to impede measures profiting the people.

We fight hand in hand—Socialists, Communists and all republicans —to support the people of Spain against Franco terrorism.

We stand together against violence.

In all these actions there is the underlying idea and embryo of a common platform, a common program. The draft of a program was advanced by us as far back as 1959 with the object of providing a concrete foundation for an alliance of the working class, the working peasantry, the middle classes and all the victims of the monopolies. We can put on record at this point that the programs of the different democratic parties already contain many common elements. So could we not on these grounds produce a conception that would facilitate general agreement?

If we want to inspire among the democratic forces the confidence and enthusiasm indispensable for victory, it is essential that we work together to frame a common program. On the other hand, the absence of such a program enables the government to capitalize on fears of a "return to the past" and to allege that the workers and republicans are incapable of agreement in the name of a positive and new cause.

Let us also note that French political affairs must not be made dependent for two years on the personal conduct of the candidates to the presidency. In your resolution you have expressed your determination "to oppose the candidate of personal power with a jointly nominated candidate who can effectively represent the mass movement and the alliance of all the democratic parties and organizations without exception, in order to establish a new democracy."

To achieve a real change, it is necessary more than ever to have a mass movement of unprecedented proportions, which, in turn, calls for agreement and unity.

We see this unity taking shape most impressively in the battles for the working people's various demands, in the strikes, and in other forms of struggle for higher wages and salaries, for a 40-hour working week without reduction in pay, for the various economic interests of the masses, for non-violation of the right to strike, and in defense of trade-union freedoms.

Unity is being wrought in the struggles of the working peasantry for a revision of the prices of farm products, which the government has rejected, and against the measures of mass expropriation, to which the government resorts in the interests of agrarian capitalism. Special acclaim is due to the big joint demonstrations of workers and peasants held in some of the areas.

Unity is evident in the struggle against reactionary incursions on

public education, in the actions to protect secular schools, for a democratic educational reform under the Langevin-Wallon plan and in defense of the young people's rights to culture, to a trade or profession and proper leisure time.

Unity is also gaining strength in the battles to safeguard local freedoms from the assault of personal power, to check the reactionary administrative reforms and to reaffirm the right of the people to impartial democratic information.

We see unity making distinct progress in the struggle for peace. Socialists, Communists, radicals and all other republicans, churchgoers and atheists, jointly denounce de Gaulle's refusal to participate in the disarmament negotiations. The government's opposition to the Moscow nuclear test-ban treaty, (since the building up of a strike force *(force de frappe)*—so ruinous to the country's finances), is likely to create the frightening condition in which France risks total destruction. All of them act jointly, they find themselves shoulder to shoulder in the big demonstrations protesting against atomic arming, such as that in Parc de Sceaux. The policy of relieving international tension, of general and controlled disarmament, and of peaceful coexistence, is welcomed unanimously by all democrats.

We leave this Congress, which has proceeded under the motto of unity, with the conviction that we can and must overcome the resistance still obstructing joint actions.

Today, the time is ripe to respond to the mounting aspiration of the masses to socialism. We must act on the demands of our time, the time of transition from capitalism to socialism. At this time, when all roads lead to this great transition, we Communists and Socialists must not fail to find the means of achieving mutual understanding.

It is by building a united front of parties representing the working class and by effecting the alliance of all republicans that we shall in the near future generate a movement strong enough to abolish personal power and establish a true democracy.

Comrades, our Congress has given the vast majority of Communist and Workers' parties an opportunity to reaffirm their firm adherence to the principle of the unity of our international movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. This was strikingly indicated in the speeches made by our guests from this rostrum and in the messages we received at the Congress from fraternal parties.

We extend our fondest greetings to the delegates of the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is leading the people of its land to the inspiring goal of Communist construction showing the superiority of socialism over capitalism to working people the world over, and opening the most radiant prospects for all mankind.

Lenin's great Party and the Soviet people are showing every nation the road to a happy future. The Soviet Union remains the beacon for all working people, for all progressives. It stands in the van in science and technology. It is opening an entirely new field for the flowering of democracy in its state of the whole people. It embodies the social ideal which has for centuries been the dream of the oppressed. Acting in behalf of the Soviet people, Comrade Khrushchov

has, in the eyes of the whole world, become the standard-bearer of peace. We add our applause to the ovations of the Egyptian people, who are giving a rousing and grateful reception to the head of the Soviet Government, the friend and supporter of the peoples fighting for complete independence.

The presence at our Congress of numerous delegations from the People's Democracies, and their speeches demonstrate the unity of the socialist camp. We deeply regret the absence of the delegates of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, who did not have French visas. We applaud the message which our comrades sent us from the German Democratic Republic and assure them of our fraternal solidarity.

We also applauded the message of the Vietnamese Party of Labor, whose heroic struggle for national independence, for socialist construction and for the country's democratic reunification we have always supported, and with which we have particularly close bonds. We extend fraternal greetings to all comrades, present and absent.

The presence at our 17th Congress of delegations from many Communist parties of capitalist countries also reflects the powerful upsurge of our international movement and the unshakeable loyalty of the Communists of different countries to the principles of proletarian internationalism. While greeting the delegates of all these parties from the bottom of our heart, everyone will understand that our Congress sends special expressions of solidarity to the courageous Communist Party of Spain, whose policy of unity contributes so effectively to the development of mass action against the Franco regime.

Fraternal greetings to the working people of Spain, to all the antifascist fighters of Spain! Fraternal greetings to the brave strikers in the Asturias!

Allow me to express the deep gratitude of the Congress to the representatives of the national democratic parties of the independent African countries, the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, Guinea, and the Mali Republic. We ask these delegations, when they return to their countries, to convey to their parties and their peoples the fondest wishes of the Communists and the working people of France.

At the price of many years of harrowing and selfless struggle, the people of Algeria, led by the National Liberation Front, have triumphed over colonialism and re-established their national independence. The achievement of freedom and sovereignty by Algeria is a victory for all progressives. True to the principles of proletarian internationalism and acting on the properly understood interests of France, we have from the first supported this just struggle. Three years ago, our 16th Congress appealed to all Frenchmen advocating negotiations, to take vigorous actions in favor of peace. Today, we heartily wish success and prosperity to Algeria, which has embarked on socialism.

We send equally heartfelt greetings to the other independent African countries, which have courageously taken the road of creative development.

In their speeches at our Congress, the delegates of the fraternal Communist parties have reaffirmed their adherence to the policy of

the international working-class movement and to its unity. One cannot help feeling concern and grief over the fact that the leaders of the Communist Party of China are departing more and more from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, from the line worked out jointly on the basis of these principles by the international conferences of Communist and Workers parties in 1957 and 1960. They are spreading incorrect theories of a purely adventurist nature.

Instead of considering the contradiction between world socialism and world imperialism as the principal contradiction of our time, the Chinese leaders contend that "the principal storm centre of the world revolution," the pivot of the contradictions of our time, is located in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They are trying to oppose the national-liberation movement to the socialist system, in order to knock in a wedge between the peoples fighting for independence, on the one hand, and the socialist countries and the international working-class movement, on the other.

But could the national-liberation movement ever have achieved all its successes without the October Socialist Revolution? Could it have done so without the 46 years of creative labor and the immense sacrifices of the Soviet people? Could it have done so without the Soviet Union's victory over Hitler Germany and Japan? It was the historic achievements of the Soviet Union that created the conditions for the liberation of the Asian, African and even the Latin-American peoples, and China is no exception. It is the Soviet people again, who are able, thanks to their labor, to render material aid to many countries, thus helping them to build up independent economies. It is the Soviet people who stand guard over the sovereignty and integrity of the newly-free countries.

This statement of the facts is not made by me to belittle the importance of the struggle waged by the peoples in the former colonial countries for their complete independence and of their own contribution to the solution of the big problems of our time.

The Chinese leaders are committing gross blunders. Instead of considering the new balance of forces in the world, which leads to the conclusion that it is possible in our time to prevent world war, they are playing with fire and making a policy devoid of any sense of responsibility for the future of the peace and the very existence of the peoples. This attitude prompts them, among other things, just like de Gaulle, to oppose the Moscow Treaty and advocate the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Instead of recognizing that concrete conditions of time and place create possibilities of either peaceful or non-peaceful forms of revolution, the Chinese leaders condemn the peaceful form out of hand, and recognize only the non-peaceful. Furthermore, they obscure the temporary character of the dictatorship of the proletariat and reject the conception of a state of the whole people. In effect, they denounce the idea of a united front with the Socialist parties, and seek thereby to turn back the clock by 40 years.

Having at first acknowledged the evil caused by the Stalin cult, they have now changed their minds about it. They glorify the methods

regretted and condemned by the working-class movement, and do so, evidently, because these practices persist in their country.

In trying to spread this indefensible line, the sectarians and dogmatists of the CPC leadership fall back on impermissible practices in their relations with other Communist parties, and resort to gross aggression and calumny.

They say in our country that anything exaggerated does not count.

What Communist or, generally speaking, what sensible man in France and elsewhere, would give credit to the outrageous and, at once, pitiful and ridiculous contentions of the Chinese leaders against our Party?

Who would believe that we "defended the positions of French imperialism" and that we are "opposed to the struggle of the colonial peoples for their independence"?

In any case, it would not be believed by those who have in the last 40 years responded to our call and battled against the injustices inflicted on the peoples of Morocco, Syria, Vietnam and, more recently, the people of Algeria.

It would not be believed by those who paid with their liberty for supporting the liberation struggles of these peoples.

From Sabatier, killed on October 12, 1925, during the big strike against the war in Morocco, to the nine people killed in Charonne—of whom most were Communists—the blood of our dead cries out against the calumnies of the Chinese leaders.

The peoples now free do not believe the insulting charges made against our Party. The presence of delegates from many of them at our 17th Congress is precious evidence of the strong friendship that binds us, and of the active solidarity that has in no sense ever been one-sided. We have helped the peoples of the oppressed countries, and they have helped us, the proletarians of France.

The Chinese leaders are multiplying their attempts to disorganize and divide the working-class movement. They employ all kinds of renegades and adventurers to further their disruptive enterprise. Their sole aim is to injure the Communist movement.

Can one remain indifferent to their intrigues? Can one keep silent? For a long time we showed extreme discretion, over the theoretical differences of the Chinese leaders with the whole international working-class movement and their disruptive work against our parties. We confined ourselves to briefing them on the resolutions of our Central Committee, and it was not until the end of 1962 that we informed just the members of our Party about our speech at the 1960 meeting.

The Chinese leaders mistook this moderation and this desire to conduct the discussion on a fraternal basis, for weakness. They expanded their disruptive activities. They went to the length of outrages and slanders.

Today, our entire Party, as the Congress has just declared, considers it necessary that all the Communist and Workers' parties solemnly reaffirm the principles of Marxism-Leninism. We believe it is necessary to reaffirm the Communist theses on peaceful co-

existence, on the possibility to avert war, the possibility of advancing to a world without arms and without wars, the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in definite circumstances, and the necessity of creating a united front with the socialist parties.

Our Congress has pronounced itself in favour of an international conference in order to discuss the problems of the international working-class movement, and to safeguard its unity. The only people who could oppose such a conference are those who wish, in one sense or another, to go back on the principles of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement.

Comrades, the serious deviations of the Chinese leaders remind us, if that is at all necessary, that in all circumstances the Party must always firmly adhere to Marxist-Leninst principles. In our own Party, and internationally as well, we must always struggle with determination on two fronts: against sterile sectarianism and narrowness, which today represented the chief danger, and also against Right opportunism, against revisionism, which is still in evidence.

We have entered a period of big battles. It is therefore doubly necessary that our Party should be strong ideologically, that it should be steeled, always combining fidelity to principles with the bold and flexible tactics that convince and attract the masses. At the same time, the Party must be solidly organized on the basis of democratic centralism. Equipped with the new rules, it will accomplish its tasks still more surely.

As always, it must not stint its strength in the performance of its mission, which is to serve with devotion the working class, the people, and the country. It will struggle with all energy to hasten a big democratic change, a regime of progress and freedom, which is feasible in our time solely in the context of socialism.

How far we have travelled since 1922, since that Congress in Paris at which I, a young worker, was a delegate of the Pas-de-Calais federation! That was when, on Lenin's recommendation, our Party first raised the problem of working-class unity and a united front with the Socialist Party.

Ever since that remote period we have worked tirelessly to eliminate the split and to reunite all working people in a single militant front. In 1934, exactly 30 years ago, when the working people of France rose against fascism, our efforts were crowned with an agreement on united action between the Communist and Socialist parties. Soon it was followed by the Popular Front, and a joint program for democratic parties and groups came into being. We had joined hands not only *against* something, that is, *against* fascism, but also *for* something—*for* "the Popular Front of bread, freedom and peace".

The Popular Front yielded many benefits to the working class, the peasants, and all the other working people. It gave them higher wages, collective agreements, a 40-hour working week, paid leaves, a wheat office, etc. Once again, the democratic spirit asserted itself in our country. When the war was over, after the battles of the Resistance and Liberation movement, it was through unity that we

gained new victories: social security, nationalization, the vote for women, the status of civil servants, etc.

We were bent on uniting all the sound forces of the nation and proffered a fraternal hand to the Catholic working people and working people of other faiths in order to fight in concert for happiness on earth.

In these years the people of France recognized our Party more and more as the bearer of their hopes. As far back as 1936, at the time of our Eighth Congress, in order to make the future of our counntry secure, we appealed for the unity of the French people against the two hundred families who exploited them. The Communists denounced and combatted those who undermined national prosperity and impelled the country towards stagnation. They regained the *Marsellaise* and the tricolour for their people.

Since then the Party's national far-sightedness and national courage came into evidence at every stage — it condemned the Munich betrayal, waged war against the Hitler invaders, opposed the Atlantic pact and the notorious strike force in any of its forms. We continue the history of France. The history of our Party is marked, as with milestones, by important initiatives in the service of France, by its national actions. This has won it the trust of the people. Nobody in France can ignore the Communist Party. Today, as before, it has decisive weight in the country's affairs.

It has won extensive support among the main sections of the working class, in the important industrial centres. At the same time, its words carry weight among the people in the countryside.

Communists head the most important trade union organizations of the working class. The working people elect them freely by reason of their devotion and ability. The Communist Party is a party of proletarians, but it can also be proud of the fact that the most prominent intellectuals of France occupy in our ranks the place left empty by Anatole France and Henri Barbusse, Langevin and Joliot, Eluard and Léger. The Communist Party, we see, represents the France of working people and that of the intellectuals, the whole industrious and productive population in all its wealth and variety.

On its banners it has inscribed the slogans of struggle for socialism, for communism, which will secure prosperity and abundance, culture and freedom for all. Marxism opens the only new road to mankind that will lead it forward and, so to speak, rejuvenate and renovate it.

It is not surprising that the youth, which does not want an unjust society — a cruel, egoistic world based on violence, a world without ideals — turns to the noble cause of communism. Is it not enough to glance at this hall, at the faces of the delegates, to see this?

In our Party young people are trusted with responsible posts. No greater happiness exists than to devote one's life to the Communist cause and to see a new generation rising around it to which we will pass the torch.

Everyone of us, young and old, knows what he owes to the Party.

Everyone of us knows that he will never be able to give it as much as he gets from it, and is always prepared to serve the Party, no matter what functions it may entrust him.

In a few minutes the delegates of the 17th Congress will return to different parts of our country. They will be guided in their work by the clear decisions we have adopted. They will be animated by the conviction that life makes the imperious demand of unity between Communists and Socialists, based on the pooling of the energy of all republicans.

Let us do all we can by our ardent, persevering and tireless efforts for unity to hasten the day when a new democracy will arise in France and when the country will be able to advance firmly forward to socialism.

Long live working-class unity!

Long live the unity of all democratic forces!

Hail to the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party!

Long live Communism!

STRUGGLE OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT FOR PEACE, DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

RESOLUTION* ADOPTED BY A PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF DENMARK

The Communist Party of Denmark has repeatedly emphasized the decisive significance of unity among the Communist Parties in the struggle to resolve the historical task of our time—the task of ensuring the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. Hence we could not but deplore the publication by the Communist Party of China of its "proposal concerning the general line of the international Communist movement" of June 14, 1963. By advancing this proposal the CPC widened and deepened its differences with the overwhelming majority of Communist parties, violated the agreement to call a halt to the public polemic, and struck a blow at the striving to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement through discussions between parties.

The main questions brought into dispute by the CPC are: the attitude towards the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, the significance of national-liberation movements, the personality cult in the Communist parties, and the unity of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement.

It has therefore become necessary for the other Communist parties clearly to state their views on these basic problems. Our Party does so in order to forestall any attempts to distort or sow doubt in regard to its aims and tasks and with a view to further substantiating our policy. Our Party also seeks to promote the achievement of greater clarity and to strengthen the ranks of our movement through an exchange of views among Communists.

1. The Communist Party of Denmark holds that life has fully confirmed the correctness of the general line of the Communist movement as set forth in the joint documents of 1957 and 1960. Underlying these documents is the view that the world is now in transition from capitalism to socialism, that ours is a time when social development is determined above all by competition between the two diametrically opposed social systems — socialism and capitalism — and when the socialist world system, in alliance with the other anti-imperialist forces, is increasingly exerting a decisive influence on social development. The proposals of the Communist Party of China on all the basic questions run counter to this general line. Attempts are being made theoretically to substantiate these

*Land og Folk, August 28, 1963.

proposals by claiming that the national-liberation movement in the former colonies is now the decisive determinant of progress. In defiance of the facts, the forces of the working class and socialism are relegated to a secondary place. The CPD rejects both this view put forward by the CPC and the theoretical argumentation advanced to vindicate it.

2. Our Party and the Communist movement generally regard the *struggle for peace* as one of the main aims of their policy, as the cardinal task of our time. With the present balance of strength between socialism and imperialism there exists a tangible possibility of compelling the imperialsts to renounce war, of excluding world war from the life of society even before socialism has achieved complete and final victory throughout the world. This means that the *peaceful coexistence* of states with differing social systems is possible. The transition to socialism is therefore a question which will be decided in each country through the class struggle; for socialism to triumph throughout the world there need be no world war. The Communists concentrate all their efforts on realizing these possibilities. The CPC, however, comes out against this jointly adopted militant line; it is opposed to peaceful coexistence being considered the general foreign policy line of the socialist countries capable of providing a way to socialism for all humanity. The CPC counterposes peaceful coexistence to the struggle of the peoples for freedom and socialism, regardless of the fact that in our time this struggle is inseparably connected with the fight for peace. It labels agreements facilitating detente and the achievement of peaceful coexistence as "capitulation". Inasmuch as peace and socialism are indivisible, the Communist Party of Denmark resolutely rejects this viewpoint.

3. *General and complete disarmament* would make it impossible to wage war and would provide the most durable foundation for the peaceful coexistence of states. Realization of the horrors of nuclear war makes the imperative need for disarmament clear to the peoples of all countries and impels them to fight for it. The Communist movement has jointly posed the realistic task of compelling the imperialists to accept general disarmament. To achieve this, however, vigorous effort on the part of all the peace forces is imperative; the prospect is one of progress through compelling the imperialists to accept a succession of partial disarmament measures.

The Communist Party of China has come out against these jointly elaborated aims. It calls struggle for disarmament a "sheer illusion" and seeks to reduce the demand for disarmament to a purely propaganda slogan. The leaders of the CPC describe the nuclear bomb as a "paper tiger" and are opposed to the danger it represents being brought to people's attention. Proceeding from this, they have levelled unreasonable and violent criticism at the test-ban Treaty, thereby setting themselves against all peoples, who are fighting for peace. Such a policy does not promote the cause of peace, and the Communist Party of Denmark rejects it, deploring that the CPC should have taken such a political stand.

4. The Communists seek to effect the *trasition from capitalism to socialism* by peaceful means. This is possible only if the peoples unite in defense of their interests, isolate the reactionaries and compel them to refrain from using force, the danger of which always exists. In view of the fact that the rule of monopoly capital comes into conflict with the interests or ever wider sections of the people, the conditions for building the necessary anti-monopoly unity are improving. We therefore have set ourselves the task of stimulatin the activity of the people and heightening their confidence in their own strength through a democratic struggle for peace, independence and regeneration of democracy combined with effective action against the monopolies. If the working class consistently and firmly takes the lead in this struggle, it will be able to unite around itself the majority of the people, isolate the reactionaries and in this was ensure the victory of socialism. The program and policy of our Party rest wholly on these convictions. The proposal of the CPC, however, clearly runs counter to the line which it approved in 1960 jointly with other fraternal parties. Calumnious allegations are made that this policy "regards the movement of the present as everything", and that the Communists who pursue this policy "are disavowing the revolutionary demands of the masses" and in effect preventing revolutionary uprisings where they might otherwise flare up. These concepts have nothing in common with reality and our Party rejects them wholly. The same applies to the exhortations to orientate our policy solely on preparing for the non-peaceful way. Such exhortations are a call to withdraw into complete isolation and to pursue an adventuristic policy.

5. The new, more favourable conditions for the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism throughout the world are the result above all of the tremendous achievements of the *socialist countries* in construction and raising the material and cultural standards of their people's life. Thanks to these achievements the socialist camp is exercising a growing influence on world development. We are completely unable to understand why the Communist Party of China seeks to belittle the significance of this fact, or why it has gone so far as to accuse Communist parties of socialist countries of "helping to revive capitalism". Such accusations, especially when levelled against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, whose achievements offer the most convincing living proof of the superiority of socialism as a social system, must be most resolutely rejected.

6. The *national-liberation movement* in the newly-emerged countries is an important part of the anti-imperialist struggle and of the overall process of change under way in the world. The Communists, therefore, fully support this movement, even in cases when it is not led by the working class. The attempts of the Communist Party of China to counterpose Communist parties to the national-liberation movement can only have negative consequences. For it is the support of all the anti-imperialist forces and primarily of victorious

socialism that enables the peoples of the newly-emerged countries to forge ahead along non-capitalist lines.

7. The exposure of the Stalin *personality cult* was of decisive significance for the development of the entire Communist movement. All parties assessed the 20th Congress of the CPSU as having ushered in a new phase in the movement, and life itself has confirmed this assessment. Consequently, it is impossible to understand why the Communist Party of China holds that the struggle against the personality cult is "erroneous and harmful". The Communist movement cannot and will not allow any repetition of the mistakes of the past, which have already been rectified. It will see to it that these mistakes will never be repeated again.

8. The implementation of the line of the Communist parties in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism presupposes consistent *struggle against bourgeois ideology* in all its forms. There can be no "peaceful coexistence" in the sphere of ideology. Hence our Party is constantly on guard against both revisionist and dogmatist distortions of our policy. Our Party has given a vigorous rebuff to revisionist sallies and thereby staunchly upheld and advocated the line of class struggle in the Danish working-class movement. The fact that the leaders of the Socialist People's Party have been moving farther and farther to the Right has fully demonstrated the need for such action on our part. We therefore reject as utterly groundless the accusation made by the Communist Party of China that our policy is "revisionist" or "opportunist".

9. The *unity of the Communist movement* is a guarantee that all the available opportunities will be utilized in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism. Precisely because of this the parties pledged themselves to undertake no actions that might undermine this unity. But to our dismay we find in the proposals of the Communist Party of China an undisguised call for a split in the fraternal parties and the movement as a whole. We hold that the CPC has no right whatever to pursue such a course.

10. Regarding the above-mentioned issues as being of decisive importance for our political activity, we completely reject the proposal of the CPC concerning a new general line. We fail to find in it a single weighty argument justifying changing the general line set forth in the agreed documents of 1957 and 1960.

We also deplore the methods to which the leaders of the CPC have resorted in assailing the jointly approved line. One cannot discern in these methods the slightest desire to achieve mutual understanding and unity. On the contrary, they reflect a factionalist approach which leads to increasingly contradictory positions. There is no justification for the arbitrary sallies against fraternal parties or the attempts to ascribe to parties views which everyone knows they do not hold. There is no justification for the assistance rendered to the ruling classes in the capitalist countries in their attacks against the fraternal Communist parties of these countries. Nor is there any justification for the unwillingness of the CPC leaders to achieve the mutual understanding and principled unity in the in-

ternational Communist movement which above all the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been striving for in its relations with the Communist Party of China.

11. Seeking to make its contribution to the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, our Party will make a profound study of the problems that have been raised. We shall work to foil the attempts of our opponents to use the sallies made by the CPC in order to sow confusion, and shall conduct our discussions in strict conformity with Party rules. We shall not allow the attacks made by the CPC to undermine our friendly regard and our respect for the Chinese people and the struggle they have successfully waged under the leadership of the CPC.

We shall continue to work tirelessly for the unity of the Communist movement on the basis of the principles set forth in our joint documents. We appeal to our Chinese comrades to discard their narrow viewpoint which has nothing in common with reality and can only cause harm. We urge them to display a desire to understand the requirements of our time and the conditions in which the fraternal parties are carrying on their struggle, a desire for unity, which is of utmost importance for our common cause.

Our interests are identical. We have common aims. There are no real grounds for policies aimed at a split. Hence we are convinced that unity will triumph and give new impetus to the steadfast efforts of the Communists for peace, democracy and socialism.

August 24, 1963

PROPOSALS ON STRENGTHENING WORLD UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

STATEMENT* OF THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF DENMARK, ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 23-24, 1963

Our Party has always considered the strenthening of the international unity of the Communist movement a task of prime importance. Hence we are seeking ways and means of furthering this aim in the present situation.

Our position on the current differences was set forth in a resolution adopted by the Central Committee on August 24, 1963. This position has been fully endorsed by the entire Party; moreover, it has been confirmed by later developments.

Life has shown that attacks against the general line adopted by the Communist movement have only played into the hands of its enemies. In view of this, and taking into account the position of other Communist parties, we propose that the open polemic be terminated.

---

*Land og Folk, November 24, 1963.

The exchange of views to date shows that the agreed decisions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings should be regarded as the basis uniting the Communist movement. We suggest that in the light of this fact the possibilities be explored for the convocation, as soon as the necessary political preparations have been completed, of a new international meeting of the Communist parties with a view to reaffirming these decisions, taking into account the experience gained since the last meeting.

FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

STATEMENT* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF DENMARK, ADOPTED APRIL 19, 1964

The Communist Party of Denmark has always fully supported the general line which the international Communist movement elaborated at its meetings in 1957 and 1960. Hence our Party has consistently combated all distortions of this line and all attacks levelled against it both by the Right-wing, revisionist elements, in particular those represented by Axel Larsen, and by the dogmatists and sectarians who consider themselves to be more "Left" than our Party.

From the very beginning of the debate in the international Communist movement we have voiced our disagreement with the dogmatic and sectarian views of the spokesmen of the Communist Party of China. We set forth our arguments at the meeting of Communist parties in 1960 and since then we have in diverse ways confirmed and expounded our position. In particular, the Central Committee stated its views on this question in its resolution of August 24, 1963.

At the same time we have consistently sought to ensure that the discussion among Communists be conducted in a comradely spirit, so as not to give the anti-Communists any opportunities to use it to denigrate the Communist movement. In the various messages we have sent to fraternal parties we laid stress on the responsibility they bear in this respect. We have voiced the view that the atmosphere could be improved by stopping the open polemics, and supported the initiative of a number of fraternal parties, in particular that of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has displayed a praiseworthy sense of responsibility, devotion to principle and patience in dealing with the difficulties that have arisen in the international Communist movement.

We therefore deplore the fact that the leaders of the CPC, who carried the public polemic far beyond all permissible bounds, not only rejected the suggestion that the public debate be discontinued but have latterly gone to even greater lengths. Moreover, they are attacking positions which they only recently upheld themselves. They are assailing the basic principles of joint statements, accusing the

---

*Land og Folk, April 19, 1964.

Soviet Union and other socialist countries of allowing themselves to be dominated by "capitalist forces," and trying to prove that a split is inevitable in the Communist movement. The actions of the CPC leaders constitute an unprincipled drive to bring about a split.

The situation demands new effective steps to strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement. The experience of our movement shows that unity can be ensured only on the basis of devotion to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is therefore necessary to reaffirm, elaborate and elucidate the principles which unite the international Communist movement and are its distinguishing features. The further fruitful development on this basis of the political thinking and activities of the various Communist parties, in accordance with the conditions prevailing in the respective countries, is an essential component of this process.

The CC, CPD has time and again, and in particular at its plenary meeting in November 1963, declared for the convocation of an international meeting to confirm the general line charted earlier and to elaborate, on the basis of this line, a new positive initiative conforming to the changing situation. Proceeding from the fact that genuine unity can be achieved only through a constant exchange of views between independent and equal Communist parties, we believe that it is now more important than ever to call such a meeting and that preparations for it should be begun as soon as possible.

The CC, CPD has time and again, and in particular at its plenary meeting in November 1963, declared for the convocation of an international meeting to confirm the general line charted earlier and to elaborate, on the basis of this line, a new positive initiative conforming to the changing situation. Proceeding from the fact that genuine unity can be acheived only through a constant exchange of views between independent and equal Communist parties, we believe that it is now more important than ever to call such a meeting and that preparations for it should be begun as soon as possible.

We believe that the time is ripe for the Communists of all countries to undertake a new positive initiative in the struggle for peace, national freedom and socialism.

The Central Committee authorizes the leadership of the Party, on the basis of the position outlined above, to continue to give effect to the Party's striving to strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement and to increase its contribution to the cause of communism.

ALL COMMUNIST PARTIES HAVE COMMON BASIS—DIFFERENCES OF OPINION MUST NOT UNDERMINE UNITY

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF NORWAY ADOPTED AT A PLENARY MEETING ON JANUARY 5-6, 1963

Having heard the reports of the Norwegian Communist Party delegations who visited China and Poland, and of delegations who attended the congresses of some fraternal parties, the Plenary Meeting of the National Board of the Communist Party of Norway has discussed the present situation in the world Communist movement.

The National Board herewith declares:

Differences of an ideological and fundamental nature over some important issues have arisen lately in the world Communist movement.

The point of view of the Communist Party of Norway on these issues has been set out in fundamental, programmatic Party statements. We refer in particular to the Working Program adopted at the last Party Congress and to the draft Party Program, which sum up the point of view of the Party on vital international and national problems.

Our scientific theory of Marxism has been further advanced in a number of important fields. This is reflected in international resolutions and the resolutions of individual Communst parties, notably the new Program adopted by the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party of Norway was a co-signatory of the following international instruments: the Moscow Declaration of 1957, the Rome Statement of the West European Communist Parties of 1959 and the 1960 Moscow Statement of all the Communist Parties. These provide "a theoretical basis of principle for all the Communist parties in their joint struggle for the common goal" (Resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the National Board on the Moscow Statement).

The National Board considers it necessary to elucidate its points of view on some of the main issues:

The Communist Party of Norway regards the struggle for peace as the most important task of our time. In this nuclear rocket age a new world war would be a disaster, the consequences of which are hard to foretell. However, a new world war can now be prevented; war is no longer inevitable.

The CPN holds that peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is possible and necessary for the survival of mankind. The CPN considers that the steps taken by the Soviet Union at the peak of the Cuban crisis saved the world from a thermonuclear war and, at once, protected the independence of the people of Cuba.

The CPN regards relaxation of international tension and universal disarmament as necessary to secure peace. Norway must make its contribution to this by pursuing a neutral foreign policy, a policy of non-participation in blocs, and by supporting all proposals and measures promoting peace.

The CPN considers the new neutralist countries to be an important factor in the struggle for peace and an easing of tension, and against imperialism.

The CPN strives for peaceful transition to socialism. The possibilities for this are implict in the changed international situation, the present situation in Norway and in the historical traditions of the Norwegian people and the Norwegian workingclass movement.

The CPN considers the struggle to safeguard the country's sovereignty, restrict the power of monopoly capital and extend the democratic rights of the people in all social spheres to be the principal objective of Norway's present policy. The solution of these tasks will pave the way for peaceful transition to socialism.

The CPN believes that each Communist Party must frame its policy on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and in accordance with the concrete situation and the conditions prevailing in its country. It is impossible to create a universal course of action suitable for all countries. There are different roads leading to the same socialist goal.

The CPN regards international proletarian solidarity as the decisive basis of the struggle for peace and socialism. The National Board considers it a prime task to help preserve the unity of the world Communist movement. For this reason, the resolution of the Plenary Meeting of the National Board on the 1960 Moscow Statement says: "The National Board of the CPN welcomes with deep satisfaction the standards worked out in the Statement for co-operation and contacts between Communist parties."

The National Board of the CPN considers it natural that different points of view and different evaluations may arise in the different situations and conditions of individual countries. Discussion of these questions is necessary and useful. But it must be consistent with the standards worked out in the 1960 Statement for co-operation and contacts between Communist parties.

In view of the nature which the discussion sometimes assumed of late, the National Board of the CPN declares that all the parties must, in order to preserve and strengthen their comradely and fraternal relations, try to avoid such language and such measures as would unnecessarily aggravate the situation and thereby damage unity and impede resolving the questions by means of comradely negotiation.

The National Board refers to the point in the 1960 Statement which concerns exchange of opinion and experience between parties by means of conferences and joint consultations, and rejection of any steps liable to weaken or undermine the unity of the world Communist movement. Any spread of ideological and tactical differences to relations between states must be avoided.

The Communist Party of Norway is prepared to participate in a new conference of all the fraternal parties in order to determine

and resolve the differences of opinion. But such a conference should not convene before thorough preparatory work has been done for it. The unity of the world Communist movement is a matter that concerns *all* parties, and all parties must share the responsibility for it. The National Board welcomes the initiative of the fraternal Italian Party, which suggested negotiations between two or several parties and recommended one or several commissions composed of representatives from several parties to examine and discuss the fundamental ideological questions in dispute, and to determine and examine objectively other existing differences.

As before, the CPN will take its stand on various ideological questions of current policy on the strength of internal discussions, and will set out its point of view when ever it deems necessary. The CPN will support all efforts to safeguard and develop friendly relations between the Communist parties, and will for its part try to conduct the discussion in a comradely way that will help to strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement.

DIFFERENCES MUST BE DISCUSSED IN A COMRADELY WAY.

The NB, PN dissociates itself from the harmful trend of the discussion in the world Communist movement

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF NORWAY ON THE DISCUSSION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ADOPTED AT A PLENARY MEETING ON OCTOBER 5-6, 1963

The point of view of the Communist Party of Norway on the questions now being discussed in the world Communist movement is set out in the Statement of the National Board adopted at a plenary meeting in January of this year, in the Party Program passed by the all-Norway Conference in April and in the Statement of the Party Secretariat on the conclusion of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty. The Communist Party of Norway has not changed its point of view, and does not agree to the proposals of revising the general line worked out at the conferences of Communist parties in 1957 and 1960.

The National Board greatly deplores the harmful trend the discussion has taken in the last few months, particularly because the discussion has also affected the inter-state relations of the socialist countries.

The Communist Party of Norway will not subscribe to the view that a split of the Communist movement is inevitable. All Communists and all Communist parties have a common basis. The factors that bring us together are far more important and significant than those

which may divide us in the appraisal of specific questions, be they even extremely important questions of current policy. Enemies of the working class and enemies of the peoples will be the only ones to gain from a split.

The Communist Party of Norway believes that it is possible to determine and discuss the differences of opinion in the world Communist movement in a friendly way and to resolve them in accordance with the standards of co-operation and contacts worked out in the 1960 Statement. The CPN will not take part in any discussion that may lead to a further aggravation and deterioration of the situation and will instead strive to restore the comradely standards of relations and discussions between all fraternal Communist parties.

The National Board therefore submits to all the Communist parties the proposal to end further open polemics and, at the very least, to take due measures for the discussion to proceed in a comradely atmosphere and in a politically justified manner. The National Board repeats the proposal it made in January to form one or several commissions composed of representatives of a number of parties in order to discuss the questions in dispute. Unity of the world Communist movement is not the concern of only the biggest parties, the CPSU and CPC. It concerns all the Communist parties, big and small, and all parties bear the responsibility for it.

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

STATEMENT OF THE ALL-NORWAY CONFERENCE OF THE CPN ADOPTED ON APRIL 12, 1964

The all-Norway Conference of the CPN has discussed the situation in the world Communist movement and approves the decisions taken on this score by the National Board of the Party in January and October 1963.

The open polemics have grown more acute of late and it is now even more imperative than before to act in line with these decisions.

The all-Norway conference believes that one or several Commissions should be formed of representatives of many parties in order to clarify the existing differences and find ways and means of overcoming them.

All open polemics and all activities liable to deepen the existing differences must be ceased while this work is being done.

The all-Norway Conference holds that an international conference will be useful, provided it restores the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, taking into account the independence and equality of every single party.

The proposed commission or commissions must be given an opportunity to work in a tranquil environment, until they find a positive

solution. The commissions should begin their work at the earliest date.

An international conference must yield good results and invigorate the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism.

ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND POLITICAL TASKS BEFORE NEXT CONGRESS IN 1965

STATEMENT OF THE ALL-NORWAY CONFERENCE OF THE CPN ADOPTED ON APRIL 11-12, 1964

The Program of the CPN passed at last year's conference stresses that struggle for the preservation and maintenance of peace is the most important task of our time. On the strength of an analysis of the present situation in Norway and the class structure of Norwegian society, the Program defines the purposes pursued in the struggle for daily objectives, for Norway's independence, for a renovation and extension of democracy and for restricting the power of monopoly capital, so as to pave the way for a peaceful transition to socialism. United action by the working class and rallying the people to back this policy is specified in the Program as the main task.

The contemporary world situation and that in Norway has created added opportunities for accomplishing these tasks. The Moscow nuclear test-ban treaty has been an important step towards a further easing of tension.

The developments in Norway show clearly that the time of class struggle is not over. The reluctance of employers to make concessions when signing collective agreements last year and this year proves this point. It is also proved by the reactionary offensive last year for the formation of a bourgeois government. In the circumstances, it was the correct class attitude of the Party that tended to improve the situation in the Norwegian working-class movement. At present, it is the task of the Party to intensify and extend the struggle for unity in order to form a common class front. This is necessary in order to repel the forces of capital and to secure a progressive policy.

There are deep-going differences between the CPN and the two other working-class parties on many programmatic and ideological problems. Therefore, the question of an "organizational merger" is unrealistic. What the present situation calls for—in spite of the differences—is to secure united action in areas where unity exists.

The principal political tasks, the Conference believes, are the following: 1. promote a broad popular movement for an atom-free zone in the North, to be sealed by treaty and guaranteed by the nuclear powers, and a Norwegian movement against NATO mixed-manned nuclear force. In that way, and by considerably reducing its own military expenditures, Norway could further a general easing

of international tension and the realization of disarmament; 2. work for the introduction of a satisfactory public pension, block the road to rising prices, work for an increase in real wages, for a 40-hour working week, for four-week annual leaves, protection of days off, greater public housing programs, rejection of the Handal Committee proposal of raising house rents, and secure employment, among other things, by founding industrial enterprises in different parts of the country; 3. push through democratic reforms securing participation by employees in the management of production, and restrict the power of monopoly capital by means of nationalization and other measures. First and foremost, the big banks and sources of capital should be put under public supervision.

The Conference supports the Statement of the Plenary Meeting of the National Board in October that it is the principal task of all active and effective forces in the working-class movement to act in unison and secure the promises made before the communal election last year in the "counter-statement" of the Norwegian Labour Party group in Parliament, and other urgent demands.

The Conference emphasizes the necessity of applying all efforts to achieve good results for the CPN at the communal election in the autumn of this year.

Preparations for the 1965 Storting election should also begin now. The Communists, who are the most consistent fighters for peace, progress and socialism, must again be represented in the Storting. The Communist Party of Norway believes that a united labor front should be created in the coming parliamentary election, in order to inflict a telling defeat on the forces of capital.

A strong and effective policy of unity presupposes a strong Communist Party, efficient in all its sectors and active at all times. It depends mostly on the activity and attitude of the Party leadership and the membership whether the present favourable, objective situation will lead to further positive gains for the working class and all working people of our country.

WORLD COMMUNIST CONFERENCE UNLIKELY TO HAVE POSITIVE RESULTS NOW

ENLARGED MEETING OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SWEDEN*

"We do not think that an international conference of the Communist parties could have positive results in the present conditions. This does not mean that we are neutral or indifferent to the disagreements between Communist parties. Our Party Congress has adotped a very definite stand on these cardinal issues," C.-H. Harmansson, CPS Chairman and a deputy to the Riksdag, declared as he summed up his Party's point of view.

* * *

The latest proposal to call an international conference of the Communist parties was made in M. A. Suslov's speech at the Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU, on Feburary 14. Earliest convocation of such a conference has been proposed by other parties.

STANDPOINT OF THE CPS CONGRESS

An enlarged meeting of the Working Committee of the CPS Board discussed these questions on April 20 and came to the unanimous conclusion that in the present conditions an international conference would be unlikely to yield positive results. At the same time, the Working Committee referred to the following passage in the Statement of the Party Congress in January 1964:

"The Congress reaffirms the propositions contained in the Party Program of 1953 and in the programmatic statement of 1961 regarding peaceful coexistence and the possibility of a peaceful road to socialism. The Congress rejects the Chinese Communist Party's criticism of this concept as unfounded."

ABOUT THE DISCUSSION

"I want to make the following comment on the Working Committee's stand," Hermansson said. "We consider it incorrect to describe the differences of opinion as 'a conflict between Moscow and Peking alone'! Some inter-state affairs may have played a certain part in the discussion, but in the main it concerns something else, namely, matters of surpreme importance to all mankind: how to secure peace and social progress in the complicated conditions prevailing in the world today."

*Ny Dag, May 13, 1964.

SOVEREIGN PARTIES

There has not been any international organization of the Communist parties since the Comintern was dissolved in 1943. Every party is completely autonomous and free to state its own policy. This is the only possible approach, considering the different conditions obtaining in the different countries.

This autonomy does not rule out consultation and co-operation between Communist parties. In general, extensive co-operation is necessary among all forces and parties fighting in the different countries for peace, democracy and socialism. Therefore activities aimed at a split are particularly deploragle, because they have already led to the formation of new groups and parties in some countries. What the working-class movement needs is greater unity and not a greater split.

DISCUSSION NECESSARY

The above standpoint does not signify a negative attitude toward discussion. On the contrary, what is needed today is a more active discussion, both on an international plane and within our own Party. But it should be conducted in a way that could yield positive results. The invectives one heard in the course of the international discussion will only harm the socialist cause and discredit it in the eyes of the public. Especially harmful is the fact that the question of contradictions between rich and poor nations and between different races, was raised in this discussion. The socialist working-class movement must adhere to the principle of the equality of all peoples and races. Our solidarity should be less limited to nationality or region of the world than ever before. It should embrace the whole world.

RESOLUTION* OF PARTY MEETING, CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF FINLAND

The Political Bureau of the CPF met on April 8 to discuss the situation that had arisen in the international Communist movement as a result of the Chinese Communist Party's rejection of the proposal of a number of fraternal parties to stop the public polemics and to restore unity. It was decided to publish the resolution adopted at the February 22-23 plenary meeting of the Central Committee.

At its February meeting the CC, CPF, discussed the disruptive activity of the leaders of the Communist Party of China in the international and working-class movement. The report of the Political Bureau as well as speakers who took the floor in the discussion noted that this was not the first occasion the Party had had to consider the Chinese leaders' stand, which differs from the unanimously adopted decisions of the 1957 and 1960 international meetings. Many other Communist parties, under attack by the Chinese leaders, have also discussed the differences, and support the proposal to convene an international meeting in order to resolve these differences. Already at its November meeting, the Political Bureau of the CPF came to the conclusion that such a meeting would sooner or later be necessary, but did not consider it urgent at the time. Precisely at the same time the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union proposed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to discontinue the public polemics and mutual recriminations, and to settle the problems at issue through fraternal negotiation on the basis of the 1960 resolution. The acceptance of this proposal would lay the groundwork for an international meeting, and for resolving the differences and achieving unity in the international Communist movement.

The Communist Party of Finland also refrained from public discussion of the differences and waited for an answer from the CPC to the reconciliation proposal. The Chinese leaders, however, ignored the proposal and intensified their attacks against the Marxist-Leninist parties of the Soviet Union and other countries. The proposal for reconciliation was made in confidence by the CPSU Central Committee, but the Chinese leaders began to discuss it openly—for instance, in *Jenminjihpao* of February 4, and in other articles published in many languages. These articles provided rich material for anti-communist propaganda, inasmuch as they abound in false accusations, both old and new, against the policy of the Communist parties of

*Kommunisti, No. 4, 1964.

other countries. In these articles the Chinese leaders demand that the polemics be continued and seek to provoke a split in the Communist parties and in other international democratic organizations.

In view of this, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Finland can no longer remain silent in the face of the slanderous and disruptive policy of the leaders of the Communist Party of China in the international Communist movement. It is necessary to rally all our forces to ward off the threat of a division in the Communist movement and resolutely defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism. From this standpoint, an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties has become an urgent necessity. The object of this meeting would be to rally the Communist movement to the struggle for socialism and national liberation, taking due account of the changes that have lately taken place in the international situation. The Central Committee is in favor of such a meeting and authorizes the Political Bureau to take the necessary steps to ensure the victory of Marxist-Leninist principles and the integrity and unity of the Communist movement.

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF PARTY LIFE IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA*

Back in 1912 the Prague Conference of the Bolsheviks adopted a resolution, proposed by Lenin, "On the Chinese Revolution", which was full of a warm feeling of respect for the Chinese revolutionaries and a readiness to give them every support. It stated: ". . . . The Conference recognizes the world-wide importance of the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people, which is bringing emancipation to Asia and undermining the rule of the European bourgeoisie. The Conference hails the revolutionary republicans of China, testifies to the profound enthusiasm and complete sympathy with which the proletariat of Russia is following the successes of the revolutionary people of China, and condemns the behavior of the Russian liberals who are supporting tsarism's policy of conquest." (V. I. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 17, pp. 434-435.)

Ever since the victory of the October Revolution, which shook the foundations of capitalism throughout the world and opened the sluices wide for the powerful stream of the revolutionary movement to spread all over the earth, China included, our Communist Party has always supported and continues to support the Communist Party of China, the Chinese revolution, maintains friendship with People's China and treasures this friendship.

Until recently, while the leadership of the Communist Party of China was still able to assess things objectively, this leadership repeatedly expressed, at its congresses and in individual statements, the highest esteem for the CPSU and its Central Committee, and for the line of the 20th Congress of our Party, and stressed the tremendous importance of the Soviet Union and of its support of, and assistance to, China.

We have never taken the liberty of criticizing the internal life of the Communist Party of China, although we had, and still have, some serious objections with regard to certain aspects of the activities of this Communist Party. We refrained from voicing our criticism because we regarded all this as the concern of the Communist Party of China—just as in other cases, such things are the concern of other Communist parties.

However, of late the Chinese Communists have appropriated the right to interfere in our internal affairs, both of the state and of the Party.

The leadership of the Communist Party of China lauds the Stalin cult, opposing our criticism of the personality cult and our measures to combat its consequences. This in itself, of course, is downright interference in the affairs of our Party.

---

*Pravda, April 28 and 29, 1964.

The CPSU Program and Rules are being subjected to unscrupulous and utterly unfounded criticism in the Chinese press.

Were we to do anything of this sort with respect to the Communist Party of China, its leaders would at once attach the great-power label to us. But when they do it themselves, they consider it legitimate and correct.

Lately the leadership of the Communist Party of China has adopted a policy of unbridled anti-Soviet propaganda among its own people and in all other countries where they have the opportunity to conduct such propaganda. While attacking our Party and its Program, the Chinese leaders inordinately extol the internal conditions and practices of their own party, presenting its line of activity as "the most Marxist-Leninist" line, an irreproachable line that might well-nigh serve as a model for others to follow—as if they really had serious grounds for doing this. They varnish up the state of affairs inside their own Party, and cover up their mistakes, of which, to take them at their word, they have none. This is evidence of a lack of the qualities which are above all essential to the leaders of a Leninist-type party.

Lenin said: "Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reasons for it, analyzing the conditions which led to it, and thorouhgly discussing the means of correcting it—that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties, that is the way it should educate and train the *class*, and then the *masses*." *(Works,* 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 31, p. 39.)

It is precisely over the past decade, when the Leninist standards and traditions of party life were restored, that our Party has given an especially striking demonstration of its strength, boldly revealing its mistakes and shortcomings and taking radical measures to remove them. N. S. Khrushchov stressed in the report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 22nd Congress: "In conformity with the demands of its new Program and Rules, the Party will unswervingly observe Leninist standards in Party life and the principle of collective leadership, will make Party bodies and their members more strictly accountable to the Party and the people, will foster activity and initiative on the part of all Communists and their participation in the elaboration and implementation of Party policy, and will develop criticism and self-criticism."

That is what the Chinese leaders particularly dislike today.

In the present situation, it might be useful to expose the violations of Leninist standards of Party life in the Communist Party of China, for these violations are directly connected with the roots of the present anti-Leninist stand of the CPC leadership. It goes without saying that we shall not imitate the Chinese method of resorting to lies, falsification, crude sallies, vituperation, and insults, for that is unworthy of Communists.

ONLY TWO PARTY CONGRESSES IN 35 YEARS

A Marxist-Leninist Party is built on the principles of democratic centralism.

Any violation of these two elements—democracy and centralism—in one or another respect signifies a deviation from the Leninist principles of Party organization and inevitably engenders either bureaucratic or anarchist tendencies in its development.

It is generally known that Lenin, this greatest authority and universally recognized leader of the Party, did not consider it possible to direct the Party without regularly convening its congresses. His understanding of the role of congresses was that the leadership, the Central Committee, should report to the Party, in accordance with the requirements of the Party Rules, so as to collectively elaborate further policy, by taking into account the experience of the masses and the activities of the entire Party, or to introduce necessary amendments to the decisions of preceding Party Congresses, should this be called for by the changed situation.

Within four months after the victory of the October Revolution a congress of our Party was convened to formulate the tasks of strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the Soviet system, as well as the aims of socialist construction. Both in Lenin's lifetime and right up to the beginning of the Patriotic War, Party Congresses were convened regularly. This tradition and major requirement of the Rules was restored in the CPSU after Stalin died.

The Communist Party of China held its Sixth Congress in 1928, its Seventh Congress in 1945 and its Eighth Congress only eleven years later, in 1956. Thus, the Communist Party of China has convened only two congresses over the past 35 years. The CPC held its Eighth Congress six years after complete victory had been won in the whole of China in 1949. This Congress adopted important decisions which basically corresponded to Marxist-Leninist theory, and represented the application of Marxism-Leninism to the conditions existing in China. This has been noted time and again by our Party, which has not changed its appraisal of the 1956 Congress of the Chinese Communist Party.

The Congress adopted the Party Rules. According to these rules, congresses are to be convened once every five years, Congress sessions to meet annually throughout this period; the delegates, elected to the Congress in 1956, retain their powers for five years, The Second Session was to have been held in 1957. It was held in 1958. That was the last session. Six years have already passed, although the Third Session of the Eighth Congress was to have been held in 1960, it has still to be convened.

This method of keeping delegates in office for five years is unusual and is not practised in any Marxist-Leninist Party. It cannot be considered a contribution to inner-Party democracy in the world Communist movement and it is not surprising that no other party has borrowed this "experience" from the Communist Party of China.

Let us examine, for instance, the following aspect of the matter. At the time of the election of delegates to the 1956 Congress, the Communist Party of China had 10.7 million members. Today it has 18 million, almost twice as many; yet the delegates elected in 1956 still represent the entire Party and retain their powers, although the

five-year term stipulated in the Rules has expired long ago. This means that almost half the Party, more than seven million members, have never elected delegates to Congress. What about inner-Party democracy then? What about the rights of Party members?

There is another curious thing. Since the Party Rules have not been changed, it would seem one should abide by them. However, they are being grossly violated.

The five-year term envisaged by the Rules expired in 1961 and a new Party Congress should have been convened and new delegates elected. But over seven years have passed since 1956 and it is not even known when a Party Congress will be held or why it is not being convened.

According to the Rules, the term of office of the Central Committee also expired long ago. However no one, including the Party itself, appears to be aware of this. Can this really be a matter of indifference to everyone in the Party? — even to the old Party members or those seven million who joined the Party after the last Congress and who thus participated neither in the election of its leading bodies nor in the elaboration of Party policy? Can the members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China have allowed their sense of responsibility to their Party to have become blunted to such a degree?

The leadership of the Communist Party of China does not even consider it necessary to give the Party its reasons for not adhering to the Rules and for not convening congresses.

Everything shows that in the Communist Party of China these questions are now decided not by the Rules, but by the directives of Mao Tse-tung, as was the case with us for a certain period after the war, when Stalin was alive.

After the Second World War, the question of convening a Party Congress was raised on more than one occasion in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of our Party. Stalin, however, used every means to put it off. The Party was prepared for a congress and the entire postwar situation called for one, above all in order to discuss the plan for restoring and further developing the economy. However, the plan was adopted without the sanction of a congress, the Party's supreme organ; this was a violation of its traditions and did not help to improve its practical activity.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee twice adopted a decision to convene a congress, even appointing a definite date, but Stalin contrived subsequently to obtain a postponement on the grounds that he was not prepared to present the report of the Central Committee, that because of his age he found it difficult and needed more time to prepare.

As a result, the Party Congress was convened only in 1952 instead of in 1946-48, and the only reason why it was not held at that time was the personality cult and the inordinate role it played in the Party leadership.

It may be assumed that something of the kind is taking place in the Communist Party of China today. There too the first five-year

plan of economic development was not discussed at a Congress, the "three red banners" policy and the transition from agricultural co-operatives to communes were carried out without any decision of a Congress and indeed in contravention of the still valid directives of the 1956 Congress. The new five-year plan should have started in 1963, yet to date there is no indication of a Congress being convened to chart the further development of economy. Moreover, it must be most definitely stated that the new course taken by the Chinese leadership, in recent years with regard to the world Communist movement, to international and domestic policies, and its new ideological platform, which is tantamount to revision of the major theses of Marxism-Leninism—all this sharp turn-about was affected without the Party being consulted, without a Congress being convened and contrary to the decisions taken at preceding congresses of the Communist Party of China. This signifies not only revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice common to the Communist parties, it is first and foremost revision with regard to the CPC itself, its principles and the decisions of its congresses.

Hence an attempt to analyze how and on what points the present ideological theses and practices of the Chinese leaders, who are driving towards a split, depart from the decisions of Chinese Party congresses, and how they contradict these decisions, can in no way be taken as an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Communist Party of China. This has nothing at all in common, either in form or in substance, with the gross interference of the Chinese leadership in the affairs of other parties.

REVISION OF THE POLICY OF CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The radical change in the position of the CPC leadership, its revision of theses jointly agreed upon at international conferences of the Communist and Workers' parties and of resolutions adopted at its own Party congresses can be traced without difficulty by examining its stand on international issues.

Strangely enough, the Chinese Communist Party has no program of its own. This is in itself a serious matter and we shall return to it later. The Party Rules, which the CPC adopted at its Eighth Congress in 1956, are prefaced with a brief "Program Outline". This document says that "the Communist Party of China advocates a foreign policy of preserving world peace and of peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems". Such was the general line of the Chinese Communist Party in international affairs at that time. Moreover it shared the general interpretation of peaceful coexistence. The report of the CPC Central Committee to the Eighth Congress emphasized that the 20th Congress of the CPSU had "put forward proposals for the further expansion of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation and made a signal contribution to the relaxation of world tensions".

It was on the basis of these principles laid down by their Congress

that the Chinese delegates at the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Communist Party meetings signed documents setting forth positions with regard to war and peace, peaceful coexistence and the class struggle on the international scene, unanimously adopted by all Communist parties in the world.

Who is now authorizing the editors of *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* to expound exactly the opposite?

The notorious "Sixth Article" (December 12, 1963) about the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU speaks in insulting terms, as of some crime, of the fact that the CPSU leadership "considers peaceful coexistence the 'general line of the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and all countries of the socialist camp'," claiming that this supposedly "means putting the sign of equality between the fraternal socialist countries and the capitalist countries" that it means "renouncing the socialist camp", that this line supposedly "accords with imperialism's wants and plays into the hands of the imperialist policy of aggression and war", that this line "implies the substitution globally of class co-operation for the class struggle", etc. etc.

Apropos the U.S.S.R.'s international agreement and the class struggle in the different capitalist countries, there was a time when Mao Tse-tung fully appreciated the interdependence of these two questions. More than that, he saw to it that nobody in China understood it amiss, that is, in the way it is now being presented by *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi*.

Referring in his explanatory notes to "About the Evaluation of the Present International Situation", to the possibility of agreements between the imperialist and socialist countries and, in particular, between the U.S.S.R., U.S.A., Britain and France, Mao Tse-tung wrote at that time (April 1946) that "this by no means implies that the peoples in the countries of the capitalist world should also agree to compromises at home. The peoples of all countries will continue to wage the struggle, which will assume different forms depending on the situation".

In the 1957 Declaration the Communist parties conjointly and unanimously stated their view with respect to the forms of the struggle and the forms of transition to socialism in the capitalist countries:

"The forms of transition from capitalism to socialism may vary for different countries. The working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party—seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the entire people, with the national interests of the country. . . In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind."

At its Second Session in May 1958, the Eighth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party adopted a special resolution in which it unanimously approved the Declaration and the Peace Manifesto and stated that these documents had "ushered in a new stage in

the international Communist movement of today and had lent tremendous inspiration to all the working people and to all the forces for peace, democracy and progress throughout the world."

But what document and which Chinese Communist Party Congress has legalized the departure from these positions and in particular, the crass misinterpretation of the forms of the transition to socialism and unrestrained advocacy of armed forms of struggle, regardless of the situation and of the balance of forces, as being supposedly the only possible way and the "universal law of the proletarian revolution" (from the *Hungchi* and *Jenminjihpao* articles, March 31 last) for all countries and nations? And, as the conclusion following from this "law", gross interference in the affairs of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries, the demand that they start the armed struggle, and—whenever this demand is objected to—the practice of labelling the leaders of the Communist parties of these countries as being "cowardly as mice" or "pusillanimous penguins"?

Does that correspond to the spirit, the letter or the meaning of the documents of the Moscow Meetings or of the Eighth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party? There can be only one answer: not in the slightest!

For that matter, that is no longer concealed in China. In its eighth article of March 31 last, *Jenminjihpao* directly demands "a re-examination and rectification" (which really means nothing but revision!) of formulation on major issues set forth in the Declaration and Statement of the International Meetings of the Communist parties.

The attitude of the Chinese leadership to disarmament and the ending of nuclear tests has undergone a similar metamorphosis. In the decisions of its Second Session adopted in 1958, the Eighth CPC Congress clearly and definitely stated:

"The Soviet Union was the first to stop nuclear weapon tests and the government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the government of our own country conjointly decided to withdraw the Chinese people's volunteers from Korea. These facts show the peoples of the world that the countries of the socialist camp are prepared to do their utmost to maintain peace. However, the aggressive bloc under the aegis of U.S. imperialism is still slighting the peaceful aspirations of the peoples of the world and is still refusing to stop nuclear weapon tests, end the cold war, reduce armaments or withdraw its troops from Korea, and is still doing everything to put off a summit conference."

Thus, in 1958 even the unilateral ending of tests by the Soviet Union was regarded as a manifestation of the readiness of "the countries of the socialist camp to do their utmost to maintain peace", while the aggressive circles were criticized for ignoring the peaceful aspirations of the peoples. Now, contrary to what the Congress of the Chinese Communist Party proclaimed, the partial test ban is described as "capituation to American imperialism" and as having the aim of "consolidating the nuclear monopoly of the

three powers". (From the *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* articles.) What has changed? Have nuclear tests started doing humanity less harm? No, it is the view of the Chinese leadership that has changed and is now the exact opposite of that expressed by the Congress. But it is not even thought necessary to inform the Party and its supreme organ, the Congress, of this.

Having thus revised the theses set forth in joint Communist Party Documents and the resolutions of its own congresses on international affairs, the CPC leadership tried to shift the charge of revisionism to where it least belongs, and has been drumming away in issue after issue in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi*, that it is the leadership which is "making propaganda for its revisionist line of so-called 'peaceful coexistence', 'peaceful competition' and 'peaceful transition', and has started preaching the 'reasonability' and 'kind intentions of the imperialists'." (From the article of September 6, 1963.)

The Soviet press has only to mention that some personality in a capitalist country has displayed a reasonable approach, even on a trifling point, for the Chinese press to raise an incredible clamor.

We had particularly strong charges levelled against us for negotiating with Kennedy, whom the Chinese politicians saw as merely the personification of U.S. imperialism and reaction, maintaining that any sober approach on the part of his administration or any act from positions of reason and common-sense in matters of war and peace, was completely out of the question. Therefore, in the eyes of the "orthodox" Marxists of the present Chinese slant, our search for avenues to establish relations of mutual confidence with the U.S. in these matters, is betrayal of the cause of the revolution. However, in the CPC Central Committees' report of 1956, the Chinese leaders themselves singled out American personalities who had begun to realize that a new world war would not be of any advantage at all to U.S. interests. That report said: "Even among U.S. ruling circles we find more or less sober-minded people who are beginning to realize that a policy of war would scarcely be advantageous for America."

One must not forget how carefully differentiated an approach Lenin took to such matters or the great importance that he attached to the evaluation of individual bourgeois politicians and the trends they stood for. In his *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, for example, we read:

"The divergences between the Churchills and the Lloyd Georges—with insignificant national differences these political types exist in all countries—on the one hand, and between the Hendersons and the Lloyd-Georges on the other, are quite minor and unimportant from the standpoint of pure, i.e, abstract communism, i.e., communism that has not yet matured to the stage of practical, mass political action. But from the standpoint of this practical mass action, these differences are very, very important." *(Selected Works*, FLPH, Engl. ed., Moscow 1947, Vol. 2, p. 628.)

The policy documents of the Moscow Meetings of the Communist

parties confirmed the definition, given by the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the main content and main contradiction of our epoch. In its resolution of May 23, 1958, the Second Session of the Eighth All-China Congress of the Communist Party deemed it necessary to especially single out and stress the thesis of the Declaration that at the present time "world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems".

The Statement of the 1960 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist parties clearly said: "The central factors of our day are the international working class and its chief creation, the world socialist system".

On this point again, the Chinese leadership, grossly contravening the joint decisions and the directives of the Congress of the Communist Party of China, have lent themselves now to the unsavoury business of trying to counterpose the national-liberation movement to the world socialist system and the international working-class movement.

The so-called "Fourth Article" published in the newspaper *Jenminjihpao,* and the magazine *Hungchi* (October 22, 1963), is devoted to this. It "proves" that the main contradiction of the present epoch is the one between imperialism and the national-liberation movement, whereas socialism is only a "base", an auxiliary force for this movement. For instance, it is claimed that "the national-liberation revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is presently operating as *the most important force,* that is directly delivering a blow at imperialism. Asia, Africa and Latin America are those areas where the contradictions present in the world are concentrated".

The effort to drive a wedge between socialism and the international working-class movement, on the one hand, and the national-liberation movement, on the other, is futile and doomed to failure. It is, perhaps, precisely on this point, that the Chinese splitters best show their true colours and expose themselves. Unity of the great movements of our time is the earnest of peace and social progress.

In the same fundamental way, in contravention of the Eighth Congress directives, has the CPC leadership changed its attitude to *economic co-operation between the socialist countries,* notably and, especially, in the appraisal of our assistance to People's China.

Making the report of the Central Committee to the Congress, Liu Shao-chi said:

"The Soviet Union lent tremendous assistance to the cause of socialist construction in our country; the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia also rendered great assistance in this respect. The Chinese people will never forget this comradely help of the fraternal countries. This help, as in the past, is help that we need now, and shall need in the future. China's unity and friendship with the great Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which is based on common aims and mutual assistance, are everlasting and

unbreakable. The further strengthening of this unity and friendship is our supreme internationalist duty and the basis of our country's foreign policy".

The Congress resolution underlined that the setting up in China of a new "industrial system is of tremendous importance not only for facilitating the all-round development of the national economy of our country, *but also for strengthening the co-operation between the countries of the socialist camp,* for promoting a general advance in the economy of all the socialist states".

But this Congress resolution, too, is evidently not obligatory for the Chinese leadership, which has begun to counterpose "reliance on one's own forces" to co-operation with the socialist countries.

Addressing a rally in Phyongyang on September 18, 1963, Liu Shao-chi said the exact opposite of what he had stated previously:

"There are some people today who oppose the promotion by the fraternal countries of a policy of relying mainly on one's own forces in construction. They say that since there exists a socialist camp uniting a number of socialist countries, it is necessary to draw on these splendid conditions and, in conformity with the principle of proletarian internationalism, implement in construction the policy of international divison of labor and co-operaton in production instead of stressing the principle of relying on one's own forces".

With incredible malice he went on to make deliberately false statements about those who advocate mutual assistance, co-ordination and co-operation. In his opinion, they "are using this pretty screen merely to follow the example of the capitalist countries, which in their mutual relations do detriment to others to grind their own axe, prevent the economically underdeveloped countries from developing their own independent economies, make these countries dependent on them economically, and put them under their control politically. In their view, the other fraternal countries have only the obligation to sacrifice themselves for their disposal and, meanwhile, have no right to develop an independent national economy".

Has there ever been any question, let alone dispute, about the need for each country to rely primarily on its own forces in the building of socialism? Certainly not. Why, then, have the Chinese leaders invented it and presented it as a point of difference? Because they have embarked on a nationalistic road, because the policy of nationalism now prevails in their country, and the raising of this point accords with the aims of this fallacious policy.

To deny the need for co-ordination between the socialist countries, for a division of labor between them, as the Chinese leaders are doing, in violation of the directives of their own Party Congresses, would mean to doom each socialist country to isolation, to leaving it to overcome alone the difficulties encountered in building up socialism, to insufficient use of the advantages of socialist production, and also of the advantages of large-scale production generally.

One feels the Chinese leaders are themselves aware of the folly and unreasonableness of all this. That is why their comments on this question are so confused and contradictory. They have been led to and placed in this position by the logic of factional struggle against the general line of the world Communist movement, by their vain attempts to find differences even where they do not exist to deepen and inflate these differences, and split the Communist movement.

They are, in effect, opposing close co-operation between the socialist countries because the Soviet Union accounts for the greater proportion of this co-operation, and in their anti-Soviet aberration they are sliding down to negation of the absolutely correct and irrefutable propositions adopted by the Congresses of their own party and by all the other Communist and Workers' parties.

The root of the trouble lies not in the differences on questions of co-operation within the socialist camp, but in the hostile attitude taken to the Soviet Union. That is the crux of he mattter.

No wonder that when there was none of this hostility and bitterness, the Chinese leadership's view on matters of co-operation was diametrically opposite to its present one. Here, for instance, is an extract from Chou En-lai's report on the Second Five-Year Plan to the Eighth CPC Congress, which he made on September 16, 1956. It speaks for itself, and, therefore, needs no comment.

"The other view—the effort to build alone, in isolation from the outside world—is also erroneous. Needless to say, the assistance of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies will, as before, be necessary for a long period of time to build up an integrated industrial system in our country; simultaneously with this, it is also necessary to develop and expand economic, technical and cultural exchanges with other countries. In addition, even in the future, when our country will be a socialist and industrial power, it will be difficult to imagine ourselves being able to isolate ourselves and dispense with assistance . . . Hence the isolationist attitude to the building of socialism is also incorrect".

REVISION OF CPC INTERNAL POLICY

Over the past few years the so-called line of the "three red banners" has been proclaimed the expression of China's *internal economic policy*. The "banners" policy is made up of the general line plus the big leap and the people's Communes. The fact that the leap (the industrial policy) and the communes (the agricultural policy) are not included in but seem to supplement the "general line" is somewhat strange in itself.

No wonder that no fraternal party, even ruling Communist parties of Asia, adopted the "three red banners" policy, that dubious "contribution" of Chinese theoreticians.

You will look in vain through the decisions of Chinese Party Congresses for anything about the "banners" policy. On the contrary, these decisions formulate the Party's general line quite

differently, and, it should be noted, more precisely, issuing a serious warning against reckless "leaps" and skipping of necessary stages of co-operative farming.

Thus, the report of the CPC Central Committee to the Eighth Congress in 1956 pointed out that the rate of advance "should be stable and reliable, in order not to digress from correct proportions in developing the economy, in order not to place too heavy a burden on the people or to upset the economic patterns, in order not to frustrate the fulfilment of the plan, in order to avoid wastefulness, which would lead to *adventuristic blunders*". This, certainly, hits the mark! It seems as if they themselves foresaw that adventurist blunders would lead precisely to such consequences. Unfortunately, that was what happened.

Another report to the same Congress, entitled "Proposals on the Second Five-Year Plan for Economic Development" gave the following warning against a Leftist deviation in development rates: "Some branches of the national economy and some areas sought to achieve successes faster: they attempted to accomplish in three to five years, or even in one or two years, what could be done in only seven-twelve years. The Central Committee of the Party promptly exposed and liquidated this deviation".

In its decision the Congress called on the Party "to combat the tendency to push blindly ahead without paying attention to the hard facts, the actual opportunities and the planned, proportionate development of the national economy".

On the theoretical plane we have witnessed these Congress directives being revised ever since Liu Shao-chi's report to the Second Session of the Congress in 1958, in which the "leap" was mentioned and the so-called theory of "saddle-type development" advanced. "Saddle-type development", the report explained, "implies peaks at either end and a drop in the middle." Movement of the economy after the pattern "high tide—ebb—a still higher tide, that is, a leap—conservatism—a still bigger leap—which should surely be clear to all", was elevated to the rank of a law of socialist development.

What really "is clear to all" is that a "theory" of this kind does not bear even a remote resemblance to Marxism, which considers planned and proportionate development the law of socialist economy. Cyclical development with ups and downs is a feature of the capitalist economy with its inherent anarchy of production. Lenin wrote in *Iskra*: "Capitalist production cannot develop otherwise than by leaps, taking two steps forward and one step (sometimes even two) back" *(Collected Works,* 4th Russ. ed. Vol, 5, p. 74).

Evident in the same report were the dangersous tendencies of *recognizing* the inevitability of disparities in the economy and a snobbish-Leftist attitude to technology and specialists. It demanded that the entire population take a hand in building up industry, so as to "refute the mystic assumption that this is the monopoly of the few", so as to "necessarily campaign firmly and steadfastly against the undue bias towards the latest technology", and "against

the over-emphasis on specialists". This all resulted in neglect of proportionate development, scrapping of technological processes and disdain for the quality of output.

Inasmuch as the Soviet specialists naturally could not but think in terms of balanced economic endeavor, technical progress, respect for technical standards and sound technological processes, they proved to be in the way of the organization of the "big leap", and the Chinese leaders took steps which could not but result in their recall from China.

However, as far as concrete plans for industrialization and the rates of advance were concerned, the second, 1958 Congress Session still took a realistic view of things, basically in line with the correct decisions which the Eighth Congress of the CPC had adopted at its First Session in 1956. The goals of the Second Five-Year Plan were not modified and, consequently, the 1956 decisions of the Congress still stood. The Leftist adventuristic changes in the rates of advance and the "three red banners" line were introduced after the Congress and over its head.

Whereas at the Second Congress Session in May 1958, mention had been made, for instance, of working to overtake Britain in the production of main industrial items in "15 years or sooner", later in the same year it was already stated that Britain could be overtaken in steel and pig iron output in a year or two. This became the keynote all along the line. In the collection of articles *Long Live Leninism!* published in 1960 an attempt was made "theoretically" to justify disdain for technology: "Marxists-Leninists have always said that in world history the destiny of mankind depends not on technology but on the human being, on the masses".

Why did the Chinese leadership find it necessary to counterpose technology to the human being? Merely somehow to vindicate in the eyes of the Chinese people the setting of unreal, fantastic, unfeasible tasks, to justify its adventuristic policy.

In the First Five-Year Plan period (ending in 1957) China's industrial output was nearly doubled. That was a great achievement. The Five-Year Plan was fulfilled ahead of time, in four years. We rejoiced together with the Chinese people at those successes. The Second Five-Year Plan called for doubling the industrial output. However, success bred conceit and gave rise to a desire to increase the rates of advance twofold, threefold and even more, completely unrealistic though this was. As a result, the goals of the new variant of the Second Five-Year Plan drawn up by the PRC State Planning Committee in July 1958, or in other words, shortly after the Second Session of the Eighth Congress, were arbitrarily boosted from a twofold increase in industry to a 6.5-fold increase over the five years, which meant an average annual rate of increase of 45 per cent. In agriculture a 2.5-fold increase was projected, implying an average yearly rate of advance of 20 per cent. This was the so-called 'big' or 'general' leap.

Five years went by but the Chinese leadership did not even think it necessary to render an account to the Party and the people on

how the Five-Year Plan was being carried out. It lacked the courage to confess the shameful fiasco of the fantastic "leap" which so strongly smacked of the Trotskyite schemes for "super-industrialization" that our Party rejected long ago. The danger of these ultra-revolutionary Leftist schemes lay in the inevitable subversion of the alliance of the workers and peasants, since pushing things too far in industrialization inevitably means placing a heavy burden on the peasants. Naturally, this danger soon manifested itself also in China, during the period of the "leap". It was expressed in the establishment of the communes and in attempts to skip necessary stages of co-operative farming in the countryside, in Mao Tse-tung's formula "to work persistently for three years and reface, in the main, most parts of the country".

Lenin said: "If there was a Communist who dreamed of being able in three years to change the economic foundations, the economic roots of small-scale farming, he was, of course, nothing but an idle dreamer." (*Works*, 4th Russ. Ed. Vol. 32, p. 193). The difference between utopianism and Marxism is self-evident!

In its 1956 decisions the Eighth Congress of the CPC issued a serious warning against overdoing things in the collectivization of farming. It pointed out:

"In the process of developing the agricultural producers' co-operatives care must be taken to prevent heedless amalgamation of small co-operatives into large ones, so as to avoid difficulties in the work of economic management and production organization together with the adverse effects they have on farming."

But again the decisions of the Congress proved to be not obligatory for the CPC leadership. The "drive against the so-called overdoing of things" was castigated in 1958, and in late August the CPC Central Committee adopted a decision "On the Institution of the People's Communes", which read in part: "The transformation of collective property into the property of the whole people is a whole process. In some areas this transformation may be effected rather quickly, that is, in *three or four years;* in other parts this transformation may take place at a relatively slower pace, meaning that *five or six years* or a still greater period will be required."

The Plenum of the CPC Central Committee where this decision was taken put forward the ultra-Leftist slogan: "We must not mark time at the stage of socialism!" But how was it proposed to "skip" socialism? The Plenum decision supplied the following answer: "Apparently the realization of communism in our country is no longer something remote. We must make vigorous use of the form of the People's Commune and evolve through it a concrete way of effecting the transition to communism."

Yet the Chinese leaders now question the possibility of transition to communism in the Soviet Union, a country that has built socialism! Does this not echo, even if the form has been modernized, the Trotskyite contention that it was impossible to build socialism in our country!

Though lacking the material and technological foundation and other prerequisites for effecting the transition to communism, the Chinese

leaders declared that owing to the Chinese peasants' high level of consciousness they would nevertheless be able to go over to communes sooner than the Soviet Union, which they regarded as having got bogged down at the co-operative stage. Moreover, the idea was to organize mammoth amalgamations of some 15,000 or 20,000 households each. But there were no experienced people to do the job, not to speak of the impossibility of giving proper guidance to operations on such a scale. Finally, not only were the communes put in charge of farming, schools and the local industries; they were also militarized, with people turning out for work as they might in army units.

One cannot but see a manifestation of petty-bourgeois ideology in the desire to forge on to communism through the village, through a hasty transformation of forms of ownership in agriculture. This meant ignoring the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the transition period, on the preparation of the necessary material and technological base, and the other essential conditions for the building of socialism and communism. What is this if not an attempt to substitute undisguised petty-bourgeois utopianism for scientific proletarian socialism!

The communes were set up under the slogan of "eliminating the remnants of private property". Garden plots, household livestock, poultry, orchards, trees, and farm implements, and, in many places, also homes and personal belongings (such as sewing machines, bicycles, furniture, pots, and other household utensils) were made the commonly-owned property of mammoth communes. Remuneration of labor in the countryside on the basis of the workday unit and material incentive was replaced by a minimum wage and free meals, according to the "number of mouths to feed", i.e., by a wage-levelling system. Scientific farming was proclaimed conservative and an obstacle to giant strides in agriculture. The decision adopted at that same Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee in August 1958, said:

"The overcoming of Right-wing deviationist and conservative views and the scrapping of customary rules for the application of agrotechnical measures have produced a situation in which agricultural production is being increased twofold, several-fold, more than 10-fold, dozens of times over."

Fantastic projects were put forward to reduce the sown areas and there was talk about China having nowhere to store surplus rice over the next few years. However, several months later district after district in China found itself on the brink of famine. Food rationing was introduced. It had to be announced that harvest figures had been overstated, that actually they were only about half as much. The resulting hardships coincided with crippling natural calamities.

Hard times set in for the next few years, which were proclaimed years of "regulation" in industry and agriculture. The communes were reorganized. The old co-operatives were actually restored in the guise of big teams. The principle of material incentive was also restored to a substantial extent. But the courage frankly to confess that the Chinese leaders had suffered a serious setback in their communes policy was lacking. The slogan of the communes, therefore, remained, though in substance things changed most radically.

However, the situation could not be remedied because of a new swing in economic policy, now from a Leftist to a Rightist deviation. Agriculture was proclaimed the foundation of the economy, and at its Tenth Plenary Meeting in September 1962, the CPC Central Committee advanced the slogan, "Put agricultural development first". Needless to say, this is no "new important law of development of socialist economy" allegedly discovered in China, as the Chinese press claims. It runs counter to Marxism-Leninism and to the decisions of the Eighth CPC Congress of 1956, which state:

"In order to transform our country from a backward agrarian one into a leading socialist industrial power, we should, in the course of three Five-Year Plan periods or of a slightly longer time, create in the main an integrated industrial system, so that industrial production should dominate in social production, . . . so that the technical reconstruction of the national economy should be provided with the necessary material base."

It is hard to say anything definite at this moment about the state of China's economy. No economic statistics, not even the briefest of information on economic progress, have been published over the past few years. All that is known is that 1963, as far as economic indices are concerned, was better than 1962, while 1962 was better than the preceding year. For peacetime development, this kind of statistics cannot be considered normal. Prior to 1958 the situation was entirely different.

These are all "peculiar features" of the development of Party life in the Communist Party of China in the conditions of a flourishing personality cult. Neither the decisions of Congresses nor the decisions of the Central Committee have any independent and decisive significance; they amount merely to comment on the instructions of the leader. The nwespaper *Chung Kuo Ching Niev Pao* frankly declared on March 10, 1964:

"The instructions and documents of the Central Committee of our Party and the supreme organs are the crystallization of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung in present-day practical struggle and work."

A PARTY WITHOUT A PROGRAM

The emergence of the neo-Trotskyite deviation represented by the leadership of the CPC, a deviation characterized by petty-bourgeois anarchism and nationalism, Leftist revision of the resolutions of its own congresses and the decisions of the Moscow Meetings of the Communist parties, and deification of an individual is not a matter of chance.

No small role in this was played by the conceit which seized the CPC leadership following the major successes in socialist construction that preceded the "three banners" period. V. I. Lenin foresaw the danger of success making ruling parties conceited. He noted that the setbacks suffered by political parties had often been preceded by situations conducive to self-adulation. Lenin warned against the grave danger of a party "finding itself in a very dangerous position, namely, the position of a man who has grown conceited—a rather

silly, ignominious and ridiculous position". (*Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 30, p. 493.)

The turn in home and foreign policy, the departure from the standards of party life generally accepted by Marxist-Leninists, can be traced back to the errors, manifestations of dogmatism and partial deviations from Marxism observed in the course of years; all this led to the present set of ideological and political views.

It is no secret that many of the political slogans which are now being put forward on the international scene have been current in China for many years. The atom bomb was declared a paper tiger back in 1946, while the thesis that "the whole world can be remade only with the rifle" is still older.

Up to the liberation of China, the CPC worked among the peasants, which greatly influenced its character as a party. In an article marking the 30th anniversary of the CPC Peng Chen noted:

"The Communist Party of China worked for a long time in enemy-isloated villages, and hence peasant and petty-bourgeois anarchy, subjectivism, sectarianism, bureaucracy, as well as adventurism, defeatism and other trends, at times with extreme ease found expression in the Party." This helps us to understand much of what is going on in the Communist Party of China today.

Prior to liberation, the CPC was made up chiefly of peasants, who comprised about 90 per cent of total Party membership in 1949. The proportion of working-class representation in CPC ranks climbed very slowly even after the founding of the People's Republic of China. On the eve of the Eighth Congress, in late June 1956, CPC membership had the following social composition: workers, 14 per cent; peasants, 69.1 per cent; representatives of the intelligentsia, 11.7 per cent; representatives of other sections of the population, 5.2 per cent.

Party congresses too were held in a peculiar way. For instance, when delegations from the fraternal parties came for the Eighth CPC Congress in 1956, they learned that for a whole fortnight before the official opening group meetings of delegates from the different provinces, of army delegates and of delegates from central offices had been held. This had been in a way a dress rehearsal for the congress, a rehearsal during which the texts of the various reports and resolutions were read, discussions held and speeches made. These meetings had chosen the speeches that were to be delivered at official sessions of the congress. It was even said that preliminary elections to the Central Committee by secret ballot had already been held.

No other Communist Party practised anything of the kind; moreover, such procedures can hardly be considered acceptable in any Party.

Nor did the following strange practice on the part of the CPC Central Committee pass unnoticed. Delegations invited from 50 fraternal parties attended the first session of the Eighth Congress in 1956. They were given the opportunity to state their views at the session and describe the state of affairs in their own parties. All that was good, the normal practice in all parties.

But when the second session of the congress was convened in 1958

no delegations from the fraternal parties were invited. Only two reports were published: by Liu Shao-chi, who delivered the Central Committee's report, and by Tan Chen-lin, who explained the basic points in the plans for agricultural development in 1956-67. The resolutions of the session and communiques on its meetings were also published. However, Teng Hsiao-ping's report on the Moscow Meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties was not published. This suggests that the report contained passages concerning the international Communist movement which the Chinese leaders found advisable to conceal from the members of their own party and the fraternal Communist parties. It may be assumed that the CPC had already begun evolving a special line running counter to the agreed decisions of the Communist parties.

Nor was Mao Tse-tung's speech at that session of the congress published either, though the communique said that he had addressed the session. Was the state of affairs in China such that the speech of the party leader could not be published? Was it not perhaps because the matters discussed were of an extraordinary and secret nature?

As distinct from the 1958 congress session, all reports and speeches of the 1956 session were published. For the benefit of the Soviet reading public the Soviet Party press printed in millions of copies the full texts of all reports and the more important speeches delivered at the congress, as well as slightly abridged versions of the other speeches made there.

But the most serious "peculiarity" of the Communist Party of China, and one due wholly to its leaders, is that, in effect, it has no program.

This is a hard fact. The Communist Party of China has no program, for the Manifesto adopted at its Second Congress in 1922 is not regarded as a Party program even by the CPC itself. Though this Manifesto is of definite historical value, it can in no way serve the party as a guide to action today. No references are therefore made—nor can be made—to a program either in Party decisions or in the Party press.

There is no need to speak in detail in this article of the great importance that Lenin and our Communist Party attached to a Party program.

Lenin linked up the elaboration of a program with the very founding of the Party. In 1919, less than 18 months after the victory of the October Revolution, the Party adopted at its congress a program that oriented the Party and the people on the building of a socialist society, for by this time the previous program, whose aim had been the victory of the proletarian revolution, had been carried out. At its 22nd Congress, proceeding from the fact that socialism had been built in the U.S.S.R., the CPSU adopted a new program setting the historic goal of effecting the transition from socialism to communism.

In direct contrast to this concern for a Party program is the approach that many bourgeois party ideologists take to the subject. Thus, in his book *Constitutional Government and Democracy*, the American lawyer Friedrich says that "the Party is strong in its

apparatus and, consequently, the apparatus is primary and the program secondary".

Can it really be that the Chinese leadership also regards a program as being "secondary"? Can it really be that in the 15th year of their victorious revolution the Chinese comrades cannot work out a Party program? The PRC press often declares that the Chinese cannot go by the decisions of other parties—though nobody has ever urged the Chinese Communist Party to do that. But we may well ask: Where is your own program? Is such a Party good and "correct" —as you yourselves are fond of saying? And by what is one to verify the correctness of its home and foreign policy?

Incidentally, as regards the attitude to the Party program, too, a certain parallel may be drawn between the personality cult in the U.S.S.R. in Stalin's lifetime and the personality cult that is now current in China. Back in 1939, our Party decided at its 18th Congress that it was necessary to draw up a new program, as the old one had been carried out. It elected a commission to draft such a program. However, like the commission elected subsequently at the 19th Party Congress, this commission did not meet once. Only after the 20th Congress did it become possible to draft and adopt the new CPSU Program.

Can it really be that China's Communists are not asking why, in contrast to the Communist parties in other countries, their Communist Party, 18,000,000 strong, has no program of its own? Is it not an axiom of Marxism-Leninism that to steer a correct course, never losing sight of the goals and prospects and never veering from one side to the other, a Party must have a comprehensive militant long-range program for each stage of history? But the Chinese Communist Party has no program.

Does this not lead to the conclusion that the lack of a program provides a favorable setting for the personality cult — for where there is no program there are no restraints on the cult and even the fundamental, program positions of a party can be changed without particular difficulty, without giving the matter a second thought, just as the leader wants them changed.

The absence of a program, failure to convene Party congresses regularly, the "obsolescence" of congress decisions and the consequent impression that they are no longer obligatory, all have little in common with Marxism-Leninism. On the contrary, these things are characteristic of a Party leadership which has made the personality cult all-supreme and taken the road of revisionism. For it is precisely in these conditions that directives formulated under the impact of one or another impression can be substituted for a program, for the collective will of a party and for the principles common to the entire Communist movement.

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT.

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF PORTUGAL

1. Reaffirming its position set out in the resolution "On the Situation in the International Communist Movement," adopted by the CC in August 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Portugal notes that the situation has continued to deteriorate since then, owing to the intensified anti-Leninist activities of the Chinese Communist Party.

2. The CC, CPP highly appreciates the spirit of unity implicit in the unilateral discontinuation by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of public polemics and in the termination by it, from November 1963 till April 1964, of any public criticism of the CPC, giving the latter a chance to adopt the same stand. Instead of appreciating this move and following suit, the CPC took advantage of it to launch a campaign of slanderous attacks on the CPSU and other fraternal parties and to step up splitting work in many fraternal parties and in the international Communist movement as a whole.

3. In its resolution of August 1963, the CC, CPP supported the earliest convocation of a conference of Communist and Workers' parties, which would at once have the limited purpose of establishing a general agreement to stop the public polemics and prohibit interference by one Communist Party in the internal affairs of other fraternal parties. The facts have proved the correctness of this position. As time goes by, it is growing increasingly difficult to convene a conference and less possible to avoid a split. The CC, CPP considers that a conference of Communist and Workers' parties must be called without delay.

4. There are no ideological disagreements that could justify efforts to torpedo the unity of such a mighty bulwark of the international working class as the socialist camp, and to split the unity of the Communist movement on a world scale and in every country. The attitude towards the unity of the world Communist movement and the unity of the socialist camp is the touchstone for Marxist-Leninists today. Those defending it serve the interests of the working-class movement and the Communist cause. Those trying to undermine it are doing the greatest service to imperialism. The CPP, for its part, will make every effort to uphold the unity of the world Communist movement so long as there is the slightest possibility of avoiding a split.

5. The CC, CPP considers that the struggle in defense of unity under the banner of Marxism-Leninism is waged by every Communist

Party in two directions: participation in the international discussion and defense of the general line of the Communist movement within the Party itself, on the one hand, and struggle within the Party for the unity of thought and action on the basis of the political line adopted by the Party concerned and the principles of democratic centralism, ruling out conciliation with any factionalist and splitting activities, on the other. Acting in conformity with this line, the CPP is fulfilling its internationalist duty and its duty to the working class and all working people of Portugal.

April 1964

TO THE WORKING PEOPLE, INTELLIGENTSIA AND STUDENTS—TO THE PEOPLE OF SPAIN

APPEAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN

The strike of the heroic miners and metalworkers of the Asturias is growing hourly. Tens of thousands have already stopped work, demanding trade union freedom, the right to strike, a minimum wage of 150 pesetas, and satisfaction of other perfectly legitimate demands.

The expansion of the strike started on May Day, when the working people of Biscay, Guipuzcoa and other localities went out into the streets fearlessly with the same demands as those of the Asturian workers. It is taking place at a time when the agricultural workers of Cadiz and part of Seville are waging a strenuous and audacious struggle, while the echo still resounds of the Madrid demonstration against the fascist trade unions, the strike of Riotinto and Puertollano miners, the strike at Altos Hornos in Sagunto and at other enterprises of Levante.

The strike is broadening in conditions when the working people of all Spain — Communists, Socialists, Catholics, Nationalists and anarchists — are making important steps towards unity; when the demand for the right to strike, for genuine democratic workers' trade unions without employers and henchmen of the political regime is spreading throughout the country; when the fight for new labor agreements has gripped the whole of the shipbuilding industry, and when the RENFE (national railways) and public transport workers are demanding a substantial improvement of their living conditions.

At the same time, the severe, unbearable policy of the government, prompted exclusively by the interests of the monopolistic and feudal oligarchy, the oligarchy of bankers and big landowners, is rousing discontent verging on indignation, in the rural localities, among small and middle industrialists and tradesmen, among the working people.

The entire country feels the pressing need for political changes, which enable the various toiling classes and sections of the population to act freely in defense of their legitimate interests. The entire country feels the need for ending the archaic fascist political structure symbolized by the present dictatorship which bars the way to modern development in our country.

In these circumstances, there *can and must be* solidarity with the heroic miners and metalworkers of the Asturias. The Communist Party calls on the working people of Spain to rally and carry out short stoppages, strikes and demonstrations for the right to strike,

for trade union freedom, a minimum wage of 150 pesetas, and presenting concrete economic demands for the given area.

There is no time to waste! The Asturian working people must be given to feel that they have not only the moral but also the militant support of the working people of the entire country.

At every enterprise, in every community, in every branch of industry, workers' committees must be set up without delay in order to provide leadership and direct the actions. Where no organizations exist, they must be established in the nearest future. This task must be tackled everywhere by the most class-conscious workers, especially the Communists.

The entire nation must give utmost support to the working people wherever a struggle breaks out.

We call on the tradesmen to sell on credit to the strikers and on the small and middle industrialists to support the demonstrations and strikes of their workers.

We call on the intelligentsia and the students to support the workers forthwith with all the means at their disposal!

We appeal to the armed forces and the police: the workers, students and the intelligentsia, the people, are not fighting against you. You are not well off, either. You, too, suffer from the present state of affairs. Do not let the government set you against the people! Disobey punitive orders! The dictatorship will ultimately disappear, but you, like the people, will remain, and it is not in your interests to assume the responsibility for any arbitrary actions in behalf of what are not your interests.

We also appeal to all the political and social anti-Franco forces: the dictatorship lies when it says that this movement is a Communist manoeuvre. It is a movement of all working people, all democrats. No party can take sole credit for it. The time has come to build contacts, to reach agreement and establish organized and regular relations in order to wage the big struggle mounting in Spain hand in hand, and direct it to a democratic settlement of the national problems.

Nobody should evade doing his duty due to prejudice, narrow-mindedness or fear of exposing oneself to danger. It is everybody's duty to unite and co-ordinate the democratic and anti-fascist actions of the masses before it is too late.

Every group, every politician should fulfil their duty with resolution for the sake of the present and future of the country.

Workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and women! To rally and fight together with the Asturians today means to use a favorable situation for the defense of your own rights and aspirations! If we give effective support to the Asturians, the dictatorship will be unable to suppress the rising powerful movement. We shall make a big step towards freedom.

All for one! Form fighting committees everywhere! Formulate and present your demands, including the demand for the right to strike and for trade union freedoms! Having united, hold work stoppages, strikes and mass demonstrations! Follow the example of the Astu-

rias, Bilbao, San Sebastian, Madrid, Puertollano, Cadiz and Riotinto!

Long live the strike! Long live the demonstration! Long live unity! Long live democracy!

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Spain.

May 6, 1964

AKEL CONDEMNS STAND OF CPC LEADERSHIP

STATEMENT* OF THE POLITBUREAU OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE AKEL (PROGRESSIVE PARTY OF CYPRUS WORKING PEOPLE)

Having discussed the CPC leaders' renewed attacks on the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the Politbureau of the CC, AKEL has adopted the following resolution:

1. In conformity with the September 20, 1963 decision of the enlarged plenary meeting of the AKEL Central Committee and Central Control Commission, the Politbureau resolutely condemns the anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist splitting activities of the CPC leaders with respect to all the cardinal issues of today. Their erroneous, sectarian and dogmatic petty-bourgeois and nationalistic stand on the question of war and peace, the role of the socialist world system, the national liberation struggle of the peoples, and the forms of transition to socialism, is greatly harming the unity of the world Communist movement and creating difficulties for some fraternal parties. With their outrageous and slanderous attacks on the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties the CPC leaders are emulating the bitterest enemies of the socialist camp; they are doing serious harm to the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples, and, whether consciously or not, grinding the axe of the imperialists, the enemies of the working class and all peace-loving mankind.

2. Replying to the slanderous allegations of the CPC leaders that the Soviet Union does not help the peoples in their struggle for freedom, the Politbureau declares that the latest events in Cyprus fully refute these wild contentions. The Soviet Union's courageous and unconditional solidarity with, and support of the heroic people of that small island have proved the decisive factor in their effective resistance to the sinister aggressive plans of the imperialists and their agents in Ankara.

3. Denouncing the Chinese leaders' calumniatory anti-Party attacks, incompatible with the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and the principles governing relations between Marxist-Leninist parties, the Politbureau expresses its profound conviction that the world Communist movement is strong enough to overcome the present difficulties caused by the disruptive activities of the CPC leaders. It will emerge even more steeled and solid on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

4. AKEL vigorously supports all efforts aimed at achieving the

---

*Haravghi, April 26, 1964.

great international goal of consolidating the unity of the world revolutionary movement. Therefore, our Party fully subscribes to the proposal of the CC, CPSU to convene a conference of Communist and Workers' parties of all countries in order to eliminate the difficulties and intensify the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples.

April 25, 1964

THE THREE ARCH-ABSURDITIES OF THE CHINESE LEADERS

By Khaled Bagdash

WHITHER THE CHINESE LEADERS?

Regret and pain are the words that best describe what we felt until lately about the strange attitude of the Chinese leaders. Then came their "seventh reply" to the CC, CPSU letter, and an "eighth reply" *(Jenminjihpao,* March 31 and April 4, 1964—Ed.), and all their invective at the Council of Afro-Asian Solidarity in Algiers and the Organization of Democratic Lawyers session in Budapest. After that no patriot or revolutionary in the Arab world, whether Communist, Socialist or progressive, could help feeling a sense of revolt and anger for these men sunk in the quagmire of nationalism, blinded by chauvinism and impelled by a phrenetic hatred of the CPSU and all the other Marxist-Leninist parties.

It is hard to believe that men who call themselves Communists could go to such lengths. What are they after? That is the question people all over the world ask themselves today.

The lessons of history show that a schism in the working-class movement is bound to develop dialectically. Especially if it assumes a "leftist" pose. Take Trotskyism. It began with "left-wing" attacks on Lenin and ended up as an adventurist trend, of which lack of principles and scruples is the chief trait. Trotskyites do not shrink from volunteering their services to imperialist intelligence agencies just so as to injure the Soviet Union and the socialist cause, and to split the Communist movement in various countries.

Every Marxist knows that their blind hatred makes the Trotskyites rave and rant whenever the Soviet people score a new economic victory or accomplish something in any other province. All of us know, moreover, that during the Second World War they wished defeat on the U.S.S.R., and acted accordingly.

That is the logic in the development of any group of dissenters. At first they wish defeat on the movement from which they split away. This wish is followed by direct actions to cause the longed for defeat, and lastly, their actions prompt them to make alliances and co-operate indiscriminately with the deadliest enemies of the movement they oppose, no matter what the consequences.

It strikes the eye that the Chinese leaders avoid any mention of the substance of Trotskyism. In their "seventh reply" they declare that Trotsky took issue with Lenin, but do not say which of Lenin's views and positions he opposed. In their "eighth reply", too, the

---

Al-Ahbar, April 12, 1964. Abridged. The sub-headings are ours.

Chinese leaders evade this question. All they say is that "Trotskyism has different forms, and operates in most cases under the guise of the extreme Left wing". They only add a few general quotations of Stalin, to the effect that Trotskyism is a variety of Menshevism, Kautskyism and Social-Democracy. The Chinese leaders do not quote what Lenin said about Trotsky and make no mention of how, why and which of Lenin's positions were attacked by the Trotskyites, because if they were to disclose the purport of Trotskyism, they would thereby also disclose the purport of their own line.

It will be recalled that Trotsky took cover behind shrill "revolutionary" phrases to accuse Lenin of opportunism, retreating before imperialism, abandoning "true, revolutionary" Marxism and "world proletarian revolution", and concentrating on the consolidation of Socialism in the one country where it had won while neglecting to work for the spread of revolution to other countries, all of which goes against Trotsky's own ill-conceived theory of "permanent revolution".

What the Peking leaders say today against Lenin's successors, with N. S. Khrushchov at their head, is cast in the same mould, both in form and content, as the absurd accusations the Trotskyites made against Lenin.

That is something the Peking leaders try to keep from the public. But it only shows that they do not know the people, or that they treat them with contempt, because these facts are known to every Marxist with an elementary knowledge of the history of the world revolutionary movement.

The evolution of the Chinese leaders' attitude brings back to mind the evolution and inglorious end of Trotsky's dissension.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLEMICS

Earlier on, the differences between the Peking leaders and the world Communist movement were of an ideological complexion and concerned key political problems of principle.

In view of the complicated international situation and the different conditions from country to country, it was considered natural that divergent opinions should arise. It was also natural to expect that these differences would be settled by consultation and discussion. That is why conferences of Communist and Workers' parties were convened in 1957 and 1960. The conferences adopted a declaration and a statement, respectively, signed by all the parties, including the CPC. The two documents set out an agreed general line, which the parties undertook to follow in letter and spirit.

Even when the Chinese resumed the discussion of some of the problems many comrades thought it natural that differences should arise over the interpretation of the agreed text. It seemed to them that these differences were purely ideological and that they could be put out of the way, since all the Communists were of one mind regarding the definition of the present epoch as an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, and since such great goals as lasting peace and anti-imperialist struggle for national liberation and the

victory of socialism united the Communists of all the world, and cemented their ranks.

This is why the Communist parties regarded the polemics started by the Chinese leaders with an open heart and infinite patience. They conducted the comradely discussion with calm restraint, and never let it out of their minds that they had to safeguard and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement.

The Communists of Syria, too, made their modest contribution to these efforts. We refuted the views of the Chinese leaders and responded to their slanders in a restrained, thoughtful and comradely way. Our Central Committee resolution, made public at the end of July 1963 after it was unanimously approved by all the branches of the Party, said:

"It is the supreme duty of every Communist to safeguard the unity and cohesion of the socialist camp with its main force and vanguard, the Soviet Union, and to safeguard the unity and cohesion of the world Communist movement with its true and tested vanguard, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party of the great Lenin. Every Communist worthy of the name must cherish this unity as the apple of his eye. No matter what differences may arise between Communists, they are immeasurably less important than the great cause which unites them. They have one enemy—imperialism—and one goal—peace and national liberation, and democracy and socialism throughout the world."

Many Marxist-Leninists all over the world hoped against hope that the Chinese leaders would realize their folly and come to their senses.

To create a tranquil atmosphere conducive to fraternal exchanges of opinion between members of the Communist family, Comrade Khrushchov suggested stopping the open polemics and opening negotiations between parties. The vast majority of Communist parties supported his proposal. Some prominent comrades offered to mediate in the matter. But all these efforts went to waste. With undue conceit, the Chinese leaders mistook these efforts for a sign of weakness and "fear" of their "incontestable arguments". They mistook them for a sign of "confusion" in face of their articles, which, due to narrow vision and isolation from the masses even in their own country, they believed to be masterpieces and revelations one only needed to read to prostrate oneself before the "genius" of Comrade Mao Tse-tung as pious Chinese do before the likeness of Buddha.

The Chinese leaders persisted in their folly. In the end, they exposed themselves completely, proving by their seventh and eighth replies that they had been insincere when signing the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. They showed their disagreement with what they had signed, and revealed thereby that they had affixed their signature to the documents merely to preserve their ties with the Communist parties and to exploit these ties to continue their disruptive activities in the world Communist movement.

We do not intend in this article to disprove their erroneous views on the key problems, on which there was complete agreement when they signed the documents that they later repudiated. We mean the

problems of peace and peaceful coexistence, disarmament and the possibility for mankind to avoid the horrors of a destructive thermonuclear war, peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism, alliance between the socialist countries and the national-liberation movements, and, particularly, the immense, continuously growing influence which the socialist world exerts on international developments and on the situation in every country. This has created "real opportunities of resolving the cardinal problems of modern times in a new way, in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism", and other problems as well.

Like our brothers, all Arab Communists, we Communists of Syria expressed our opinion on these problems in numerous resolutions, articles and studies. Our opinion coincides in every respect with the opinion of our comrades of the CPSU and all the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world.

However, when replying to criticisms of their views, the Chinese leaders prefer not to base the discussion on the concrete facts. They raise an outcry and fling accusations right and left. This is because the answer they received from our brothers of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the Communist movement in all countries disclosed the weakness of their position and knocked the bottom out of their slanders and claims.

EVOLUTION OF THE POSITION OF THE CPC LEADERS

In this article, we shall deal with three points that are gaining prominence in the evolution of the Chinese leaders' position, namely:

1. their attempts to persuade the public that the Soviet Union has restored capitalism;

2. their attempts to persuade the public that the Soviet Union has become an imperialist state, that it is not fighting imperialism and is bent on dividing spheres of influence with the U.S. imperialists, and

3. their attempts to persuade Communists that a split within each Communist Party in particular, and the world Communist movement in general, is objectively conditioned and natural.

These three facets of the Chinese leaders' position are closely interlinked. They show that the Chinese leaders have overstepped the bounds of purely ideological struggle. Every Communist and revolutionary sincerely fighting for peace, national liberation and socialism, no matter what trend he follows, must therefore be highly vigilant and weigh all the facts properly in order to see the deep abyss into which the Chinese leaders may fall due to their blindness, their folly and hatred, and to see what dangers their position and behavior hold for the world revolutionary movement and particularly the national-liberation movement.

The present deviation of the CPC leaders is incomparably greater in scale and influence than the Trotskyite deviations of the past. The Trotskyite group consisted of a fairly small number of people whom the Communist movement was quickly able to remove and isolate. The Peking leaders, on the other hand, hold power in a vast country and have a state machine at their disposal at home and abroad,

which they can use in the interests or against the interests of peace, and in the interests or against the interests of the liberation movement. They have the resources to bribe venal writers, to bribe the press, and to buy the conscience of people.

THE FIRST LIE

The 1960 Statement of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties says that the restoration of capitalism has been made socially and economically impossible not only in the Soviet Union, but in the other socialist countries as well, and that the combined forces of the socialist camp reliably safeguard every socialist country against encroachments by imperialist reaction. The CPC leaders affixed their signature to this Statement in December 1960.

It is a clear and lucid statement, and does not need to be specially explained or elucidated. What it means is that restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. from either within or without, is out of the question.

The Statement also says that "the Soviet Union is successfully carrying on the full-scale construction of a communist society". This means that the Soviet people have completed the building of socialism, whose motto is, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work", and have embarked on gradual transition to communism, whose motto is, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs".

So we ask, have any far-reaching changes occurred in the Soviet economic system in the three-odd years since the Statement was published to give the Chinese leaders grounds to allude (in the seventh reply and other documents) to a "rapid growth of bourgeois elements inside the Soviet Union" and to "capitalist forces spreading widely in the U.S.S.R."?

Has the Soviet Union abolished its collective farms and turned the land over to big landowners and kulaks? Of course not. The Peking leaders know that perfectly well.

Has public ownership of the means of production been abolished, and have the factories become the private property of capitalists, monopolies and stock companies? Of course not. The Peking leaders know that perfectly well, too.

So why infer "restoration of capitalism" in the Soviet Union?

Do they think that the higher living standard of the Soviet population, the fact that they eat and dress better and that their cultural level has risen (all due to steady growth of production at a rate unknown in history before) means restoration of the capitalist system in the U.S.S.R.?

If they do, let them tell us, as Comrade Khrushchov said, what object the workers and peasants pursue in making a socialist revolution? Is it not to achieve a better life in all respects?

Could the Chinese leaders, due to their irrational domestic and foreign policies, have lost faith in ever achieving a higher standard of living for the masses of China? Could they be trying to convince the Chinese masses that any sign of welfare is "bourgeois", and that

"true", "revolutionary" communism is poverty, hardship and need?

Marx, Engels and, later, Lenin, demonstrated that socialism is a higher and more progressive social system than capitalism because, inevitably, it elevates production and thereby adds to the wealth of the people, because the purpose of production under socialism is to satisfy the growing requirements of the people and not, as in bourgeois society, to increase capitalist profits.

How and why could the Peking leaders forget, or pretend to forget, this ABC of Marxism? They reproach the CPSU for raising the material and cultural level of the people, although this should gladden every genuine Communist and Socialist (as pointed out in the resolution of our CC of July 1963) because it adds to the attraction of socialist ideas all over the world, and particularly the Asian, African and Latin American countries, whose situation resembles that of some parts of former tsarist Russia. They are eager to achieve progress as quickly as the latter achieved it under socialism.

What is the purpose the Chinese leaders pursue by spreading the monstrous and ridiculous lie that capitalism has been restored in the Soviet Union? This is an important question, and every Communist, every progressive and every revolutionary patriot, should give it deep thought.

THE SECOND LIE

The charge that the Soviet Union has turned imperialist and is colluding with the American imperialists to divide the world is the second lie spread by the Peking leaders.

All patriots in the Asian, African and Latin American countries hail and thank the Soviet Union for the firm support it rendered them by word and deed, morally and materially, in their struggle for liberation from imperialism, for national and economic independence, and progress. Not only the Communists, but also all patriots and even the bourgeois nationalists in those countries, say so openly and clearly.

All of them say that they consider the Soviet Union a bulwark, a helper and a champion in their struggle against imperialism, for political and economic independence.

What is the purpose the Chinese leaders pursue by repeating this second lie over and over to so large an audience? That is also an iimportant question, and every Communist, every genuine progressive, and every revolutionary patriot, should give it deep thought.

THE THIRD LIE

Lately, the Chinese leaders have begun to spread a third lie. They are trying to persuade the Communists that a split of the Communist movement, both on an international scale and in every country, is an objective law of dialectical development.

All they have succeeded in doing by this "new proposition", however, was to disclose how far removed they are from understanding dialectical materialism and how little they know about applying its

laws. What is right for a society divided into classes—where the struggle between classes, as Marx, Engels and Lenin proved, is the motive force of history—and what is right for some specific class, such as the capitalist class, which consists of groups with conflicting immediate interests though generally connected by common class purposes and tasks, is applied by the Peking leaders not only to the working class, but also to the Communist movement, which is its vanguard and which represents its vital interests, the same for all, harmonious and free from contradiction: the building of socialist and then of communist society.

With this strong basis, Leninists oppose the existence of more than one communist party in any country and, consequently, the existence of more than one Communist movement in the world.

The Chinese leaders say that "a process of bifurcation of unity proceeds in the international working-class movement, just as it does in all other things" and that "unity—struggle or even a split—a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics in the development of the international working-class movement". If we take their words at their face value, we arrive at the startling conclusion that struggle between opposites is an organic and immanent feature of the working-class and Communist movement, and that, consequently, this struggle cannot be overcome. In other words, it follows that a split of the working-class and Communist movement, induced by continuous, endless and eternal struggle between opposites within that movement, is a natural condition (because it is governed by the same laws as any other natural phenomenon), while unity is accidental and exceptional.

The unity achieved after the split which the Chinese leaders are urging today, will, according to their own construction, be temporary and, in turn, subject to split, since that is the eternal objective law of dialectics.

If that is so, there is no objective material basis for the great Marxist slogan, "Workers of all lands, unite!"

If that is so, every worker and every workingman has good reason to ask the Chinese leaders: how can you promise us a united and harmonious society if the working class, under whose leadership we are supposed to work for it, and if its Communist vanguard, too, are doomed to splitting, that being a constant and eternal law?

Is that the way the Chinese leaders want to "strengthen" the faith of the masses in proletarian revolution, in its advantages and its future?

May we ask the Peking leaders whether this "objective", "dialectical" law of "continuous split" also applies to the Communist Party of China, or whether this "dialectics" of theirs does not suit the Chinese conditions? Or could they, perhaps, have closed China's doors to all dialectics?

In the same breath, the Chinese leaders say the following: "by destroying proletarian unity, dissension does a service to the bourgeoisie and accords with its needs".

Could there be a more convincing way of expressing the substance of the split which the Chinese leaders are urging, which they are working for, and which they present as an objective law?

There is yet another passage in the aforesaid article that rings strange coming from the Chinese leaders. "Engels said," they write, "that the proletarian movement must go through different stages of development, and that in every stage some people start marking time and stop helping the movement to advance." This sounds strange coming from them, because it describes their own condition. They are quite incapable at present of any advance.

However, what is the purpose the Peking leaders pursue with this third lie about continuous splitting of the Communist movement being inevitable? This is another important question, and every Communist, every progressive and every revolutionary patriot should apply his mind to it.

We Arab Communists of Syria are convinced that the three points we have listed here, more and more distinct in the pattern of the Chinese leaders' thought, these three points which we describe as three gross lies and three arch-absurdities, are nothing but a politico-ideological bridgehead, designed to justify the most disgraceful forms of disruption of the world Communist movement and, perhaps, the foulest forms of alliance with all the enemies of this movement, particularly the enemies of its vanguard, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

People who could spread the monstrous lie about restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. and Soviet collusion with American imperialism, and about a split of the Communist movement being objectively inevitable, must have far-reaching plans, the object of which is, firstly, to smash the alliance between the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, on the one hand, and the national liberation movement, on the other; secondly, to split the national liberation movement in all countries; thirdly, to split the Communist parties in the newly-independent countries and stop all co-operation between them and other national and progressive forces; fourthly, to subvert the world Communist movement, and, fifthly, to establish upon its ruins Chinese leadership of the Asian and African countries.

Those are the ambitions of the Peking leaders. What else could prompt them to utter such monstrous lies?

To justify their attacks on the Soviet Union before the masses in China and in the Asian, African and Latin American countries, the Chinese leaders want to make them believe the Soviet Union has become not only a capitalist, but even an imperialist state. Is this not proof enough that they have run into a blind alley?

WILL THE CPC LEADERS REGAIN THEIR SENSES?

The workers, peasants and intellectuals of China, like their brothers in all the Asian and African countries, are surely unable to find an explanation for the furious campaign of the CPC leaders against the greatest and strongest socialist state, founded by Lenin, which defeated Hitlerism and entered the history of science as the home of the first spacemen, a country that sacrificed 30 million men, women and children to pave the way to victory for the Chinese revolution, a country which then proferred a helping hand to the people of China

and whose aid enabled the Chinese people to score their biggest successes in industry and technology.

The CPC leaders have realized this. They have realized that the masses in their own country, on the three continents and in the rest of the world are baffled by the unbridled campaign against the Soviet Union. That is why they proclaimed out of hand, in Stalin's style, that the Soviet Union has become a capitalist country (sic!). This was the pivot of countless articles published in the press and broadcast over the radio. But the Peking leaders, in their blissful ignorance, ought to be told that you cannot ever change the system of a country that way, and the convictions of people, either.

We know our country very well and can assure the Peking leaders that proclamations of that sort will never evoke our response, or fall on fertile soil, either in Syria or any other Arab country.

The Arab workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals have grown out of their infancy. They have matured, and their opinions are not formed by what they hear, but by actual experience. And experience always shows them that the Soviet Union is a loyal friend of the Arabs in their struggle against imperialism, for national and social liberation. Khrushchov's name is today as popular in any Arab country as that of the most prominent of its national leaders. For the Arabs it is a synonym of the Soviet state and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We Arab Communists are not abashed by the Chinese leaders' calling us and other Communist parties "pawns on the chessboard of Soviet diplomacy". We reject this accusation scornfully. It is not a novelty for us. We have heard it for dozens of years from the imperialists and their agents, and the Right-wing nationalists. I can just imagine what Farahjalla Helou would say if he heard, when being tortured, that the Peking leaders accuse him of the same thing as his executioners, who were breaking his bones.

The friendship of the Arab and Soviet Communists, and Arab-Soviet friendship generally, is like a rock, and anyone who tries to undermine it will break his head against it.

Will the Peking leaders ever come to their senses?

It was after this article was written that the world learned about the decision of the CC, CPSU Plenary Meeting and Comrade Suslov's report on the disruptive activities of the CPC leaders. We are deeply convinced that in reading these documents all the Communists in our country will, as always, find views and conclusions prompted by devoted loyalty to Lenin's glorious party and the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism, and deep concern for the unity of the world Communist movement.

We declare our full support for the position of the CPSU and the other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties regarding the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders.

We also hold, in accordance with the latest decision of our Central Committee, that it is necessary to convene a new international conference of all Communist parties in order to discuss the situation in the world Communist movement, foil the plans of splitting it, and take effective measures to strengthen its unity. It will help to thwart

the disgraceful designs applauded by the warmongers, the imperialists and reactionaries throughout the world, and deeply regretted by all patriots and progressively-minded people who cherish peace, national liberation and socialism.

It is our deep conviction that the course charted in the documents of the 1957 and 1960 conferences will ultimately win, because it accords with the objective development of mankind and leads to a society without wars, without exploitation and oppression, its banner being peace, fraternity of labor and science, and happiness for all people.

HISTORY WILL NOT FORGIVE THEM*

AT CRUCIAL STAGE OF TOILERS' MOVEMENT SPLITTERS AT WORK

The National Council of the Communist Party of India, which concluded its six-day meeting in New Delhi on April 15 adopted the following resolution:

Thirty-two members of the National Council, having walked out of its meeting on April 11, 1964, have issued a press statement amounting to a manifesto and programme of action. The National Council of the Communist Party of India has considered this document of the "Left" minority group and found it to be a catalogue of falsehoods, distortions and anti-Party slanders, meant to justify the splitting tactics and disruptive activities of its authors.

By their walk-out and their subsequent stand as revealed in their statement, these 32 comrades have put themselves outside the pale of the Party. They have forfeited their rights as members of the Communist Party of India.

The seceders have openly declared war upon the National Council, upon the Secretariat and the Chairman of the Party in the name of "struggle against the factional activities" of "S. A. Dange and his group".

In this connection, it is well to remember certain hard facts of the past and present.

Firstly, this is not the first occasion in the Party's history when this same "Left" group has resorted to the anti-Party tactic of blackmail through threatened walk-outs and split. The most glaring example of this was seen at the Vijayawada Party Congress in 1961, where, finding themselves in a minority, these "Left" leaders and their followers threatened to walk out of the Congress unless they were given more representation than they could legitimately claim on the new National Council. They did not hesitate to precipitate a crisis in the presence of delegations from several fraternal Communist parties.

Secondly, the National Council would be failing in its duty if it did not expose the latest disruptive actions of the Left-sectarian group in their proper international context, i.e., not as an isolated event, not as a coincidence, but as an integral part of a worldwide move to divide and split as many Communist parties in the world as possible.

As is well-known, splits by minority groups have been deliberately planned and carried through in recent days, in the Communist Parties of Belgium, Great Britain, Australia, Ceylon, Peru and other countries. Disruption on an international scale and naked interference in the

---

New Age, No. 16, April 19, 1964.

internal affairs of brother parties, have become the self-proclaimed aim of the present leadership of the Communist Party of China.

OPEN ATTACKS ON OUR PARTY

During the last 16 months, the Central Executive Committee and the National Council had also to take cognisance of the open attacks on our Party by the leaderships of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia. Early last year (February 1963), the National Council adopted a resolution denouncing the leadership of the Communist Party of China for attempting to interfere in the internal affairs of our Party through open calls issued by it through articles in the *Hungchi* (Red Flag) and Peking *People's Daily*, as also through the Peking Radio.

The pamphlet called *A Mirror for Revisionists* in which our Party was attacked as the "Dange clique" and as an agency of the imperialists and the Indian big bourgeoisie and landlords, was answered in the pamphlet written by the Chairman of the Party *Neither Revisionism nor Dogmatism is our Guide.*

The leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia stooped to the low level of characterizing the leadership of our Party as "spies" and calling for the disruption of the Communist Party of India by elements which it considered to be "genuine Marxist-Leninists". All this was denounced in a resolution of our Central Executive Committee.

The *Hungchi* and *People's Daily* editorials of February 4, 1964, have issued an undisguised call for splitting our Party.

The activities and behaviour of the dogmatist, sectarian group in our Party have run parallel to the attacks on the Communist Party of India by the leaderships of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of Indonesia.

It is against this background that the National Council has to judge the latest acts of the leaders of the disruptionists in the Party.

The 32 who have walked out to place themselves outside the Party claim that the National Council majority advocates and practises the "general political tactical line of Congress—Communist unity", which mounts to gross reformism and which, according to them, was defeated by their efforts at the Vijayawada Party Congress. This is a blatant distortion of truth.

No general line of Congress-Communist unity was ever advocated at Vijayawada. As is well known, the real struggle at the Sixth Party Congress was for the correct line which was eventually adopted—the line of building the National Democratic Front, of unity with democratic elements inside and outside the Congress, on common issues, against the anti-democratic policies of the Congress.

WHO VIOLATED PARTY DECISIONS?

It is not the National Council which has violated the Party Congress decisions since 1961, as falsely alleged by the disruptors; it is the latter who have stuck doggedly to their Left-sectarian line which

was defeated at Vijayawada—a line of total opposition to the Congress, which leads to unprincipled alliances and understandings with reactionary, communal and separatist forces such as the Muslim League, the DMK, Swatantra Party, Akalis, etc., in the name of fighting the Congress.

According to the seceders, the majority in the National Council against them was the fortuitous result of the "crisis" of October-November 1962. the declaration of Emergency and the arrests of a large number of comrades. *This could not be a greater denial of truth than this.*

The "crisis" referred to so diplomatically by the Left leaders was, of course, the crisis caused by the Chinese aggression. When the National Council met in November 1962 to denounce this aggression and to declare its unequivocal stand for national defense, not a single arrest had been carried out.

The National Council resolution was adopted by overwhelming majority after thorough discussion and debate when these seceders were present and when none of them had been arrested. How then could it be claimed or insinuated that the majority was not a genuine one?

Yet another gross distortion in the statement of the Left seceders refers to the alleged rejection by the National Council of their proposals for "the organization of inner-Party discussion" and for "creation of necessary conditions in which a Party Congress can be convened". This, according to them, has prevented their participation and co-operation in the solving of inner-Party problems.

This presumably refers to the discussions which took place in the National Council meeting of October 1963, on a document by Comrade Basavapunniah and 16 others entitled "The Threatening Disruption and Split of the Party—How to Avert the Disaster?" This document which was circulated in clandestine fashion outside the National Council also, was replied to by Comrade Dange on behalf of the Secretariat which later published both documents.

In the meeting itself, the Council agreed to open discussion on all the controversial questions, to prepare for the Party Congress, and to associate with this work nominees of the minority group.

The National Council agreed to postpone the Party Congress, though it was overdue, until after the comrades in jail were released.

The CEC elected a Commission to prepare documents for the Party Congress in which were included Comrades M. Basavapunniah, EMS Namboodiripad, Jyoti Basu and P. Ramamurty. When the Commission meetings were called, these comrades boycotted them and later on organized their rival conference.

Why were these offers rejected by the "Left"? What more could they want? Today they pose themselves as champions of Party unity who have been forced out of the Party by the "undemocratic" practices of the majority. But the truth of the matter is that they were all along determined to flout the basic principles of Party organization and the authority and discipline of the National Council and to continue their activities as a rival party within the Party.

The only postion which could satisfy them was one in which the elected majority would agree to accept the status of a minority, while they, the actual minority, could dictate terms as though they were the majority. The National Council refused to surrender to such outrageous demands.

The "Left" leaders complain that the National Council and some State Councils have used their majority to carry out vindictive disciplinary actions against them.

LENIENCY OF NATIONAL COUNCIL

The truth is that the National Council and these State Councils can, on the contrary, be charged with sowing excessive leniency to persons who, while sheltering under the cover of their Party membership cards and their reputation as Party leaders, have been systematically wrecking the Party from within, repeatedly violating every single principle of Party organization and discipline, throwing all accepted Party norms and forms to the winds and running full-fledged rival Party centres from Delhi and several states. This has been conclusively established by the Central Control Commission in its latest report submitted to the National Council.

In the face of such conscious, planned and cold-blooded wrecking activity, the only disciplinary action taken so far against any leading member of this group has been the public censure of Comrade A. K. Gopalan in last October! The National Council has erred, if at all, on the side of leniency by any standards. The disruptors have taken full advantage of it to further intensify their anti-Party activities to an unparalleled extent.

Knowing that they cannot justify their ideological, political or organizational stand (in fact, they admit that they have serious ideological differences among themselves which have been subordinate to a common factional interest), the "Left" leaders have produced the diversionary provocation of the alleged "Dange letters" and are counting on cheap sensationalism to serve as a smokescreen for their nefarious anti-Party game.

The National Council has heard the available evidence and held that not even a prima facie case has been made out for the genuineness of the letters. It has repudiated the slanderous accusation that Comrade Dange was or is a British agent. Even then, in order to carry out a more thorough probe, it has appointed an inquiry committee of seven National Council members.

But why did not these "Left" leaders who proclaim from the housetops that they are convinced of the genuineness of the letters produce their evidence, if any, before the National Council? Why did they walk out? Why did they not return even after Comrade Dange declined to take the chair during discussion of this subject? And why do they now repeat the demand for an "agreed inquiry committee" when their representatives have already denounced to the world that the genuineness of the letters is beyond doubt?

They did not have the decency even to raise the issue in the CEC or the National Council before rushing to the press. None but the

worst enemies of the Party could ever indulge in such shocking activity and that, too, in collusion with the pro-American weekly *Current.*

OPEN REVOLT

The "Left" leaders have now publicly announced their future course of action. It amounts, in short, to organizing an open revolt by Party members and units against the National Council and against the accepted political line of the Party, and to preparing for the organization of their own all-India Congress which they have the temerity to call the "Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of India". They have decided to circulate their own documents and to convene a meeting of "representatives of Party members from all over India" after two months.

These and other decisions have been adopted in the seceders' conference which has been in session, as they admit in their own statement, from April 2 to 9 in Delhi.

Draft "Programs" and other documents have been issued to and discussed by Party members specially invited to this conference from various states and districts. The press has been briefed every day.

Clearly a rival Party — all but the formal signboard — has been openly set up. And yet its organizers put forward so-called "proposals" for the National Council to accept as the price of their co-operation, even at this last moment. This is nothing but a last desperate attempt to dictate terms to the majority.

The National Council wishes to make it clear that it is always ready and anxious to explore all avenues for restoration of Party unity at any stage. But how can unity be restored as long as the seceders do not agree unconditionally to scrap their rival and parallel party centres and to accept unhesitatingly the authority of the National Council?

It has to be emphasized that these desperate anti-Party activities have been resorted to in the background of the rising wave of mass struggles in India on economic and democratic issues, a wave in which the Party has been playing a glorious and most prominent role.

For the first time in the history of our Party, an all-India mass movement has been unleashed against the monopolists and the anti-people forces of the Congress government. This movement which began with the Great Petition campaign and the Great September March last year, is entering the next stage of preparations for an all-India General Strike.

It is precisely at this moment that the seceders have come out with their open split.

The disruption unleashed by this group inside the Party has, therefore, to be strongly condemned for the immense damage it has done, not only to the Party but also to the entire working class and popular democratic movement in the country. It has brought grist to the mill of the reactionaries and the vested interests — internal as well as foreign. Such a crime cannot be forgiven.

STILL NOT TOO LATE

The Communist Party of India is facing the gravest crisis in its history—a crisis which is the reflection of the international conspiracy of disruption and direct creation of a group of hardened dogmatistic, Left-sectarian and adventurist leaders within our Party.

History will never forgive them for their crime of splitting the Party which tens of thousands of heroic revolutionaries and selfless workers have built up at the cost of their lives and untold sacrifices, a Party which is the hope of the toiling millions of India.

The National Council calls upon all Party members and Party units to rally round the banner of the Party, defend its unity and honour and exercise maximum vigilance against the forces of disruption and disunity.

The National Council is fully alive to the danger that the attack of the splitters on the Party is likely to be accompanied by similar attacks on the unity of the trade unions and other democratic mass organizations. This attack, too, must be resisted tooth and nail, for, if the disruptors succeed in their game of setting up rival unions, rival kisan sabhas, etc. it will be a grave blow to the unity of the toilers in their struggles against class oppression and exploitation and for better conditions of life and democratic rights.

Such disruption will only bring grist to the mill of the monopolists and reactionaries in every walk of life, enabling them to divide and suppress the struggles of the working people, deprive them of all their gains and crush their fighting mass organizations.

The National Council declares that the Communist Party of India, the revolutionary Party of the Indian working class and of all the toilers in town and countryside, will remain united to fight the battles of the toiling and democratic masses of India. The Party has been built by the sweat and blood of millions of our countrymen. Their sacrifices and devotion cannot go in vain. The banner of the Party will be victorious.

ON THE SPLITTING ACTIVITIES OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY LEADERS IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST AND WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ARGENTINA

Having examined Comrade Suslov's report to the February (1964) Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPSU and the decision adopted by this Plenary Meeting, and having discussed the situation that has arisen in the world Communist movement as a result of the incessant hostile attacks of the leaders of the Communist Party of China on its general line and unity, the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina rejects these attacks in both form and substance and supports the Marxist-Leninist stand of the CPSU, the stand of consistent unity.

1. Ever since the CPC leaders launched their attacks on the basic propositions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, seeking to supplant them with their own anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theses, our Party has adhered to a clear-cut, unambiguous position.

In face of the dogmatic and disruptive activities of the CPC leaders, our Party has always supported the policy of the CC, CPSU headed by Comrade Khrushchov, who, while vigorously defending creative Marxism-Leninism, displayed reserve and patience, striving to avoid a split in the world Communist movement. The 12th Congress of our Party, held in February 1963, denounced the political views and splitting activities of the CPC leaders and supported Comrade Krushchov's proposal, made at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, to discontinue all open polemics in order to create a more favourable atmosphere for discussion, in keeping with the standards established by the 1960 Statement. Our Party has abided by the decision of its congress.

2. As subsequent events have shown, the CPC leaders never intended to discuss their objections fraternally, so as to remove them. On the contrary, they are doing everything to exacerbate them. That was why they replied to the repeated CPSU proposals to hold a conference and iron out the differences, with dilatory tactics in order to gain time and try to set up factions in the Communist parties, and to establish parallel organizations in every country with the object of splitting the world Communist movement.

This is borne out by the June 14, 1963, letter of the CPC Central

---

Nuestra Palabra, April 21, 1964.

Committee to the CPSU Central Committee, in which the common line worked out at the 1957 and 1960 meetings is openly countered with their own, dogmatic and sectarian line. In these circumstances, the CC of our Party, again condemned the stand of the CPC leaders at a meeting on July 23, 1963, and voiced full support of the CPSU reply contained in the "Open Letter of the CPSU Central Committee to All Party Organizations and All Communists of the Soviet Union."

In view of the fact that the CPC leaders did not discontinue their open polemics, conducted in a language impermissible in relations between fraternal parties, and in view of their splitting activities in these parties and in mass international movements, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina decided to publish Comrade Codovilla's report "The Marxist-Leninist Position with Regard to the Trotskyite Dogmatists from the Communist Party of China", which he delivered in September 1963 and in which he analyzed in detail and denounced the Chinese leaders' anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist position.

3. Of late the CPC leadership has gone over from ideological discussion to slanderous attacks on the policy of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, and to undisguised splitting activities, in order to organize the basis for a parallel movement devoid of Marxist-Leninist principles.

Although the harm they do to the international Communist movement is obvious, there is every indication that they will fail to attain their disruptive ends. The most they have achieved is to win over some vacillating elements, especially those with a petty-bourgois background, bringing them together with a few counter-revolutionaries expelled from Communist parties for anti-Party activities and with representatives of the bourgeois-nationalist intelligentsia and Trotskyites.

Athough the Chinese splitters have so far failed to do damage to our Party and won support only among some elements expelled by us for anti-Party activities, we must be vigilant because they are stepping up their disruptive work, and so prevent them from harming us. At the same time, our Party considers that in the international arena the struggle against this dangerous dogmatic and nationalist deviation of the Trotsky type must be continued. Nothing but open struggle against it from the positions of creative Marxism-Leninism staunchly upheld by the CPSU and the other parties of the Communist movement, will enable us to rout the splitters and consolidate our unity so as to go forward to new and bigger victories on the international scale and in every country, dashing the imperialists' hopes of weakening our parties.

4. Ideological struggle against dogmatism, as well as against revisionism, which both stem from the influence of bourgeois nationalism on the proletariat, is one of the forms of class struggle. The issue is which of the two lines to choose: the proletarian line collectively worked out at the 1957 and 1960 meetings and based on creative Marxism-Leninism, or the adventurist line of those who,

like the CPC leaders, are trying to implant in the Communist parties an ideology alien to Marxism-Leninism.

That is why it is now more necessary than ever to defend Marxism-Leninism in the name of the unity and consolidation of the world Communist and working-class movement.

5. Although, as repeatedly stated by the CPSU and other fraternal parties, our Party included, the CPC leaders have gone far in their anti-Leninist and splitting activities, we reaffirm our readiness to support any proposal designed to bring the discussion back to the standards established at the 1960 Meeting, and conforming with the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism, provided it is honestly accepted by the Chinese leaders.

We Communists of Argentina, like the Communists of all countries, hope that the CPC leaders will realize what colossal harm they are doing to their people and to all the peoples with their disruptive policy aimed at weakening the socialist camp and the international Communist and working-class movement at a time when their unity is necessary more than ever for the struggle against the imperialist camp headed by the United States. Enraged by the consolidation and development of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, by the growing successes of the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and by the advances of the democratic and progressive forces in all countries, the world peace movement especially, which are undermining their positions, the most reactionary and warlike imperialists are intensifying their aggressive actions, such as the hostilities in South Vietnam. They advance the Johnson-Mann "new doctrine", a doctrine of undisguised and outright support of reactionary and fascist coups, such as the recent coup in Brazil.

6. In view of the above, our Party considers that a conference of Communist and Workers' parties must be convened to examine the present situation in the world Communist and working-class movement and to discuss the common line with due regard for the changes in the international situation, on the basis of the main principles enunciated in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement.

Buenos Aires, April 18, 1964.

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR by G. Deborin $2.00

A new thoroughly documented book, based on Soviet archives.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75

393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75

404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50

735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

13

Included in this issue

SPEECH BY OTTO KUUSINEN

MARXISM-LENINISM: INTERNATIONAL TEACHING FOR COMMUNISTS IN ALL COUNTRIES

ECONOMIC PROGRAM OF COMMUNIST PARTY IN U.S.A.

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 13

contents

SPEECH BY OTTO KUUSINEN 5

MARXISM-LENINISM: INTERNATIONAL TEACHING FOR COMMUNISTS IN ALL COUNTRIES
Series of articles in Pravda 11

PLENARY MEETING, CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRIA 28

INTERVIEW WITH ARMAND NICOLAS, GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY OF MARTINIQUE 38

THE WAY FORWARD FOR CEYLON
Speech by Pieter Keuneman, General Secretary, at the 7th. Congress of the Communist Party of Ceylon, April 16, 1964. 43

END POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE U.S.A.
Economic Program of the Communist Party, U.S.A. 55

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
July 9, 1964

SPEECH BY OTTO KUUSINEN

AT FEBRUARY 1964 PLENARY MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION*

Comrades, since the erroneous anti-Marxist position of the Chinese leadership was already exhaustively dealt with by Comrade M. A. Suslov in his report, allow me to dwell only on the one question of the character of the dictatorship existing in China today.

No one of course has any doubts that there is a dictatorship in the People's Republic of China. But what sort of a dictatorship is it?

Clarity on this score is essential both from the angle of basic theory and from the angle of practical considerations. For the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a fundamental question of Marxism-Leninism. It is the touchstone of the attitude of the Communist parties to the different classes in society.

You know, comrades, that the Peking leaders aspire to be the teachers and mentors of all Marxist-Leninist parties as concerns this question as well. They level at the CPSU Program criticism which is completely unfounded and illiterate from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, assailing the way this document presents the question of the character of state power following the proletarian revolution and the triumph of socialism. It is therefore not amiss to examine what sort of a dictatorship they have in China. Such an examination will perhaps help to understand why the CPC leaders have plunged headlong into the abyss of splitting activities.

The Chinese leaders themselves give the dictatorship they have established a deliberately confused characterization. In the initial period after the victory of the revolution they defined their state system as "the democratic dictatorship of the people", "the people" being understood as including the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie.

As Mao Tse-tung explained it, China's state system was precisely the dictatorship of an *alliance of all these classes.* In those years Mao Tse-tung emphasized time and again that there was a fundamental difference between this Chinese "dictatorship of the people" and the dictatorship of the proletariat as Marxists had always understood it.

There was no need for him to have said that! One could see even with the naked eye that his theoretical edifice had nothing at all in common with Marxism-Leninism. Marxist theory in general knows no such thing as "the dictatorship of the people". This term smacks strongly of petty-bourgeois revolutionary phrase-mongering. It is reminiscent in particular of the lingo the followers of the Narodnaya Volya and the Socialist-Revolutionaries of old Russia were fond of using.

---

*Pravda, May 19, 1964.

If the Chinese leaders really sought to give a Leninist definition of the class character of their state system during the initial stage following the victory of the revolution, they could have spoken, for instance, of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry developing, under working-class leadership, into the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a form of dictatorship would have offered ample opportunity to enlist also representatives of the loyal sections of the national bourgeoisie in the work of the various organs of power. However, for some reason—we shall see later why—Mao Tse-tung believed it necessary to proclaim the national bourgeoisie of China a class exercising the functions of the dictatorship. This indeed is the heart of the matter!

However, somewhat later the Peking leaders had to cudgel their brains to polish up their definition of China's dictatorship. which was a patent revision of Marxism. "Our state," Mao Tse-tung now said, "is a state of the democratic dictatorship of the people, directed by the working class and based on an aliiance between the workers and peasants."

That already had a better ring. At any rate it did mention the guiding functions of the working class. However, further explanations again upset the apple cart. *"Who exercises the dictatorship?"* Mao Tse-tung asked, following up with the answer: "Of course, the working class and the people it leads, *all men and women enjoying civil rights* who are rallied together by the working class, firstly the peasants, *exercise the dictatorship* with respect to the reactionary classes. . . ."

The question is: Doesn't the national bourgeoisie in China enjoy civil rights? Of course, it does, at least the overwhelming majority does. In that case, according to Mao Tse-tung, the overwhelming majority of the Chinese national bourgeoisie exercises the dictatorship in the country along with the workers and the peasants. Hence Mao Tse-tung's new, edited formula again concealed his old piddling opportunist idea, the point of which is that after they gain power the working classes are not able to exercise the dictatorship by themselves, but have to go halves with the national bourgeoisie.

Why, is it, one may ask, that the Chinese leaders, those ultra-revolutionists, are showing such great concern for the rights of the bourgeoisie? Who knows for sure? But it is very likely that they hope thereby to make it easier to flirt with bourgeois nationalists in other countries, especially with bourgeois Chinese nationals living in various parts of Asia and Africa. "Come over to us," the Peking leaders seem to tell these elements, "and we shall see to it that you get a decent place in the system of dictatorship we have invented."

However, decisive for the assessment of the state system in China is the question of the part allotted in it to the *working class.* As we have seen, the Chinese leaders recognize on paper, though in a very general and abstract way, not only the participation but also the leading position of the proletariat in the Chinese "dictatorship of the people". But how do matters stand in reality?

It must be said that the Chinese working class in reality does not occupy in the state power system the place allotted to it by Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, the policy of the Chinese leaders with regard

to the urban proletariat bears a stamp of distrust and alienation. One cannot get away from the impression that the CPC leaders act as though they were afraid of the growth of the influence of the working class. This is manifest in full measure, first of all, in the attitude to the Chinese trade unions. The attempts of the trade unions to draw attention to the just demands of the workers and on the need for a certain improvement of their conditions were resolutely rebuffed by the CPC leaders. These activities, quite normal for trade unions, were branded as a manifestation of dangerous "deviations", of "economism" and "syndicalism".

Instead of cultivating in the working masses class-consciousness and helping them to understand their lofty historical mission of builders and the leading force of the new society, the Chinese leaders demand of the workers only blind obedience. It is being impressed upon them that they should be satisfied with playing the part of mere "cogs" in the machine. The Chinese leaders consider that their main support is the peasantry and hence pin all their political hopes on it and not on the working class.

This incorrect and essentially scornful attitude of the CPC leaders towards the working-class movement in the country is not a new development. The Communist International in its time subjected it to justified criticism. I do not want to say that all the decisions of the Comintern, including the ones on the Chinese question, were always faultless. But on this basic question the Comintern was absolutely correct!

Overestimation of the role of the peasantry in the socialist revolution combined with underestimation of the role and potential of the working class, which, according to Marxism, is the only consistently revolutionary class in society, is in general characteristic of the petty-bourgeois system of views which is being intensively propagated in China. The CPC leaders, in the period before they came to power, did not devote due attention to the proletarian section of the Party and did not work enough with the urban proletariat. And after that they had the audacity to complain that in such a major working-class centre as Shanghai the Kuomintang had more influence than the Communist Party and to blame the workers for it.

How much more the Chinese leaders rely on the revolutionary potential of the peasantry can be seen also from the testimony of the American journalist Anna Louise Strong, this zealous advocate of the Chinese regime. She says in her book, for instance, that in a talk with her Liu Shao-chi praised in every way the revolutionary nature of the "Chinese boys" who, he said, were superior to any proletarian revolutionary. According to him, 'Marx had never seen such people. . . . They are even more disciplined and loyal than the industrial proletariat."

Needless to say, the Chinese peasants joined the revolutionary struggle for the abolition of the feudal yoke and for national liberation with great enthusiasm. But would any Marxist-Leninist consider this ground for counterposing the peasantry to the working class, belittling the revolutionary potential of the proletariat and even "correcting" Marx on this question!

However, so as not to reveal their departure from the Marxist theory, the Chinese leaders talk about the participation and the leading role of the proletariat in the Chinese dictatorship. But they cannot show where this role of the proletariat is concretely manifest in the conditions of China. On the contrary, the facts indicate that the Chinese working class has no rights; its position is indeed grim. But while saying this I do not for a single moment doubt that the glorious working class of China will in the further course of the revolution win its vital rights and the leading role allotted it by the laws of history.

To extricate themselves from the difficult situation in which they have landed as a result of gross distortion of the Leninist teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the leaders and propagandists of the Communist Party of China resort to the following simple explanation: the leading role and the dictatorship of the working class are implicit in the fact that we have a Communist Party which in the final analysis manages all the major affairs of the country. Mao Tse-tung wrote that "the working class leads the democratic dictatorship of the people" in China *"through the Communist Party"*. In his report to the Eighth Congress of the CPC Liu Shao-chi also pointed out that with the establishment of the People's Republic of China "the Communist Party of China has become a Party wielding political power, and the democratic dictatorship of the people has actually become one of the forms of the *dictatorship of the proletariat.*" Thus, the leadership and the dictatorship of the proletariat are in effect identified with the leading position of the Communist Party. Is this correct?

No, it is not. The Chinese leaders completely forget that the great Lenin pointed out that far from every Party which calls itself Communist is really the vanguard, the recognized leader of the working class. A party can be, according to Lenin's teaching, a genuine vanguard of the working class only if it pursues a correct policy meeting the interests of the proletariat, if it is closely linked with the proletariat, lives the same life with it, trusts it and enjoys the benefit of its undivided confidence. These theses of Lenin's apply not only to the Communist parties of the old capitalist countries but also to those of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, where there is a working class. Lenin classed China among such countries.

Do the top leaders of the Communist Party of China take into account these propositions of Lenin's? No, they do not. As I mentioned already, the Chinese leaders do not trust the working class, ignore its interests and demand only submissive obedience from it. It is not by chance that the CPC Central Committee has of late been imposing on the workers' collectives and trade unions such slogans, characteristic of militarized organizations, as: "Policy is a commanding force", "The Secretary of a Party Committee is a production commander", etc. The All-China Conference on Industrial Matters, held in Peking early in 1964, called upon all the workers "to learn from the People's Liberation Army". Thus, instead of persuasion, insistence on obedience and army discipline is what underlies the attitude of the leadership of the CPC towards the working class. How

under the circumstances can the proletariat exercise its leading role?

On major international questions too the Peking policy is erroneous, non-Marxist; it is not a policy of proletarian internationalism. Does a policy permeated with great-power aspirations, which replaces proletarian internationalism with chauvinism, and the policy of strengthening the unity of the socialist countries and the world Communst movement with the policy of undermining and splitting it, accord with the interests of the Chinese proletariat? The leadership of a Party pursuing such a nationalistic policy can in no way be regarded as one expressing the will of the working class.

Hence the Communist Party of China cannot be now considered a genuine vanguard of the working class, capable of giving effect to the leading role of the proletariat.

In reality in China today there is no dictatorship of the people, no dictatorship of the proletariat, no leading position of the proletariat, and also no vanguard role of the Communist Party. The whole of the Chinese leaders' pseudo-Marxist phraseology is only camouflage designed to disguise the dictatorship which really exists there. It is a dictatorship of leaders; or, to be more exact, *a one-man dictatorship.*

The Party leaders have actually freed themselves from any control by the Party. For many years now congresses of the Communist Party of China have not been convened, and its representative bodies are increasingly playing merely an ornamental part. The decision of the Communist International which back in 1926 demanded that the Chinese Communist Party "firmly give effect to *collective leadership* in the Party, all the way from the Central Committee down to the factory and neighborhood nucleus", has also been buried in oblivion by the Chinese leaders.

Like-wise indicative is the fact that in attacking the Program of our Party, the leaders of the Communist Party of China furiously assail those propositions in it which envisage all-round development of inner-Party and Soviet democracy and ever greater participation of the working people in the administration of the state. In China democracy is either not spoken of at all or mentioned merely as a matter of form. This is not surprising, because socialist democracy is a flower which does not grow in the shade of the personality cult.

The Mao Tse-tung dictatorship is weighing down on the entire life of the working people of China. This is felt in all parts of the country. The leading Party workers not only do not conceal the existence of the dictatorship of Mao Tse-tung, but are trying in every possible way to invest him with a halo of infallibility and to build the cult of his personality.

It is widely known what fantastic proportions the Mao Tse-tung personality cult has assumed in China. A special ritual has been created for Mao Tse-tung's rare public appearances. Each pronouncement of his is assessed as "a great contribution to the treasury of Marxism". Even the verses he writes in his leisure time are served up as an historic event in the ideological life of China. The Chinese leaders do not even notice, or do not want to notice, that in their idolatry they have deviated far, not only from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, but also from elementary decency.

Comrades, you know that for a long time the Central Committee of our Party did everything it could to explain to the leaders of the Communist Party of China their mistakes and delusions. Our Party patiently waited and hoped that they would, in the final run, heed the voice of reason and conscience. To make their return to the correct road easier, our Party, as everyone knows, proposed that open polemics be mutually rejected.

However, from our proposal, which was prompted by good will, the leaders of the Communist Party of China drew the following conclusion: the people in Moscow, evidently, are afraid of polemics with us, and once this is so, the Chinese leaders decided, we shall compose as many thunderous replies to the CPSU Central Committee's Open Letter as necessary to achieve our ends.

You are greatly mistaken, gentlemen! Our Party is not afraid of struggle in defense of Marxism-Leninism. Since you persist in and have decided to continue your harmful undermining campaign against the unity of the world Communist movement, we, too, most likely, will have to expose publicly the anti-Marxist position of petty-bourgeois nationalism which you, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, have adopted.

In the course of its history, our Leninist Party more than once shouldered the task of defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism against both the Rightist and "Leftist" petty-bourgeois splitters.

The whole of our Party indignantly condemn the foul slander and undermining activities of the Peking renegades. Our entire country firmly stands and will continue firmly to stand for that policy of creative Marxism-Leninism which the Central Committee of our Party, headed by Comrade Khrushchov, is pursuing.

We are confident that all honest Marxist-Leninists the world over will march side by side with us in the struggle which our Leninist Party will wage to preserve and strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement.

MARXISM-LENINISM: INTERNATIONAL TEACHING FOR COMMUNISTS IN ALL COUNTRIES

The Chinese leaders have declared an outright ideological and political war on the world Communist movement with the aim of splitting it.

The Chinese leaders can conceal their actions no longer. They are, therefore, trying to justify them, alleging that the purpose of such actions is to protect Marxism-Leninism, and extolling themselves as the sole guardians of the purity of this teaching. However, the entire development of the polemics shows that the activities of the Chinese leaders are nothing but political intrigues on the part of factionalists who talk about the defense of Marxism merely to cover up their desire to undermine the unity of world communism for their own private ends. That this is so was convincingly demonstrated in the speeches of N. S. Khrushchov, in M. A. Suslov's report and in the other materials of the February Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as in the documents of the fraternal parties.

Today when Peking wants to screen its subversive activities against the fraternal parties behind noisy protestations of a desire to protect Marxist-Leninist theory, first-rate importance attaches to the struggle for the ideological unity of the Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism—the international teaching for Communists in all countries. This vital issue is raised in a series of *Pravda* editorials which follow.

IDEOLOGICAL UNITY IS THE FOUNDATION OF UNITY IN THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

The world-historic mission of the working class can be discharged only if the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist parties pool efforts internationally. Hence the tremendous importance attaching to the task of achieving cohesion in the world Communist movement.

This task is especially important today, because never before have the Communists borne such a great responsibility for the destinies of peace, socialism and progress, for the destinies of mankind.

How can this unity be achieved, a unity which presupposes not only verbal declaration of solidarity, but also united, concerted action, constant mutual assistance, and the organic blend of the national and international tasks of each revolutionary detachment? The Communists have always regarded ideological unity based on Marxism-Leninism as one of the main pillars of their international solidarity. This unity is an expression of the identity of aims and agreement

*Pravda, May 10, 1964.

on the fundamental means and basic tactical revolutionary detachments of the international working class.

Even the Comintern, whose Rules were obligatory for all parties, could unite Communists in different countries only by relying on their ideological unity. The importance of the struggle for ideological unity is all the greater today, not only because in our days an organization such as the Comintern no longer exists, and the forms of contact between the parties have changed. Of far greater importance are the changes that have resulted from the growth of the Communist movement and all revolutionary forces.

Communist parties exist today in most countries of the world, and their concrete tasks under which they are waging their struggle are becoming increasingly diverse. This, naturally, gives rise to a great variety of forms of struggle and tactical methods, and also to a different approach to one or another common issue.

The international Communist movement was also confronted with a new historical situation owing to the fact that the rise of the socialist world system, the collapse of colonialist empires, the mounting class struggle of the proletariat, and the upsurge of the popular democratic movements awakened once passively-minded sections of society to achieve political life. The revolutionary dynamic character of the epoch has brought vast sections of the petty-bourgeoisie in Asia, Africa and Latin America into the vortex of political developments. They have joined in the world revolutionary movement, and this is a major victory for social progress. At the same time, the drawing of new sections of society, including the petty-bourgeoisie, into the making of history has broadened the channels of non-proletarian influence on the revolutionary detachments. Hence the increased importance of the struggle which the Communist parties are waging for the correct ideological, theoretical and political line of all revolutionary forces, and, above all, for ideological unity among the Communists themselves.

Without this struggle, without ideological unity, communism would cease to be a world movement and become but an amorphous conglomerate of parties incapable of joint action.

It is quite clear that there are no relations of hierarchy, domination, and subordination in the world Communist movement, consisting as it does of independent parties enjoying equal rights, nor can there be any relations of that nature. Hence it follows that the only form of unity can and must be a *voluntary alliance of like-minded people,* which would guarantee the equal rights and independence of each Party and at the same time ensure the cohesion, unity and co-ordination of action and voluntary discipline in pursuing the general line of the Communist movement.

An alliance of this kind can be achieved only on such an ideological and theoretical platform which, on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the present epoch, provides the correct answers to the vital problems of today and takes into account the new phenomena and processes of reality. This is the platform of creative Marxism. There is absolutely no question that to be loyal to Marxism-Leninism means upholding the basic principles and propositions of the revolutionary

theory of the working class and fighting against every attempt to revise it — whether made from the "right" or from the "left". It is also obvious that fidelity to Marxism-Leninism calls for the creative application and development of this teaching in accordance with the changing historical conditions.

At the same time, the creative development of theory itself must necessarily be the collective concern of all the Marxist-Leninist parties. Not because the entire multi-million strong army of Communists lacks talented theoreticians and, consequently, we have decided "for want of anything better" to tackle theory "together". There is a good number of talented theoreticians among present-day Communists. They are to be found in many parties. However, the ways of developing Marxism have changed — not "for lack" of talented people, but because of the wealth of forms, conditions and experience of struggle which we possess. Today theory can be developed only when all the parties, the entire movement co-operates — and not so much by "armchair" reasoning as by practical activity, in the very process of the struggle against imperialism, for socialsm and communsm.

Implicit in the international character of the Marxist-Leninist teaching is the need to take into account the national peculiarites and specific features in the concrete approach of each country in solving the *common* international task. The experience accumulated by all the contingents of the Communist movement is of great importance for perfecting and enriching the theoretical weapons of the working class.

Every Party — big or small — takes an active part in the common cause of creatively developing revolutionary theory and makes its own contribution to this effort.

It is common knowledge that the CPSU has done much theoretical work over the past decade to generalize the changes that have taken place in the world. We take pride in the fact that the results of this work, as recorded in the Resolutions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and in its new Program, have been highly appraised by the fraternal parties.

These years were extremely fruitful also as regards the theoretical work done by other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries faced new problems in their socialist reorganization of society. As they solved these problems they developed a whole series of important Marxist propositions dealing first of all with the theory of revolution and the building of socialism in states differing in the conditions and level of economic development.

The Communist Party of China has also made its contribution to the common cause of developing Marxist-Leninist theory. In the struggle against imperialism and the Kuomintang reactionaries and in the first stages of socialist construction, it enriched the theory and practice of the Communist movement with important conclusions with regard to the guerilla campaign in China, the united front of the national forces in the struggle against imperialism, the ways of transforming capitalist property (redemption, mixed property, etc.)

Extensive theoretical work has also been done by the Communist parties of such leading capitalist countries as France, Italy, Britain and the U.S.A. They have developed many aspects of the Marxist-Leninist teachings as to the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat in their application to modern conditions. The Communists of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are successfully tackling important aspects of Marxism-Leninism that are related to the problems of linking the struggle for socialism to the national liberation movement, establishing groad alliances with the petty and national bourgeoisie and working out methods for the non-capitalist development of countries that have shaken off the colonial yoke.

Each party contributes to the common treasure-store of Marxism. In so doing it proceeds, first of all, from its own experience. For instance, no one could know the problems of the working-class struggle in the developed capitalist countries better than the Communist parties of those countries. The same can be said of the parties tackling the problems of the national liberation movement or of the building of socialism and communism. Proceeding from real life, all the Communist parties take an active part in working out general theoretical principles affecting the Communist movement as a whole.

This nature of the creative process of the development of Marxism-Leninism cannot but be reflected in the forms of the parties' theoretical work. Each new word of Marxism is not uttered peremptorily from the heights of some theoretical Olympus, but is verified in practice, is discussed at international forums of Communists, and becomes the gain of the entire movement. A case in point is the work of the two Moscow Meetings and the programmatic documents of international communism they drafted, i.e., the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. Adopted by the movement, the new theses become the guide to action for all its contingents, by virtue of the voluntarily assumed pledge to abide by them and by the assessments recorded in joint documents.

As for the joint collective theoretical work of the parties, Marxism-Leninism develops, as is only natural, through discussion, disputes and struggle. That is how it will always be, because the development of Marixsm-Leninism is a creative process that never ceases. This only makes it still more important strictly to adhere to the standards and principles of theoretical disputes and discussions which the movement has evolved: under no circumstances should they be used as a method for factional struggle and for squaring accounts with other parties. Marxist-Leninists regard theoretical and political discussions among Communists as a means for strengthening unity, not as a disruptive factor. To prevent these discussions from playing into the hands of the enemies and to make them serve our cause, they must be carried on in a friendly, dignified form, conscientiously and to the point, with the common interests of communism put before narrow nationalist egotistical considerations.

In theoretical disputes between like-minded Communists, there must be no sectarian, fanatical intolerance of differences in views, for that

is characteristic of medieval monks, not of Marxist-Leninists. The fact that the Communist parties are working in different conditions, have arrived at different stages of the struggle and have accumulated varying experience, accounts for the many diverse shades of opinion on specific questions. This of course is no cause for displeasure or alarm. Our Party has expressed its view on this score more than once, stressing that such differences should not be the cause for quarrels and strife. Real Communists are concerned primarily with everything that unites them with their fellow-Communists in the other countries, not what divides them; they believe that questions upon which no common view has been established today, can be agreed upon tomorrow, after time and experience have demonstrated who was right and who was wrong.

All these norms of ideological activity in the Communist parties, which in recent years have won general recognition in our movement, are now being grossly violated and rejected by the Chinese leaders.

Suffice it to read the polemical material published in Peking in the past few months to see that, far from cherishing the unity of the parties, they, on the contrary, have proclaimed constant schism to be a sort of law of normal development in the revolutionary movement.

That is exactly how the question is put in the article published in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* on February 4, 1964. ". . . Like everything else," the article says, "the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two." And further: "Unity, struggle or even splits, and a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement." It is clear to all that this "philosophy of split" is intended not so much to explain the past as to argue the present activity of the Chinese leaders with its aim of undermining the ideological and political unity of the Communists.

Peking does not recognize creative collective work in the field of theory, though it makes a big fuss about the "equality" and "independence" of the different parties. Refusing to reckon with the general conclusions of the world Communist movement, posing as supreme arbiters on questions of theory and politics, and "excommunicating" one fraternal party after another from Marxism, the Chinese leaders have quite openly arrogated to themselves some special rights in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory.

However, the Communist movement does not believe in "prophets" and "oracles", who think and decide for others — as Stalin attempted to do in his time. As far as the CPSU is concerned, it has made its views with regard to this question crystal-clear.

Owing to the wealth of experience accumulated by the CPSU and the services it has rendered to the Communist movement it became traditional for a special, leading place to be accorded to our Party, and this was recorded in the jointly adopted documents of the Communist movement. The Central Committee of our Party took the initiative to end this tradition, even over the objections of a number of other parties, among which most active, paradoxically enough today, was the Communist Party of China, which demanded that the

corresponding formulation be introduced in the common documents of the Communist parties. The real reason for this position of the CPC leaders is now quite clear. Apparently, the Chinese leaders sought already at that time to establish the "office" of head of the Communist movement, with the aim of eventually taking it over themselves.

Our Party has resolutely opposed violations of equality in relations in the socialist camp and the Communist movement such as were typical of the time of the personality cult, and repudiated the very idea of one or another party enjoying "hegemony" in the Communist movement. The Chinese leaders, on the other hand, are obviously eager to revive the idea, appropriating the right to solve unilaterally theoretical and political questions that concern the entire movement.

Indeed, what other explanation can be found for the hullabaloo raised in China over the "ideas of Mao Tse-tung" which were presented as the apex of Marxian thought for all the peoples, for the entire movement? Peking went so far as to claim that the task of theoretical generalization of the historic tasks of our day had fallen completely to Mao-Tse-tung alone, that our age itself was the "age of Mao Tse-tung".

Such utterances are not only permeated with adulation of a leader that is unworthy of Communists. They also clearly attempt to assert the "monopoly" of Chinese theoreticians in Marxism-Leninism. In contrast to the great teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Chinese leaders seek to impose on the Communist movement as its ideological banner the so-called Chinese version of Marxism.

WHAT CHINESE LEADERS ARE TRYING TO IMPOSE UPON THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT UNDER THE GUISE OF MARXISM-LENINISM*

In their theoretical speculations, the Chinese leaders are revising the Marxist-Leninist teaching, distorting the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and repudiating one of the most important principles of Marxism-Leninism—the creative approach to theory. Peking denies the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory, the new appraisals and conclusions drawn by the fraternal parties in their jointly adopted documents.

Indeed, what do the CPC leaders regard as the "revisionist sins" of the Marxist-Leninist parties? As they themselves explain: the fact that these parties have adopted the "course of so-called peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition", "peaceful transition", "the state of the whole people" and "the party of the whole people". There is hardly any need to say that the general line of the Communist movement is by no means reduced to the above-mentioned propositions. This is generally known. What is noteworthy is the very range of propositions selected for attack.

Several things are in question here — the principles of the foreign policy of the socialist states and the character of the state in the period of the transition from socialism to communism, the roads of

*Pravda, May 11, 1964.

the socialist revolution and the social character of the Party after the complete victory of socialism. All these diverse questions, however, have one thing in common — in every case the points at issue are theoretical problems, in the elaboration of which the Communist parties, in accordance with the demands of the epoch, have introduced many new elements over the past few years.

It is against this that the CPC leaders have directed their offensive first and foremost. They appraise all the propositions of creative Marxism advanced by the present generation of Marxist-Leninists from the point of whether or not they conform or not to what was written 100, 50 or 30 years ago. This approach is matched by their method of criticism, which completely ignores objective reality and boils down to the culling of individual quotations from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin referring to a different epoch and a different historical situation. The Chinese theoreticians, judging by their own pronouncements, imagine that Marxism-Leninism is a set of hard-and-fast rules, principles and slogans valid for all time, which Communists have strictly to abide by, like churchmen to the Old and the New Testaments.

Such an approach to theory was utterly alien to Marx, Engels and Lenin. The founders of Marxism-Leninism saw their theoretical task not in remaining loyal to the letter of books written earlier, but in being loyal to the spirit of the scientific world outlook of the working class, in carefully analyzing changing reality, generalizing the new experiences gained in the struggle, and creatively solving the tasks that each new epoch puts on the agenda.

This is the attitude of the modern Marxists to the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin. For them, Marxism-Leninism is not only the collected works of the classics, and not only truths expressed by authorities decades ago, but also achievements of modern Marxist thought, which have stood the test of experience. This is the kind of Marxism we uphold.

Can one visualize the scientific theory of the working class today without the Declaration and Statement, without the conclusions drawn by the parties in their programmatic documents, without the truths that have emerged from the revolutionary battles of the past few years? To expunge all this from Marxism would be infinitely to impoverish it, to deprive it of the very thing which bears the imprint of the epoch and which is particularly important for the struggle of the working people. Our generation of Marxist-Leninists would be unworthy of their great teachers, were they not to do their duty to the working class in the field of theory.

This is precisely the premise the Marxist-Leninist parties proceeded from in working out the general line for the present.

The Chinese leaders have met at dagger-point the scientific generalization of the new phenomena of reality and the vast creative work done by the Communist parties to implement the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Having accused the fraternal parties of "revisionism", they counterposed to the general line of the Communist movement argumented in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement their own

"proposals with regard to the general line" in their letter of June 14, 1963. It is noteworthy that in the interpretation of the Chinese leaders, only the most general propositions of the Declaration and Statement, such as "the union of the proletarians of all countries", "the gradual attainment of full victory in the world proletarian revolution", etc., are in keeping with the general line. "This is, in our opinion," the letter pointed out, "the general line of the international Communist movement at the present stage."

One may well ask the Peking theoreticians: what has this to do with the present? Although all the said propositions are important, they apply to all epochs and call for concretization at each specific stage of history: how to bring about a union of the proletarians of all countries at the present stage, how to wage the most effective struggle against the imperialists in the given conditions, and how to struggle for the full victory of the world proletarian revolution today.

The Marxist-Leninist parties deemed it their main task to answer these concrete questions. Their answers constitute the political line of the Communist movement, its strategy and tactics. The Chinese leaders, on the other hand, under cover of general declarations and repeating universally known truths, reject every new thing that has been added to revolutionary theory by the collective experience of the fraternal parties. But the new evaluations and conclusions are more than just "pure" theory. They are a guide to action, a generalization of the new forms of the struggle of the working class movement, an argumentation of the new methods of waging an offensive against the positions of imperialism. Rejection of the new conclusions is not only evidence of theoretical stagnation, it also leads to idle talk and political inertia, to rejection of the new powerful levers that exist for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the first in the history of our movement to be faced with the task of all-out Communist construction. Naturally, the Party had to answer a number of new questions that arose at this stage, in particular those pertaining to the historical destinies of the state and the Party on the approaches to communism. The Chinese leaders, without taking the trouble to analyze the essence of the problems in question, hastened to anathemize the new theses advanced by our Party.

After the war, the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries found themselves confronted with new conditions of struggle engendered by the aggravation of the general crisis of the capitalist system, by the defeats it had sustained in the peaceful competition with socialism, by the growth of state-monopoly trends, by the upsurge of the working class and democratic movement. It is only natural that these parties paid particular attention to evolving new tactics in order to make more effective use of the new possiblities to defend the interests of the working people, fight the monopolies and bring the masses nearer to the socialist revolution.

The Chinese leadership again chose to close its eyes to the problems posed by life, as is particularly evident from the article published in *Hungchi* and *Jenminjihpao* on March 31, this year; they preferred to

cling dogmatically to quotations, taken out of context and presented in a distorted light, relating to a different epoch and different conditions.

Nor did they wish to see the new tasks facing the national-liberation movement and the peoples who had won political independence — the tasks of fighting for economic independence, overcoming century-old backwardness, and embarking on non-capitalist development. The Chinese leaders keep on reiterating that these peoples have, as before, to follow only the one road, namely, the road of continued armed struggle, although the Chinese leaders themselves fail to explain against whom this struggle should be waged today in such countries as Algeria, Mali, Ghana, and Burma, for example.

Many general problems, among them the problem of war and peace, have today emerged in a new light before the world Communist movement. Here too the Chinese leadership has preferred to resort to old quotations, and, posing as the "champion" of Marxism-Leninism, has launched an attack against the agreed position of the fraternal parties.

The CPC leaders try to cover up their break with Marxism-Leninism by referring to the history of the Communist movement; they draw parallels between the struggle Lenin and the Bolsheviks waged against the opportunists of the Second International and their own splitting activities in the world Communist movement. But again the Chinese leaders are treading on thin ice.

What aspect of the Second International's activities was it that Lenin so ruthlessly combated? What were the principal ideological and political points at issue between the Communists and social-reformists?

Lenin formulated the law of the uneven economic and political development of imperialism and drew the major conclusion as to the possibility of a break in the imperialist chain in one country. Adopting doctrinaire, dogmatic positions, the leaders of the Second International accused Lenin of departing from Marxism, attacking him with antiquated quotations.

After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party led the people on to the building of socialism, advancing the thesis that the complete victory of socialism in one country was possible, thereby making a historic contribution to revolutionary thought. This conclusion of Lenin's was also opposed with dogmatic stubbornness by the leaders of the Second International.

Lenin's analysis of imperialism and its contradictions, his plan for the building of socialism and all his tremendous contribution to the treasury of Marxist thought was viewed by the opportunist leaders of the Second International as an encroachment on Marxism. Actually, it was exactly the struggle against the fossilization of theory, for a creative Marxism constantly enriched by revolutionary practice, that lay at the root of the bitter ideological battles which Lenin waged against Bernstein, Kautsky and other leaders of the Second International.

Hence, if one is to look for an analogy between the present struggle launched by the Chinese leadership within the ranks of the Com-

munist movement and Lenin's struggle against the "orthodox-minded" of the Second International, we shall see that this analogy is by no means favourable for the CPC leaders. It is not Lenin they resemble by any means. On the contrary, they are aping the spiritual fathers of the Right-wing Socialists of today. Like the latter, they, too, proceed through ossification of Marxism to its distortion, to attempts to substitute for it home-baked "theories" that undermine the development of the revolutionary process.

A closer examination of the theoretical concepts advocated by the Chinese leaders, a thoughtful analysis of their ideological evolution of late will compel the conclusion that the path the Chinese leadership is following is one of flagrant distortion of Marxism-Leninism and revision of its fundamental principles.

The revisisionist essence of the positions adopted by the Chinese leaders is particularly manifest in their revaluation of that vital point of Marxist-Leninist theory, the question of the historic mission of the proletariat and its place in the world-wide emancipatory process.

The CPC leaders are, in effect, discarding the Marxist-Leninist thesis concerning the world-historic role of the working class in the revolutionary transformation of the world, a thesis that has been verified by the experience of decades of class struggle. The Chinese leaders attack this cardinal tenet of revolutionary theory from different angles, but with the sole aim of proving that the hegemony in the world revolutionary process is shifting, or has already shifted, from the working class to the social strata that comprise the mass base of the national-liberation movement, namely, the peasantry, the radical intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie. Marxist-Leninists greatly value the revolutionary potential of the peasantry. It was the peasantry who, after they started making history, become the staunchest ally of the international working-class movement in its struggle against imperialism. However, the Chinese leaders are not speaking of this obvious fact, they are advocating a regrouping of revolutionary forces which dispenses with the vanguard role of the international working class.

This is precisely the purpose of Peking's "theory" that the zone of the national-liberation movement, upon which presumably the destinies of the world socialist revolution now wholly depend, has allegedly become the main centre of all world contradictions. The Chinese theoreticians are trying to invoke Lenin's authority to back up this point. But actually they are going against Lenin's ideas. Because when Lenin spoke of the great significance of the national-liberation movement, he did not oppose it to the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat; on the contrary, he proved that there existed an unbreakable alliance between these two forces and laid particular emphasis on the role and importance of the labor movement in all revolutionary processes.

But what is Peking doing? It is peddling the notion that today the peasantry has supposedly become the most consistent revolutionary force. As for the world working class, in the opinion of the theoreticians acting as apologists for the Chinese leadership, it has been "in-

fected" with social-reformism and has thus relinquished its revolutionary birth-right.

Such reasoning may flatter the egos of certain immature, nationalistically-minded, petty-bourgeois politicians. But what can it have in common with Marxism-Leninism?

The Peking leaders are shouting from the house-tops not only about the "special" role which the national-liberation movement plays in the world proletarian revolution. At the same time they are trying in every way to minimize the revolutionary role of the world working class and its offsping, the socialist system.

Such is the idea behind all the talk about it being impermissible to attach decisive significance to the competition between world socialism and world capitalism, since, allegedly, such an attitude is nothing but "revisionism". Such also is the idea behind the charges of "social reformism" levelled against the Communist parties of the developed capitalist countries. To all intents and purposes the Chinese leaders completely discount the working-class movement in these countries and refuse to recognize its revolutionary force, its revolutionary potentialities and world-historic mission of the working class posing as the sole defenders of the revolutionary theory of that class!

Just how far the new-fangled "orthodoxists" go in their revision of Marxism is shown by the fact that the Chinese leaders do not stop at distorting the ultimate goal of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, its socialist ideal.

The pronouncements of the CPC leaders and their political activities give us a clue to a type of society which is presented as a model socialist society but which in reality contradicts the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist theory and the proletarian character of socalism.

The men in Peking do not consider a high level of industrial development to be an inalienable feature of socialism. Improvement of the living standards of the working people is declared unnecessary indeed dangerous, as it allegedly, causes "bourgeois degeneration". The principles of socialist democracy are constantly ignored both in theory and practice. The very concept of socialist democracy is rarely met with in the lengthy materials Peking publishes. Instead, the Chinese leaders make a fetish of violence and cultivate the personality cult which is alien to the very nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. They are "militarizing" every aspect of life and look upon the masses as a "blank sheet of paper" (to quote Mao Tse-tung) on which the leader may "write" what he pleases.

The Chinese leaders' idea of socialism is most unusual — they visualize it as a society without a developed industry, without democracy, legality, or respect for the rights of the individual, a society perpetuating the poverty and privations of the working masses. But is this the "socialism" that Marxist-Leninist theory offers? Is this the socialism millions of working people all over the world are fighting for? Not for nothing do the CPC leaders defile the banner of humanism borne aloft by the Marxist-Leninist parties. They have no use for it, for they no longer visualize socialism as a society created for the working man, in the name of his happiness.

The socialist revolution, Lenin pointed out, replaces private ownership of the means of production by public ownership and introduces the planned organization of social production to ensure the well-being and all-round development of all the members of society. Socialism is built in the name of the people, for the good of the people.

Whatever the Chinese leaders may say, however they may extol themselves, the real facts refute their claims to the role of law-givers, in Marxism. These facts convincingly testify to the very opposite: the Chinese version of Marxism-Leninism which underlies the ideological and theoretical platform of the Chinese leadership is nothing but betrayal of the basic principles of the international revolutionary theory accepted by Communists in all countries, betrayal of the great teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

THE POLITICAL AIMS BEHIND THE CHINESE LEADERS' THEORETICAL CONCEPTS*

The first thing that strikes the eye in analyzing the concepts of the so-called "Sinified Marxism" is their contradictory nature, confusion and the rather curious tangle of dogmatism and out-and-out revisionism, the utter inconsistency with which views are expressed, and, last but not least, the yawning gulf between the revolutionary bombast and the practical activities of the CPC leaders.

At first they announced the "great leap" and boasted of the sensational iron-and-steel and coal output. targets they had set in an attempt to solve in one swoop all the tasks of building up a modern industry. But having failed in industrialization, they proclaimed farming the "basis of the economy".

They first considered the people's Commune a ready-made "ladder to paradise", a form of transition to communism, totally oblivious of the fact that the appropriate material facilities and productive forces had to be created beforehand to effect such a transition. Then they advanced the contention that in general one cannot talk of building communism, before imperialism has been finally routed.

The constant swing-around in positions, the ideological and political scurrying to and fro of the Chinese leaders, distinctly reveal the petty-bourgeois nature of their outlook. The utterances of the Peking ideologists betray a lack of principles which has been elevated to a principle, a preparedness to put forward, or subscribe to, any thesis, provided it accords with the political directives of the CPC leaders. The entire development of the polemics in the Communist movement has shown that the Chinese leaders are not concerned in the slightest with questions of Marxist-Leninist theory, nor do they endeavour to ascertain the truth by honestly comparing positions and putting them to the test of practical activity. They use the polemics on problems of theory as a subsidiary means of camouflaging and vindicating their own particular political aims, as a tool in the struggle for these aims.

What, then, is the political implication of the CPC leadership's theoretical concepts?

---

*Pravda, May 12, 1964.

It is crystal-clear that the main purpose of their claim of being the only true Marxist-Leninists of today is to assert their own hegemony in the Communist movement and in the liberation movement as a whole.

The Chinese leaders are attempting to produce the impression that they started the polemics in the Communist movement and launched a political drive against the fraternal parties only because they are concerned most for the interests of the revolution and are the most relentless, staunchest fighters against imperialism.

But these claims can deceive nobody.

In this case, too, we must go by what is being done, not by what is being said. What the Chinese leaders are doing shows that they are not "impatient" revolutionaries or inordinately ardent fighters against imperialism. By raising a hue and cry about the "defense" of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they are attacking the CPSU, the Party which was the first to establish and develop the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Chinese leaders, in effect, arrive at the very same political position held in their time by the leaders of the Second International, who flatly denied the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian dictatorship. The Peking leaders simply love to fight their own inventions, views that they slanderously attribute to the fraternal parties; they are least of all concerned with the successes of the world socialist revolution and the anti-imperialist struggle. They do more than objectively disrupt and weaken the anti-imperialist revolutionary front in the face of the class enemy: their subjective intentions, the aims they are setting themselves, are becoming more and more dubious.

As recent developments have shown, the Peking leaders level the most vicious slanderous attacks against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is now perfectly clear that they have spearheaded their ideological attack not against imperialism and colonialism, but against the world Communist movement, primarily the CPSU.

Peking propaganda has accused our Party of every single mortal sin. Moreover, not only all the norms of relations between fraternal parties are being trampled underfoot: elementary common-sense is being defied. The writers of the Peking articles are looking for simpletons who would believe them when they allege that the CPSU leadership is "aligning its actions with imperialism", seeking co-operation with the United States "to dominate the world", and is "regarding American imperialism its most loyal friend", when they allege that the CPSU leadership has ". . . given free reign to the capitalist forces in the Soviet Union".

Such ways of conducting "theoretical" polemics will hardly win the Chinese leaders any laurels.

But what interests us here is not moral principles in general, but the political aspect of the matter. It is perfectly obvious that such base slander can serve only one purpose, that of discrediting and defaming the CPSU, which the Peking splitters view as the main obstacle to the accomplishment of their hegemonistic plans.

Their attempts to dominate the international revolutionary move-

ment at all costs, completely disregarding its real interests, and to subordinate it to their own egoistic interests have brought the Chinese leaders into conflict with the Marxist-Leninist parties, the real vanguard of the revolutionary forces. The hegemonistic plans of the CPC leaders have come up against an insurmountable barrier. The overwhelming majority of Communist parties have emphatically condemned their course of action.

When their way is barred, the Chinese leaders seek other methods to achieve hegemonistic ends. They are now staking their all on splitting the Communist movement, and establishing under their own aegis a special international bloc that would stand in opposition to the world Communist movement.

Never in the history of the working-class movement has talk about the purity of the great teaching of Marx and Lenin, been so cynically used to conceal aims so alien to its ideals.

The auxiliary role which the theorizing of the Peking splitters plays in the furtherance of their political ends is distinctly revealed also in their approach to problems of the national-liberation movement. Again pseudo-revolutionary slogans and pseudo-theoretical postulates are used merely to conceal narrow nationalist political aims.

The Peking theoreticians claim that the "hub" of all present-day contradictions has shifted to the "zone of the three A's"—Asia, Africa and Latin America; this claim serves very definite political aims: speculating with this proposition the Chinese splitters are trying to win the sympathy of the peoples of the young national states, usurp the leadership of the national-liberation movement and place it in opposition to the socialist countries and the international proletariat.

When considerations of nationalistic policy so demand, the Chinese leaders do not hesitate to brush aside both their revolutionary phrasemongering and their theoretical concepts. For example, they started a border conflict with India, a state pursuing a policy of non-alignment, accused it of aggression and of collaboration with U.S. imperialism, and at once began to court friendship with Pakistan, a state that is a member of the imperialist aggressive SEATO and CENTO blocs.

In the light of the Chinese leaders' latest practical moves on the world scene, one can readily see the true political purpose of their theory concerning a so-called "intermediary zone" between the socialist countries and the United States, the object of which is to justify the Chinese leadership's line of expanding co-operation with such imperialist countries as France, Japan, West Germany and Britain.

Our Party has no intention of replying in kind to the Chinese leaders' allegations that improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist states is "collusion with the imperialists" and "a departure from the class struggle." Our Party regards improvement of economic and other relations between the socialist and capitalist states as something quite normal, as the practical embodiment of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The whole point, however, is that the CPR is establishing closer contacts with a number of imperialist powers not in pursuance of

a common policy of peaceful coexistence but in a situation where China is co-operating less and less with the socialist countries, where the Chinese leaders are isolating themselves from the socialist camp, in the conditions of the ideological and political war that the Peking splitters have declared on the Communist movement. In a situation such as this, instead of taking advantage of the contradictions between the imperialists to promote the interests of socialism, the CPC leadership is itself becoming a pawn in the political game and intrigues which the imperialist powers are engaged in with the object of weakening the Communist movement and the positions of socialism.

What is the net result of all this?

An analysis of Peking's theoretical concepts and, even more so, a comparison of these concepts and the actions of the Chinese leaders leave not the slightest doubt that what we have to deal with is an artificially constructed system of concepts devised specially to serve definite political aims. Peking needs this set of theoretical concepts to "substantiate" and "justify" the great-power nationalistic policy of the Chinese leaders, to promote their claims to hegemony, to split the world liberation movement, and to bring under the aegis of Peking a definite type of element both inside and outside the Communist movement.

The dissenting theoretical stand taken by the Chinese leaders bears the obvious stamp of these unsavoury aims — aims which are inimical to the interests of the working class and the cause of communism.

To win a following they orient their theoretical concepts on the Left-wing adventuristic elements of the liberation movement, on incorrigible doctrinaires upon whom the cleansing spirit of the 20th Congress of the CPSU has had no effect and who nostalgically yearn for the old methods of leadership characteristic of the time of the personality cult, and, finally, on the chauvinistic, and even racialist, moods of people to whom the ideals of proletarian internationalism are alien.

Hence the eclecticism of the Chinese leadership's theoretical platform. And hence, too, the gulf between theory and practice, the inconsistent and contradictory nature of their outlook.

It is not fortuitous, of course, that the Chinese splitters have slipped into Left-wing opportunism. There was much that inclined them for this, including the pressure of petty-bourgeois anarchy, an inadequate proletarian ideological and political schooling, certain traditions and certain peculiar historical features. However, one cannot fail to see that in choosing a position most advantageous for attacking the world Communist movement, the CPC leaders preferred Left-wing opportunism also because they saw the complete ideological bankruptcy of Right-wing opportunism. They believed "Leftist" pseudo-revolutionary phrase-mongering to be a more reliable means of justifying the failures of their domestic social-economic experiments. This "Leftist" pseudo-revolutionary phrase-mongering is designed also to win for their egoistic policy those

working folk who rise to the revolutionary struggle on the crest of the wave of the great historical developments of today, but whose ideological and political training is still inadequate.

In the person of the Chinese leaders the international Communist movement is faced with a trend that is petty-bourgeois in social roots, nationalistic in political aims and Left-wing opportunist — with a goodly dose of Trotskyism added — in ideology.

* * *

By working hard to thrust on the Communist movement their own erroneous views and attitudes that are leading towards a split, the CPC leaders have themselves produced a situation where a resolute struggle against their ideological and political platform has become the way to unity. Explaining the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the general line of the Communist movement and exposing the theoretical distortions, demagogy and slander has become a vital and indispensable task of defending creative Marxism and, consequently, of fighting for the ideological unity of our movement.

At the same time Marxist-Leninists proceed from the premise that it is primarily social practice that shows us which theory is right and which is wrong.

The editorial in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* of March 31 ends with a chapter entitled "Our Hopes." What are the Chinese leaders' hopes? It appears they hope for the unconditional ideological surrender of all who do not share their views, for success in imposing their policy on other parties by blackmail, slander and threats.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have a different view of the prospects and upshot of the differences in our movement. They will not vie with the Chinese leaders in blackmail, slander and invective and are not demanding ideological surrender.

Our confidence in the ultimate restoration and consolidation of the unity of the Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism derives from quite different sources.

Consistently pursuing their general line, the Communist parties are demonstrating its validity and correctness. They are demonstrating this by scoring success after success in building socialism and communism, developing the economy and culture of the new society, improving democracy and the welfare of the working people, and enhancing the might of the socialist world system. They are demonstrating this by winning new victories in the struggle the working class and all the working people in the capitalist countries are waging against the monopolies, to achieve democracy and pave the way for a revolutionary transition to socialism. They are demonstrating this by organizing the victorious struggle of the oppressed peoples for freedom and independence and helping them to find the best paths of economic and social progress. They are demonstrating this by successfully battling for peace and peaceful coexistence. They are demonstrating this by developing internationalist relations of solidarity, equality and comradely assistance between all forces of the world Communist and liberation movement.

Every success achieved and every victory won along this road is one more contribution to the struggle for unity in the Communist movement, meaning also ideological unity, for the triumph of creative Marxism-Leninism. Social practice, the actual course of developments, will increasingly show the ideological poverty of the splitters and the subjectivist and adventuristic character of their policy. As for all those who have been deluded, because of political immaturity and inexperience, to take the wrong attitude, they will be surely brought back to the correct path by all the Communist parties achieve in practice in carrying forward the Leninist general line.

The Communist movement rejects the position of the Chinese leaders, who have spearheaded their struggle not against imperialism but against the fraternal parties which do not subscribe to their views and do not want to yield to their exhortations.

The Marxist-Leninist parties always remember that the main task history has placed on the Communists is to battle against imperialism, for peace, national independence and democracy, for socialism. It is in the vital interests of this struggle to have inviolable unity between the socialist countries, and between all Communists of the world. Holding high the banner of creative Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the world Communist movement will foil the designs of the splitters and rally all revolutionary forces still more firmly together.

PLENARY MEETING, CENTRAL COMMITTEE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRIA

REPORT* BY COMRADE FRANZ MUHRI, MAY 6, 1964

Our Party's views on the situation in the international Communist movement, on the ideological and political differences with the Communist Party of China, were stated in detail at the Plenary meeting of our Central Committee held on August 22, 1963, and in the autumn these problems were discussed throughout the Party. Later developments were taken up at the January 27-28 plenary meeting of the CC. Since then, however, it has become necessary to make a more detailed examination of the situation in the world Communist movement.

The salient new development is that in recent months the Chinese comrades have begun openly pursuing, on both the "theoretical" and the practical plane, a line aimed at a split, which they claim is inevitable, in the Communist parties, a line aimed at disrupting the international Communist movement. Such aggravation of the differences contains the threat of a split in the socialist camp as well.

Following the repeated proposals that the public polemic be discontinued, made by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Chinese comrades on October 25 and November 7, 1963, in two speeches by Comrade Khrushchov which were published in the press, the CC, CPSU once again addressed a letter to the CC, CPC on November 29, 1963. The tone of this letter was restrained and friendly.

The CC, CPSU suggested to the Chinese comrades that, the ideological and political differences notwithstanding, steps be taken without delay to improve the relations between the two Parties and countries. Agreement to increase trade between the two states was envisaged as one such step. Further, reopening of the negotiations on deliveries to China of industrial plant from the beginning of 1964, which were postponed on China's request for two years in 1962, was suggested as another. A suggestion was made to expand technical co-operation, and it was offered, if China wished it, to send Soviet specialists for work in that country. The letter also raised the question of settling border conflicts between the Soviet Union and China by precise demarcation of the frontier in disputed areas.

Finally, the CC, CPSU once again urged that the open polemics be discontinued, without, however, terminating the exchange of views on questions of principle. On the contrary, such exchange should be continued through mutual consultation, negotiations, etc. The CPSU voiced the opinion that such steps to improve the relations between the two Parties and countries could create a favorable climate for preparations for an international meeting of the Communist parties.

---

*Abridged from **Volksstimme**, May 13, 1964.

To underscore its good will, the CPSU refrained from public debate with the Communist Party of China even before this message was sent.

THE CPC IS STEERING TOWARDS A SPLIT

Instead of replying to this letter, the CPC stepped up the public polemic. Its sallies reached a new peak in a long article published in *Jenminjihpao* on February 4, 1964.

This article—the "seventh reply" as it was called—treats of the problem of unity or split in the international Communist movement. "What does the history of the development of the international Communist movement demonstrate?" the article reads. "First, it demonstrates that like everything else, the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is inevitably reflected in the Communist ranks. It is inevitable that opportunism of one kind or another should arise in the course of the development of the Communist movement, that opportunists should engage in anti-Marxist-Leninist splitting activities and that Marxist-Leninists should wage struggles against opportunism and splittism. . . .

"This is exactly what happened. The Communist League, the First International and Second International, all of which were originally unified, divided in two in the course of their development and became two conflicting parts. Each time the international struggle against opportunism and splittism carried the international working-class movement forward to a new stage and enabled it to forge a firmer and broader unity on a new basis. The victory of the October Revolution and the founding of the Third International were the greatest achievements in the struggle against the Second International's revisionism and splittism.

"Unity, struggle or even splits, and a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement."

The Chinese comrades thus seek theoretically to prove that a split in the world Communist movement and in the various Communist parties is in the natural order of things. They schematically apply their completely one-sided and erroneous interpretation of the preceding period in history to the present time, to the contemporary world Communist movement, just as if no changes had ever taken place. The above-mentioned article completely lacks a creative analysis of the situation today. No qualitative distinction is drawn between Social Democracy and the Second International at the turn of the century, on the one hand, and the Communist parties and the international Communist movement of today, on the other. According to this fatalistic concept, the international Communist movement has nothing but a split to look forward to. The Chinese comrades completely ignore the main problem of the west-European working-class movement—the division into the Social Democratic and Communist trends. The same applies to the persistent effort the Communists are exerting to overcome this division, to defeat reformism in the working-class movement. The Chinese comrades turn away from this decisive task

and concentrate their attacks on the Communist parties instead. In reality the pseudo-revolutionary line of the Chinese leaders tends to weaken the struggle against reformism and opportunism.

Secondly, the article declares that the CPSU can no longer be considered to be in the van of the world Communist movement. "Marx and Engels pointed out," it says, "that the trade union movement in Britain and the political struggle of the French working class were successively in the van of the international proletarian movement. After the defeat of the Paris Commune, Engels said that 'the German workers have for the moment been placed in the vanguard of the proletarian struggle' . . . At the beginning of the 20th century the Russian working class, standing at the forefront of the international proletarian movement, won victory in the proletarian revolution for the first time in history. . . . By embarking on the path of revisionism and splittism, the leaders of the CPSU automatically forfeited the position of 'head' in the international Communist movement."

The question arises: what is the aim pursued in presenting the issue in this light? The only conclusion we can draw is that the Chinese leaders are clearly striving to establish their hegemony in the world Communist movement.

Under these circumstances, when the Chinese comrades are directing their main fire against the Soviet state and the fraternal Communist Party of the Soviet Union in order to undermine solidarity with the first socialist country, we Austrian Communists declare that, as before, we regard the Soviet Union and the glorious Party of Lenin as the main bulwark of strength of the international Communist movement and all those who are fighting for peace, democracy, independence and socialism. We likewise resolutely repudiate the attacks levelled against Comrade Khrushchov, whose tireless work for peace and to develop socialist democracy and the socialist economy is of signal importance not only for the Soviet Union but for the entire international working-class and liberation movement as well. Comrade Khrushchov is rightfully accorded growing respect, recognition and trust by the peoples, the Austrian workers and other working people included.

Thirdly, in their "seventh reply" the Communist Party of China openly declares that the Chinese comrades are rendering every support to factional and splinter groups in the various countries and parties. "In the international Communist movement, we have contacts with revisionists," it says, "why then can we not have contacts with Marxist-Leninists? The CPSU leaders describe our support for Marxist-Leninists in other countries as a divisive act. In our opinion, it's simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge." Here we have a practical conclusion from the above-mentioned thesis of the Chinese comrades that a split is allegedly necessary, inevitable and even useful.

The Communist Party of China, like the Albanian Party of Labor, is now investing a great deal of effort and money in organizing and supporting disruptive activity.

The CPC leaders are stubbornly pursuing a policy of setting up

new "Communist parties" consisting of splinter groups and factions or declaring such groups to be parties. The object is to build up a new bloc under their leadership, counterposed to the international Communist movement. They lay claim to the right to be the sole judges of which countries are socialist and which are not, which parties are Communist and which are not, which political line is the correct one and which erroneous.

Fourthly, the Chinese comrades state their views in the above-mentioned article also on the question of terminating the public polemic. Although they formerly urged on repeated occasions that the open debate be ended, they now take the opposite view. They write: "These major differences of principle cannot be solved in a fundamental way by a cessation of the public debate. On the contrary, only through public debate, setting forth the facts and reasoning things out, will it be possible to clarify matters, distinguish right from wrong, and safeguard and strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Marxism-Leninism is a science, and science fears no debate. Anything which fears debate is no science."

We would like to ask the Chinese comrades: what is there in common between scientific debate and your insults and lies about the leaders and policies of other Communist parties? What is there in common between scientific debate and your intensive disruptive and factional activities, between science and your line which is aimed at splitting the international Communist movement?

The so-called "seventh reply" essentially signifies aggravation of the polemic and rejection of the positive proposals put forward by the CPSU on November 29, 1963.

NEW EFFORT FOR UNITY

In this situation the CC, CPSU sent a letter to the fraternal parties on February 12, 1964, pointing out that the CPC still had not replied to its November 29 message and that the Chinese comrades were intensively continuing the open polemic as well as their disruptive activities. The Soviet comrades also informed us in this letter that they would state their views at a plenary meeting of their Central Committee in mid-February and would subsequently publish the report delivered at this meeting as well as its resolution, thereby coming out once again in public debate. Under the circumstances, the letter further stated, the CPSU considered it essential to take a resolute stand against the splitters and to reconsider the question of convening an international meeting of Communist parties. Previously, too, the CPSU and many other parties were for the convocation of such a meeting in principle, but did not press the matter, believing that it should be preceded by thorough preparation so as to create the prerequisites for the achievement of unity. Now, however, the real aims of the Communist Party of China had become perfectly clear. It was out to gain time, to put off the international meeting, in order to deepen the rift and to set up factions, groups and new "parties" in as many countries as possible. Therefore, the letter said,

the CPSU considered it inexpedient to put off the international meeting any longer.

In this situation the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party addressed a letter on February 14 to the CC, CPSU asking that the materials of the February plenum be not published for the time being. The Rumanian Party proposed to undertake one more attempt at reconciliation. The Rumanian Party informed us that it had sent a letter on February 14 to the CPC, pointing out, with reference to the Chinese comrades' article of February 4, 1964, that such exacerbation of the polemic would inevitably lead to a split in the Communist movement. The Rumanian Party urged the CPC to refrain from public polemics and offered to send a Rumanian Party delegation to Peking.

To this Rumanian initiative, which was supported by other fraternal parties, the CC, CPSU replied at once that in view of this attempt to mediate it would not publish its plenum documents. But if after the steps taken by the Rumanian comrades the CPC did not stop the public polemic, the reply stated further, the CPSU would be compelled to reconsider the matter.

On February 17 the CPC informed the Rumanian comrades that it was ready to receive on March 1 a delegation empowered to conduct talks and that it would refrain for the time being from open polemics, which it did. At the same time, other fraternal parties likewise wrote to the CPC urging it to end the public debate.

On February 19 our Party wrote to the CC, CPC urging the Chinese comrades to put a stop to the public debate which was causing serious harm to the entire world Communist movement and giving rise to a grave threat of a split; this, however, did not exclude a businesslike discussion of problems. We published the text of this letter in *Volksstimme* on April 4.

The Chinese comrades have not answered us to this day. They merely handed to a representative of our Central Committee, through their Embassy in Prague, copies of letters exchanged by the CPSU and CPC with which we already were acquainted.

It was only on February 29, 1964, when the Rumanian delegation left for Peking, that the CC, CPC replied to the CC, CPSU letter of November 29, 1963. The Chinese letter dealt with the proposals of the CPSU point by point.

In regard to the proposal to end the public polemic, the Chinese letter stated that for this bilateral and multi-lateral talks and the conclusion of a corresponding agreement were essential, since the CPC had not yet replied to many of what it called attacks by the CPSU and other Communist parties. The CPC also expressed the view that the proposed meeting of Communist and Workers' parties should be properly prepared, and to this end it suggested reopening bilateral talks between representatives of the CPSU and the CPC between October 10 and 25 this year. Following these talks a committee consisting of representatives of 17 fraternal parties (the 13 parties of the socialist countries and the Indonesian, Japanese, Italian and French praties) could begin preparations for the meeting. Such a

committee would thus include the representatives of a number of Communist parties close to the CPC.

The time schedule proposed by the Chinese comrades for the preparatory work clearly shows that they are only too eager to put off the meeting so as to gain as much time as possible.

The CC, CPSU replied to the Chinese letter at once, on March 7, when the Rumanian Party delegation was still in Peking. Once again the need to end the public polemic was stressed. The CPSU accepted the idea of bilateral negotiations and proposed that they be held in May 1964. The Soviet comrades likewise agreed that they be held in May 1964. The Soviet comrades likewise agreed that a committee be set up to prepare the international meeting, but suggested that its composition be the same as during the preparations for the international meeting of 1960, when it was made up of the representatives of 26 fraternal parties. It was suggested that the committee meet in June-July, so that the international meeting could be held in the autumn. The CPC replied to this letter only after the plenum with a virtual rejection of these proposals.

The results of the talks the delegation of the Rumanian fraternal Party had early in March with the Chinese leaders in Peking can be seen from the statement published by the Rumanian Workers' Party. The Rumanian comrades stated that they had considered it their main purpose to bring the public debate to an immediate termination. The Chinese comrades, however, had replied that this could be done only if the conditions were agreed upon in the course of bilateral or multilateral talks. Until such agreement, and even while the negotiations were going on, the polemics should be continued. The Rumanian comrades thus failed to persuade the Chinese leaders to desist.

On March 24, when its delegation had already returned from Peking, the Rumanian Party once again turned to the Soviet and Chinese parties in an attempt to stop the open debate.

On March 28 the Soviet comrades replied that they accepted the Rumanian proposal, although the CPSU under no circumstances could agree to the Chinese comrades' putting off their reply to this initiative indefinitely while continuing to assail the CPSU and the world Communist movement in public.

THEIR REPLY: NEW ATTACKS AND ACCUSATIONS

To this day the Chinese comrades have not replied to the Rumanian Party's letter of March 25. Instead, they published on March 31 another long article, the so-called "eighth reply" to the open letter of the CC, CPSU of July 14, 1963. This article contained particularly vicious attacks and accusations.

The article challenges the orientation of the Communist parties on the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism. "Khrushchov maintains," it says, "that if the proletariat can win the majority in Parliament, this in itself will amount to the seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machinery . . . Khrushchov holds that if the proletariat can win a stable majority in Parliament,

this in itself will enable it to realize the socialist transformation of society . . . But abundant historical evidence indicates that the reactionary classes never give up power voluntarily. . . ."

This is a downright distortion of facts, for neither comrade Khrushchov nor the new Program of the CPSU, nor any document of any West-European Communist Party for that matter, seek to uphold such a line. Our program principles concerning Austria's road to socialism are in full agreement with the viewpoint of the Soviet and other fraternal parties; in this document we underscore the fact that peaceful transition to socialism is possible only through revolutionary class and mass struggle, in the course of which the positions won by the working class in Parliament should be utilized.

In their "eighth reply" the Chinese comrades for the first time call for revision of the agreed decisions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings of the Communist parties. In their opinion, the orientation on the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism but forward in both documents should be re-examined. I quote: "We hold that in the interests of the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and in order to prevent the revisionists from misusing these programmatic documents of the fraternal parties, it is necessary to amend the formulation of the question in the Declaration and the Statement through joint consultation of Communist and Workers' parties so as to conform to the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism."

How far the Chinese comrades go in distorting the truth in this article can be seen from the following passage: ". . . Using the pretext of these very changes in postwar conditions, Khrushchov draws the conclusion that revolution must be opposed and repudiated, and he holds that as a result of the changes in the world balance of forces imperialism and reaction have changed their nature, the law of class struggle has changed, and the common road of the October Revolution and the Marxist-Leninist theory of proletarian revolution have become outmoded."

Where and when has Comrade Khrushchov, or any of the other leaders of the Communist parties against whom accusations have been levelled, defended such a viewpoint? The Chinese comrades cannot cite a single instance to prove their point.

A section of the article is devoted to assailing the internal development of the Soviet Union.

The article of March 31 marked a new culmination point in the attacks made by the CPC. We cannot but tell the Chinese comrades that such vilification of the Soviet Union plays directly into the hands of our class enemy by undermining the faith of the masses in socialism.

The Chinese comrades' "eighth reply" in effect amounted to a rejection of the new attempt made by the Rumanian comrades to end the public debate.

The day the Chinese article was published, the CC, CPSU informed the Rumanian Party that the CPSU, which had refrained from public polemics since the autumn of 1963, was now compelled openly to state its views in reply to the CPC.

COMRADE SUSLOV'S SPEECH

On April 3 the CPSU published the speech delivered by Comrade Suslov at the February (1964) plenary meeting of the CC, CPSU and the resolution adopted by that meeting on February 15 on "The Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity of the World Communist Movement". We were in full agreement with the basic propositions set forth in this speech, which once again surveyed the principal issues on which there are differences with the CPC, and made a profound analysis of the present situation in the international Communist movement.

We thoroughly examined the substance of the political and ideological difference between the world Communist movement and the CPC at our plenary meetings in January and August last year and stated our views on this matter. Today, without going into the details, I should like briefly to summarize the issues at stake in the light of new developments.

1. The speech by Suslov correctly proceeds from the fact that the struggle beween world socialism and world imperialism constitutes the main content of our time and that the socialist world system is the main bulwark of all the revolutionary forces of the day. Contrary to this view, the Chinese comrades, going against the agreed decisions of 1957 and 1960, hold that the decisive factor of world development is the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

While the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties adhere to the viewpoint, recorded in the 1957 and 1960 decisions, that the socialist countries influence international development above all through their efforts in economic upbuilding, their successes in the economic competition between the two systems, by the force of example, the Chinese comrades increasingly refuse to draw on the advantages of international division of labor, of economic, scientific and technical co-operation between the socialist countries. They underestimate the role of the economic competition between the two systems and lay the emphasis, in a one-sided way, as Trotskyism did in its time, on the armed forms of national and international class struggle. Hence their campaign against peaceful coexistence, against orientation on peaceful transition to socialism.

2. The struggle for peaceful coexistence and the struggle for democracy, independence and socialism should be regarded as an integral whole. The Chinese comrades counterpose these two sides of the single world revolutionary process to one another, describing, in defiance of the facts, the policy of peaceful coexistence as representing capitulation to imperialism. They fail to see the nature of nuclear war and the new opportunities to fight for peace which are opening to the peoples in our time. The striving of the Chinese leaders to gain possession of nuclear weapons or to launch the manufacture of their own nuclear bomb in effect plays into the hands of the West-German and Japanese imperialists, who are reaching out for nuclear armaments.

3. The Chinese leaders are pursuing a policy aimed at isolating the national-liberation movement from the Soviet Union and the West-

European working-class movement. Moreover, in doing so they draw on nationalistic and race prejudices. This runs counter to the thesis accepted by the world Communist movement that the socialist world system, the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement constitute an integral anti-imperialist force.

The Chinese comrades criticize the Communist parties on the grounds that the struggle for peaceful co-existence and disarmament allegedly prejudice the interests of the national-liberation movement. Recently Chou En-lai, the Premier of the Chinese People's Republic, toured Asia and Africa. In nearly all the countries he visited he put his signature to a joint communique recognizing the need for international detente, peaceful settlement of conflicts without the use of force, and disarmament, i.e., peaceful coexistence. It may be asked: what is it that should be taken seriously—the Chinese leaders' criticism of the Communist parties, or the statements they sign in support of peaceful coexistence?

4. The Chinese leaders have long attacked the new Program of the CPSU, the entire home policy of the Soviet Union, and the orientation on the deepening of socialist democracy in the course of the building of communism. Now they openly say that the Soviet Union is returning to capitalism.

The declarations of the Chinese comrades elevate the use of violence to an absolute law and ignore the need to strengthen democracy. More than that, they accuse other fraternal parties of revisionism precisely on the grounds that these parties aim at extending democracy: in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries at strengthening socialist democracy, and in the capitalist countries, at the regeneration of democracy through restricting the power of the big capitalists. Precisely this orientation on promoting democracy is the basic issue in our discussions with the Socialists and in working for unity of action among all democratic forces.

Our task today consists not so much in convincing the Socialists that we Communists are for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The decisive, and far more difficult, task which we must carry out is to prove that we want to achieve a new and higher degree of democracy, that communism and democracy are not mutually exclusive.

5. The Chinese leaders are increasingly concentrating their attacks not against imperialism but against the world Communist movement, in particular against the Soviet Union, the CPSU and Comrade Khrushchov personally. They are openly steering a course towards a split in the world Communist movement and in the various parties, towards the creation of factions; they are out to organize a bloc of splitters under the leadership of the CPC.

FOR THE RESTORATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF UNITY

Rejecting the erroneous and harmful views and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders and urging the termination of the public debate in its present form, we reaffirm the thesis set forth in our letter of February 19, 1964, to the CC, CPC: "Differences and disagreements between Communist parties should be cleared up through mutual

consultations and closed meetings, or solved in the course of events, which does not exclude businesslike discussion of problems."

As regards the attitude of our Party towards the convocation of an international meeting, we believe that such a meeting would be useful provided it is thoroughly prepared through consultations between parties with a view to achieving maximum unity in the international Communist movement.

Precisely because our enemies speak of a crisis of world communism, we must not lose sight of the fact that the contradictions and differences in the world Communist movement emerged on the basis of its growth and momentous achievements. Although we are seriously disturbed by the present situation in the Communist movement, we share the view which was voiced in Comrade Suslov's speech at the February plenary meeting of the CC, CPSU in the following words: "The facts show that a grim and, evidently, long struggle lies ahead for the strengthening of the unity of all the socialist forces, for friendship and co-operation between the Soviet and Chinese peoples. . . . The CC, CPSU is certain that no matter how great the difficulties experienced by the world Communist movement, that movement will be strong enough to surmount them and to cement its ranks in the struggle for the great Communist cause."

We can make our contribution to the creation of new unity above all by preserving, strengthening and consolidating the unity of our own Party.

INTERVIEW* WITH ARMAND NICOLAS, GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY OF MARTINIQUE

Question: In his speech at Fort de France General de Gaulle spoke at length about France's efforts, in particular on Martinique, and about the progress achieved there. What is the actual state of affairs, and in what way does de Gaulle's Antilles policy manifest itself?

Answer: The situation on Martinique is, of course, not as idyllic as it was described in the accounts of de Gaulle during his over-optimistic Latin-American tour. Coué's method, accompanied by the refrain "All is well, my Marquise" has virtually been made a government policy. The publicity regarding France's "achievements" was part of the show put on to "idealize" colonialism, to gild the emblem of departmentalization which has lost its luster, and to keep alive the legend about the good general, the "decolonizer".

In point of fact, however, Martinique presents an entirely different picture: it has no industry to speak of; the old economic structure has remained intact: the emphasis continues to be on agriculture which is geared for export of certain crops (sugar, bananas, pineapples), making the island dependent on France for its manufactured goods and foodstuffs; the production of sugar cane continues to be extremely limited (France has monopolized this branch of industry since the 18th century when the operation of sugar refineries on Martinique was prohibited by a Royal decree); the island still suffers from the non-equivalent trade exchange based on the Colonial Treaty.

FIVE CENTIMES FOR A KILOGRAM OF BANANAS

Practically all crops have been affected by a crisis. Bananas are sold at a loss (sometimes for 5 old francs a kilogram). This has led to the entire crop being destroyed (20,000 tons in 1961). The market for pineapples has been badly hit and is recovering with difficulty. The high sugar prices on the world market in 1963 did not benefit the island in the least. Retaining the old prices the colonialists made a deal which netted them a clear profit of more than 4,000 million francs. The deficit in the trade balance is steadily growing: in 1963 it reached 19,000 million old francs; our exports cover only 49.5 per cent of imports.

20,000 YOUNG PEOPLE UNEMPLOYED

The economic situation is having social repercussions. Poverty is widespread in the countryside: for eight months of the year 35,000 agricultural workers are without work. The small plantation owners

*L'Humanité, April 10, 1964.

(peasants) have to contend with innumerable difficulties and debts. The destruction caused by the hurricane "Edith" has further aggravated the situation. But it is the youth who have to bear the full brunt of unemployment: according to official figures 20,000 young people have no work. (Martinique's population is estimated at 300,000).

THE "BEKES" OWN 75 PER CENT OF THE LAND

In the past two years three of the island's 12 sugar refineries have been closed down, with the result that additional hundreds of workers have found themselves without jobs. The Government's solution of the unemployment problem is a typically colonialist one: on the pretext of giving the youth a professional training in France, it is organizing their mass emigration and thus depriving the island of its life-giving force. France's overseas departments have become the suppliers of unskilled labor power (domestic servants, waitresses, etc.).

In order to conceal the real situation the de Gaulle government ever since the big popular actions of December 1959, has been pursuing a policy of throwing dust into the eyes of the public. With this end in view the port is being enlarged, an air-port and motor highway are being built, the hillsides of Fort de France are being cleared of slums which will be replaced by several new buildings. Such are the spectacular "achievements", which are primarily in the sphere of commercial undertakings and which will ultimately make for still greater colonial plunder.

The government has blazoned about its "agraraian reform". This "reform" in effect consists of several hundreds of hectares being purchased from the big landowners at a high price and then resold to peasants who in order to buy the land get into debt for the rest of their lives. This "reform" has not hurt the interests of the "békés", (the descendants of the slaveholders) who continue to control 75 per cent of the land.

There has been much talk about "plans" and "industrialization". After thunderous fulminations against the Communists, who showed that industrialization was feasible, official circles finally, in 1960, "discovered" the advantages of industrialization. But to date the only "achievement" in this sphere has been the project to build an industrial zone in Lamentin.

There has also been a lot of talk about social achievements, but these have not made things easier for the tens of thousands of unemployed. On the other hand, not a word has been said about the fact that the Government has been compelled to make some concessions under pressure of the masses. Beginning with 1960, the powerful strikes that swept the island, some of them bloody ones (3 killed and 25 wounded in Lamantin in 1961), have yielded positive results. It should also be stressed that the Government made concessions under pressure of the movement for autonomy. The Government's so-called achievements are therefore actually the result of the struggle waged by the people of Martinique. The real purpose of the Government's policy of throwing dust into the eyes is to prevent the autono-

my movement gaining ground, to establish its alibi in the eyes of world public opinion.

I might also note that in our so-called "department enjoying equal rights", discrimination in the sphere of wages, social benefits, etc., and a state of emergency is a common practice (under the decree of October 15, 1960 prefects have the right to deport to France "any official whose behavior is likely to disturb public order".

The Government's concessions are accompanied by repressions against the anti-colonial forces, and in particular against the Martinique Communist Party (the Party's weekly organ *Justice* was banned fourteen times in the past three years; Communists are dismissed from their jobs, Party functionaries are arrested, etc.). Everybody still remembers the arrest of the twelve young people as a result of a veritable colonialist conspiracy. The police network is steadily being extended: millions are being spent on the construction of huge police stations. (What price "social achievements"!)

Finally, I might note that the rigging of elections to ensure the election of politicians loyal to the colonial power has been practically legalized. French public opinion should know that the "yes-men" do not represent the Martinique population.

Such is the real state of affairs on Martinique today. It hardly fits in with the description of the islands a a "paradise" in the period of "departmentalization" and de Gaulle colonialism.

DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF PEOPLE OF MARTINIQUE

Question: The head of the state particularly stressed the French character of Martinique and its people. What do you think about this?

Answer: The President's statement to this effect is clearly intended to conceal the colonial regime on Martinique on the assumption that Martinique is France and that the island's people are French. The conclusion is therefore drawn that there is no need for "decolonization".

It would be futile to deny, of course, that three centuries of "French presence" including a century of the policy of assimilation, have left their imprint on our people. It goes without saying that our people have the greatest admiration for French progressive culture and for the democratic France as symbolized by the ideals of the 1789 revolution, the anti-slave movement of 1848 and the Popular Front of 1936. History has closely linked the democratic forces of France with the people of Martinique.

But the fact remains that our people has its own distinctive character which has been shaped by its own particular historical evolution (two centuries of slavery), ethnic composition, geographic position, etc. A sense of national consciousness, of the distinctive character of its people is developing in the new generation.

MARTINIQUE IS MOVING IN STEP WITH THE TIMES

Question: Please tell us about the aspirations of the people of Martinique and the policy of the Martinique Communist Party.

Answer: Martinique is beginning to move in step with the times. The policy of assimilation has met with failure everywhere. The world is now swept by a powerful national liberation movement. It has spread to even the smallest countries, the "specks of dust" as General de Gaulle scornfully remarked. Nobody can halt this process. Several Antilles islands (Jamaica, Trinidad) have won their independence. The Cuban socialist revolution has by its example shown the way to the rest of Latin America. All this has naturally made a deep impact on our island. Our people, like all other peoples, want to be the masters of their own destiny, that is, want to conduct their own affairs. The Martinique Communist Party was the first to voice these aspiartions of the people. To this end it has advanced a program of demands in keeping with the specific conditions of Martinique. This program will make it possible to achieve the broadest unity of all sections of the population, to discard all subjectivism, all tendencies to mechanically copy the experience of other peoples.

FRONT OF STRUGGLE FOR AUTONOMY

That is why we have advanced the slogan of autonomy, i.e., for the establishment of autonomous power (with a consultative assembly and an executive organ) which will conduct the affairs of Martinique and establish new relations with France, based on co-operation and association. Autonomy would enable the people of Martinique to carry out the tasks of the anti-imperialist revolution (agrarian reform, industrialization, annulment of the colonial treaty, democratization of institutions, development of our national culture).

To achieve this our Party has set as its paramount task to unite all social strata who are the victims of colonialism and to establish a front of struggle for autonomy, an alliance of parties, organizations and individuals who want to wage joint actions on the basis of a common program.

Some progress has been made in this direction. In December 1963 twenty-four organizations of the Antilles and Réunion signed a manifesto calling for autonomy. It was signed on behalf of Martinique by the Communist Party, the Progressive Party, the United Socialist Party, the General Confederation of Labor (the leading trade union organization), the Women's Union, the Communist Youth League, the Anti-Colonialist Youth Organization, and by other organizations of Martinique in France.

Thus, our Party's correct united front policy has led to significant results.

Question: What can you tell us about the struggle of your people?

Answer: The struggle of our people has reached new heights in recent times, thanks to the decisive role played by the Party. The trade unions have forged ahead. The numerous actions in defense of economic demands, have affected all sectors. The manifestations in defense of freedom, and for the liberation of the young people imprisoned in Fresnes are multiplying. The youth, and especially the young people of working-class and peasant families, are taking an active part in the struggle.

Our Party believes that there is every possibility in the present conditions to compel the government, through mass political action and by mobilizing the masses, to accept the demands of our people. We do not share the view of those who maintain that the solution lies through violent actions by a handful of "heroes". General de Gaulle's sharp refusal, incidentally, is bound to intensify this impatience. But we believe that any hasty action would seriously prejudice the anti-colonial movement. Recent events have proved the correctness of our general line. We should not, of course, underestimate the strong pressure brought to bear by the colonial apparatus, the difficulties caused by alienation due to the policy of assimilation.

Against this background our successes stand out in bolder relief. For example, at the recent cantonal elections (March 1964) which centered around the slogan "for or against autonomy", despite the fraud and the nomination of government-sponsored candidates, the parties standing for autonomy won half of the vote and secured the re-election of all their councillors (four Communists, three members of the Progressive Party). Our Party received 25 per cent of the vote.

THE STRUGGLE IS INTENSIFYING

The united front of the anti-colonial forces has won new victories. Such are the facts. They speak of the strength and scope of the movement for autonomy. The recent visit of the President cannot overshadow them.

The President has left and the sound and the fury have died down. The attempt to evade pressing problems by holding forth about some "great community" is nothing but an ostrich policy. The problems of Martinique remain. The contradictions inherent in its colonial society remain and they are growing sharper. The struggle of our people for freedom, progress and dignity will develop.

We are convinced that our just cause will triumph for it is supported by the progressive forces of the world, by the working class and democratic forces of France, headed by its glorious Communist Party.

We are certain that our fight in these conditions will compel the Government to satisfy our legitimate aspirations.

THE WAY FORWARD FOR CEYLON

SPEECH* BY PIETER KEUNEMAN, GENERAL SECRETARY, AT THE 7th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CEYLON, APRIL 16th, 1964.

The 6th National Congress set our Party two important tasks.

It enjoined us to build a united front of the Left Parties and through it the unity of the working class.

It called on us to build a united national front of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic forces in which the united working-class movement would play the leading role.

Our 7th Congress meets at a time when one of these tasks—the formation of a united front of the Left Parties on a common program, has been achieved and when favorable conditions have begun to mature that can lead to the accomplishment of the other task as well.

There is no need to recapitulate the steps that the Central Committee took to ensure the formation of the United Left Front in August 1963. These are set out in the political resolution. The important role that our Party played in these developments has been publicly acknowledged and appreciated by leaders of the other Left Parties.

The formation of the ULF in August 1963 was an important victory for the line of the Party, for the working class and the progressive forces of Ceylon. To ensure this victory, our Central Committee had to struggle against both Right and Left deviations and to overcome the opposition and sabotage of the Sanmugathasan-Kumarasiri clique.

As in the past, the reactionary forces seek help from the disruptive and sectarian elements in the Left movement such as the Sanmugathasan clique and people of similar views.

At the same time when the reactionary Right-wing forces were preparing a coup d'etat for January 1962, these same disruptive and sectarian elements, under cover of ultra-Left slogans, sought to stampede the Left—fortunately without success—into agreeing to a general strike about the same time.

When the reactionary forces were working tooth and nail to prevent the formation of the ULF in 1963, they enlisted the support of these very same elements to slander, discredit, oppose and try to prevent the ULF agreement.

And now the same song is being sung by the same singers.

The UNP and the other reactionary forces use the slogan of "democracy" to prevent the unity of the progressive forces. The sectarians and splitters speak of the "Left turning Right" and of "betrayal of the proletarian revolution" in order to achieve the same purpose. They are two sides of the same coin.

---

*Forward, April 24, May 1, 1964.

Neither our Party nor the ULF need be diverted by all this. Current developments only help to confirm once again the correctness of the general line our Party has followed since our 4th Congress, when we routed a similar sectarian group and advanced the policy of building a united national front, led by a united working class, to complete the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic stage of the Ceylonese revolution.

The people of Ceylon are, at present, in a new stage of our fight for national liberation. Political independence was substantially achieved after the defeat of the UNP in 1956. Since then, important advances have been made in the fight to destroy the dominance of cosmopolitanism which the imperialists imposed in the cultural sphere, and to promote national languages and culture.

These were important victories. The fight to consolidate and to secure them still continues and must be fought till victory is won.

Lenin, however, has taught us that national liberation cannot be complete unless economic emancipation is achieved. The national liberation revolution does not end with political independence. If this revolution does not solve the urgent tasks of national renascence and lead to profound changes in social and economic life, even the political independence that has been won will be insecure and constantly threatened.

This is why our Party, while carrying on the fight to strengthen political independence and promote national culture, has devoted so much attention in recent years to the fight for economic independence. We have fought to nationalize foreign capital. We have demanded the liberation of the peasantry, the majority of the population, from feudal and semi-feudal relations and from exploitation by landlords and usurers. We have advanced concrete proposals to do away with the economic structure inherited from colonialism and to develop an independent, strong and viable multi-branch economy in which industry will predominate. These ideas have gained support among the people and thus become a material force.

Our 6th Congress was held one month after the historic 1960 Meeting of the fraternal parties. The Statement and other documents of that Meeting were unanimously and enthusiastically approved by our 6th Congress.

Our 7th Congress is held under different conditions for the international Communist movement.

It is held against a background where the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party have launched an open political struggle to overthrow the general line of the 1960 Meeting, which they themselves endorsed.

It is held under conditions where the Chinese leaders openly slander and seek to overthrow the leading organs of other fraternal parties, where they openly encourage, support, promote and theoretically justify splits in other fraternal parties and in the international Communist and democratic movements.

It is no secret that the 1960 Meeting became necessary owing to the fact that in early 1960 the Chinese comrades began to express

openly in their publications and at meetings of international democratic organizations views that were opposed to the conclusions of the 1957 Declaration that all fraternal parties, including the CPC, had endorsed.

The differences expressed by the Chinese comrades were thoroughly discussed at the 1960 Meeting. The delegations from other fraternal parties, including the delegation from our own Party, expressed their disagreement with the Chinese position.

Eventually agreement was reached on a common Statement that all fraternal parties, including the CPC, signed.

Events since the 1960 Meeting show that the Chinese leaders, when signing the 1960 Statement, were not acting in a sincere and open manner towards the rest of the international Communist movement but were instead playing for time in order to prepare a new offensive.

This offensive against the general line and the unity and solidarity of the world Communist movement has since been systematically developed from one stage to another.

The CPC leaders began with what they called a "great debate" on certain ideological questions. Although the positions they advanced challenged the general line of the 1957 and 1960 Meetings of many fundamental questions, the Chinese leaders at this stage proclaimed loyalty to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

This was followed by their open letter of June 14, 1963 to the CC of the CPSU. Here the Chinese comrades came out into the open. They began an open political offensive to overthrow the general line of the 1957 and 1960 Meetings and to impose on the international Communist movement a 25-point "general line" of their own.

Needless to say, this aroused indignation and opposition among the fraternal parties.

Since then, the Chinese leaders have passed over to a massive onslaught against other fraternal parties, who do not accept their erroneous views and loyally uphold the general line of the 1957 and 1960 Meetings.

In this, they have gone beyond all limits and have trampled underfoot all norms that should regulate relations between fraternal parties.

The course on which the leaders of the CPC have embarked has nothing in common with a principled discussion of differences on ideological, strategic or tactical questions.

Any such differences that may arise between fraternal parties are capable of solution through discussion based on common fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

But what have so-called "ideological" differences to do with the reckless and unbridled slander of other fraternal parties and their leaders and leading organs that have become the chief stock-in-trade of the Chinese propagandists?

What "ideological" differences do the leaders of the CPC hope to solve by scurrilous defamations of the CPSU and its leaders whom they accuse, without any regard for truth, of a so-called "unholy alliance" with the imperialists against the peoples of the world?

What questions of Marxist-Leninist principle do they seek to eluci-

date when they call other Marxist-Leninist parties and respected leaders of world communism "betrayers", "fawners on imperialism", puppets who dance to the "batons" of others, "parrots" who are incapable of independent thought?

This is crude abuse and slander, not principled discussion.

CPC leaders say that they defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

But since when has the dissemination of nationalism and even of racism been part of the defense of Marxism-Leninism?

Since when has Marxism-Leninism had to be defended by extolling all types of opportunists, petty-bourgeois adventurists, splitters, corrupt persons and sometimes downright scoundrels as "genuine Marxist-Leninists"?

Since when has the defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism required resort to methods of personal and political corruption hitherto associated with the bourgeoisie?

CPC leaders speak day in and day out about independence and equality of all fraternal parties, big or small.

But in practice they interfere in the internal affairs of other parties, including small and young parties like ours.

They help to split other parties, set up rival "parties" and even seek to justify the existence of more than one Communist Party in a single country as something not merely quite normal but also inevitable.

They arrogate to themselves the right to declare which members of other fraternal parties are "genuine Marxist-Leninists" and which are not.

All this has created an impermissible and dangerous situation for the international Communist movement which cannot be allowed to continue.

In its statement of September 26, 1963 "On Questions of the International Communist Movement", our Central Committee set out its views on the main ideological questions raised by the Chinese comrades.

We took our stand on the positions of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement and expressed our sharp disagreement with attempts of the CC of the CPC to challenge and oppose many fundamental propositions of the Declaration and Statement which our Party had endorsed.

We cannot fight splittism in practice, internationally or at home, unless we combine the fight with a struggle against the ideological and political positions that lead to, encourage or justify such splits.

At the 1960 Meeting, the Chinese representatives fought bitterly against a proposal to include in the Statement a condemnation of factionalism in the international Communist movement.

Now they argue that the existence of more than one Communist Party in one single country is normal and legitimate.

All these "theories" have not come out of the air. They are intimately connected with the practical activity of the Chinese leaders in promoting international factionalism and splits in other fraternal parties.

Our Party has its own experience of the close and intimate connection between such Chinese "theories" and the practical attempts to split our own Party and to sabotage the United Left Front.

We know very well how the special views of the Chinese comrades were used by the anti-Party Sanmugathasan clique as a banner in their fight to split our Party and oppose the ULF. We know how the anti-unity elements in other Left parties also made those "theories" their banner.

We know the tremendous material, political and other support that the Chinese leaders have rendered these splitters at every stage of their campaign.

We know that techniques and methods adopted by the Sanmugathasan splitters' group against our Party are part of a general pattern used against other fraternal parties, encouraged and promoted by the CPC leaders.

It is not only in Ceylon that anti-Party elements have been encouraged and supported to set up rival so-called "Communist Parties" on the basis of the special views of the Chinese leaders. Similar developments have also taken place in Brazil, Australia, Britain, Belgium and other countries and are being attempted in others as well.

Let not anyone think that the Sanmugathasans and Kumarasiris were unique in adopting the ludicrous technique, after their expulsion from the Party, of holding a mock assembly claiming to be the 7th Congress of our Party, electing a so-called "Central Committee" whose names they are not even ready to reveal, and informing the bourgeois press that they had "expelled" the members of the Central Committee and other leaders of our Party. A similar mockery took place in Peru and will, no doubt, be repeated elsewhere if conditions permit. Although this mockery only aroused derision and contempt in Ceylon, it was solemnly broadcast over Peking Radio and given great publicity in Chinese and Chinese-sponsored publications.

We must tell the Chinese propagandists that it is the members of the Ceylon Communist Party and not anyone in Peking or elsewhere who decide what is the 7th Congress and who are the leaders and members of our Party.

Let us say this straight and let there be no mistake about it. The Communists of Ceylon have never accepted and will never accept the imperialist thesis about "two Chinas". Likewise we do not accept and will never accept the Peking thesis about two Communist Parties in Ceylon.

The splitters and some of their apologists sometimes try to make out that the relations between our Party and the CPC became abnormal only after the CC resolution of September 26. This is absurd and contrary to facts.

To start with, the September 26 CC resolution provides no excuse for the CPC leaders encouraging and supporting factional and splitting activities inside our Party. Political differences are one thing and the promotion of splits quite another.

But it is also necessary to emphasize that Chinese political and material support for this group of splitters dates back to a period

much earlier than September 26. In point of fact, direct relations between ourselves and the CPC, which had hitherto been cordial, suddenly stopped on their part after the end of 1962 when we took up a different position from theirs on the events of the Caribbean crisis and in our appraisal of certain events connected with the Sino-Indian border clash.

It was after this that representatives of the CPC, by-passing the CC and its elected officers, sought to strengthen and support those who took the path of factionalism and splittism.

You all know that Sanmugathasan and his clique were not expelled from our Party for their political views but for shameless and deliberate anti-Party factionalism, for undermining the unity of the Party and seeking to split it and set up a rival "Party" for which prior arrangements had been made from about March 1963. The details are set out in the CC resolution which was published.

You are also aware that the CC assured all members that no one would be punished for holding different views but only if they engaged in anti-Party factionalism and supported efforts to split the Party. Without even inquiring to find out what happened, the *Peking Review* says, without a blush, that their expulsion was "unwarranted".

It is also worth mentioning that Kumarasiri's case was, at this time, still under review by the Central Committee and that only Sanmugathasan had been expelled from the Party. The other persons mentioned as "genuine Marxist-Leninists" were at the time not even on a Party charge.

No doubt *Peking Review* and those who publish it consider it qute "unwarranted" and legitimate for members of the Political Bureau, as Sanmugathasan was, to oppose the ULF policy of the Party in public lectures, articles and press interviews, to organize separate demonstrations opposed to those organized by the Party and the ULF on the oil question, to attempt to set up under the guise a so-called "Marxist Study Circle" the nucleus of a Party within the Party, with its own platform and list of members, to set up parallel newspapers, youth organizations and women's organizations to those of the Party and opposed to the Party, to seek to misuse his position in the trade union field to set the workers against the Party and the ULF.

After all, this is precisely what Peking is now doing both in Ceylon and internationally.

WHO ARE THE SPLITTERS?

Does *Peking Review* expect any Ceylonese Communist to take seriously its claim that those it names are real revolutionaries and genuine Marxist-Leninists.

Kumarasiri, for instance, was the leading spokesman of Right opportunism in our Central Committee, the main exponent of complete capitulation to the national bourgeoisie, the man who openly boasted in the CC that he had opposed all mass struggles after the SLFP government came to power.

Yet *Peking Review* considers him a "genuine revolutionary".

Our members know very well the real character and actions of

some of the people whom *Peking Review* dubs as "genuine Marxist-Leninists".

We know the person who has become the so-called "Assistant National Organizer" of the splitters' party. We all know his reputation in regard to financial matters. The Badulla comrades framed serious charges of financial irregularities against him, and a Party commission, which inquired into the matter found him guilty.

But before the CC could deal with him, he became a "genuine Marxist-Leninist" — à la Peking.

Another leading member of the splitters' Central Committee had the brazenness to tell us that he had been offered Rs. 5,000 to join the splitters but was prepared to reconsider the matter if we offered him the same amount in turn.

The splitters — or at least the leading ones — are doing well out of their apostasy.

Several of them have been provided with new well-furnished houses, vehicles and other amenities.

They and their wives have been given jobs — and the pay is not bad either.

All this undoubtedly helps them to develop a truly "revolutionary" spirit!

Do the editors of *Peking Review* know how some of the signatures to the documents they publish are obtained? Take the case of one of our comrades who was a full-time worker in the CTUF. He was not paid his allowance for several months and put into economic difficulties. He was then told that he would be paid provided he signed a document condemning the CC.

It is quite obvious that the Chinese publicists do not care what stick they pick up to beat our Party. They should read the articles we published from Comrades like S. S. de Silva who left the splitters in disgust, exposing their true face.

Of course there were a few genuine and confused persons who were deceived by the splitters and joined them temporarily. Some have come back to the Party, others have dropped out and become non-political, and some have made approaches to the Party to take them back. But the main core of the splitters are a gang of opportunists and renegades and the Party is stronger and purified now that they have gone.

No, comrades, if the relations between the CPC and our Party are not normal, it is because the CPC has interfered in our internal affairs and encouraged splits and factionalism. We would like to normalize matters but this requires that the CPC should not interfere in our internal affairs.

The dangerous and impermissible position that the CPC has created in the international Communist movement should not be allowed to continue.

We feel that the entire movement should now rally to rebuff these tactics and to defend and strengthen the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement.

We feel that this situation requires another international meeting

as early as possible. We therefore support the appeal made by several other fraternal parties for another meeting this year.

The struggle that our Party has successfully waged against the Sanmugathasan anti-Party splitters' clique who were supported and encouraged from Peking, has given us experiences which are valuable not only to our Party, not only to the entire Left movement, but also to other fraternal parties that face similar attacks.

In a sense, our Party was one of the first guinea-pigs for a world-wide experiment. Well, we stood the test and survived. Let it be said to the credit of our Party, that we fought back this "experiment" and overcame its evil consequences.

That is why our 7th Congress, which sums up these experiences, has not only a domestic, but a certain international significance.

The inner-Party struggle that we had to face and overcome was not, however, solely due to external causes. It arose, in the first instance, from domestic reasons—from the opposition of Sanmugathasan and Kumarasiri, from their respective points of of view, to the course set by our CC when at its historic meeting in August 1962, it advanced the proposal of building a United Left Front on an agreed program as an immediate and realizable objective.

What is common to the splitters' group in our Party and similar groups in other Left parties is their common opposition to the path of the ULF. This is because the social stratum on which all these groups mainly rely for support is the English-speaking petty bourgeoisie.

Our political resolution correctly stresses that the class roots of the opposition to the ULF within our Party and other Left parties are to be found in this social stratum.

This was clear when we analyzed the social composition of the 100 or so persons who joined the splitters in our Party. The substantial proportion of them were English-speaking petty-bourgeois clerical employees, although there were others of whom I shall speak later.

In his writing on dogmatism, Lenin has pointed out that ultra-Left adventurism and revolutionary phrase-mongering are a phenomenon associated with the declassed petty bourgeoisie and foreign to the working class. He also showed that such phenomena usually reveal themselves at times of big "breaks" and turns in the political situation.

What we have witnessed since the major "turn" in the situation brought about by the formation of the ULF confirms the truth of what Lenin said.

The fact that such a tendency manifested itself first in our Party is no surprise. Our Party has always been the most consistent and resolute fighter for the unity of the Left and the progressive movement. It was also our Party that first initiated the fight for the ULF.

The fight of the Sanmugathasan-Kumarasiri group against the course of the ULF also coincided in point of time with the decision of the Chinese Communist Party to intensify its so-called "great debate" in the international Communist movement and to seek allies elsewhere. This created the objective conditions for a link-up.

The special views of the CPC leaders, which were being openly

spread in the international Communist movement at this time, were also attractive. The theory of temporary majorities and minorities, which Sanmugathasan quoted at the CC meeting of Feburay 1963 to justify his factional conduct, gave a seal of "ideological" respectability to plain, ordinary factionalism and splitting. The nationalist positions and Left-adventurist slogans of the CPC leaders also had great attraction for this stratum and their spokesmen.

FACTIONALISM

It is at this point of link-up that serious factionalism started and, stage by stage, systematic preparations were made for creating the nucleus of a new "party".

In the first stage, the main aim was to discredit our Party among the workers, to break the connections between the Party and the trade unions, to oppose the trade unions to the Party.

Whispering campaigns were conducted against our Party saying it was "opposed to" or "not interested in" workers' struggle. Party leaders were deliberately not invited to address workers' or trade union meetings.

Inside the Party a similar whispering campaign was launched to create divisions and suspicions, to slander and discredit the CPSU and the leaders of other fraternal parties.

An attempt was made to drive a wedge between the old Communists and those who joined the Party in 1953, after breaking away from the LSSP. Although at first this campaign was conducted under the slogan of "rescuing" the comrades who had led the Party since its foundation from the "former Samasamajists", the attack soon centred on the very leaders whom, only a moment earlier, the splitters were so anxious to save.

The next stage was the organizational preparation of the nucleus of a new party.

A so-called "Ceylon Marxist Study Circle" was secretly set up with its own list of members and a theoretical platform borrowed from Peking. Most of those who are now in the splitters' so-called "party" were members of this "Circle".

At the same time, using the CTUF as a base, parallel youth and women's organizations were set up to compete with those of our Party, and the trade union papers issued by the CTUF were transformed into rival political papers to our Party journals.

At first we had to overcome some confusion among certain members and open or concealed opposition from agents of the splitters still lurking in the Party.

But when the splitters made their aims clear by holding their notorious 85-person Nawala meeting on November 17, 1963 which decided to set up a new "party", the Party members rallied round the Central Committee to fight the splitters.

The splitters' attempt to set up a separate organization of Communist youth also brought the youth into the fight.

A major stage in our struggle against the splitters was our decision

to carry the fight against them into the trade unions and the working class.

Like all conspirators, the splitters had confined their activities to enlisting "top" people whose directives, they thought, would be automatically obeyed by the workers.

When we went from factory to factory, work place to work place, explaining the issues to the workers, they rallied to the support of their Party.

The workers of one work place after another passed resolutions condemning the splitters and proclaiming their support of the Party. Many non-Party workers joined actively in the struggle against the splitters.

As a result of this intense two-month struggle, when the Special Session of the CFTU was held in early March 1964, we were able to announce that over 70 per cent of the workers formerly organized by the CTUF had repudiated the splitters and joined hands with us. The process is still going on.

Comrades sometimes ask us why the CC waited till the middle of 1963 to take action against the splitters.

There were many reasons for this. First of all, before that time the mass of the Party members were not yet convinced that Sanmugathasan, Kumarasiri and their clique were determined on a split.

Secondly, this was the period when the international Communist movement stopped public polemics, a decision which was supported. Although Sanmugathasan did not observe this, our Party did.

Thirdly, this was the period when we concentrated all our energies on building the ULF. To have been provoked into an inner Party struggle at that moment would have played into the hands of the forces opposed to the ULF and weakened the key role our Party had to play in bringing it into being.

But since then, by publicly opposing and fighting back the splitters our Party has made a major contribution to strengthening the ULF and to increasing its prestige among the workers and the mass of the people.

Many leading representatives from other Left parties, which face similar problems, have appreciated our fight and taken it as an example.

WHY OUR PARTY WITHSTOOD THE ATTACK

Why was our Party able to withstand the attack of the splitters and their supporters?

Firstly, we had a relatively strong working class core in our membership. We had a number of experienced comrades. We had brought up our Party in the spirit of loyalty to proletarian internationalism.

Secondly, our members were devoted to the Party and determined to defend its unity. There was tremendous support for our ULF policy. We appreciate the fact that there were those who did not see eye to eye with the CC on certain questions, but nevertheless joined us to fight splittism.

Thirdly, we had previous experience in dealing with such factional

groups. A very similar petty-bourgeois adventurism had prevailed for a short time prior to our Fourth Congress and done geat damage to the Party and the mass organizations under its leadership. The faction of those Left adventurists was smashed at the Fourth Congress. Before the Sixth Congress, too, we had the so-called "Baillie Street" factional group. Is it a mere coincidence that many leading members of the so-called "Central Committee" of the splitters' "party" were members of one or both of these earlier factional groups?

Fourthly, our Party had a 20-year experience in the fight against Trotskyism. We knew how anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, operating under Trotskyite slogans, were responsible for the split in the united Left movement in 1940. We also realized how these same policies and slogans, although dressed up in slightly different clothes and propagated by persons claiming to be Communists, were being used once again to split the united Left movement.

When we confronted Sanmugathasan, in the CC meeting of August 1963, with the similarity between his Peking styled views and those of Trotsky, he took the position that although Trotsky had been wrong then, he was right now! And since then, his miserable group have been peddling all the familiar theories about the "degeneration" and restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R., the "impossibility" of building communism in one country, the export of revolution, etc.

What, then, are our experiences in the fight against the splitters?

Firstly, it has confirmed Lenin's teaching that ultra-Left dogmatism mainly comes from the petty bourgeoisie and has little or no support among the workers.

Secondly, we have seen in practice how Left deviationists and Rightist capitulationists feed and support one another and unite. We have seen in particular the connections between dogmatism and opportunism.

Thirdly, we have learnt the need to pay very careful attention to the social composition of the Party membership and continuously to strengthen its membership from among the workers. This is especially necessary in a country like Ceylon where petty-commodity production and semi-feudal relations are very strong.

Fourthly, we have learnt that the struggle against splittism must be an offensive one. Splitters will always seek to paralyze the initiative of loyal Party members by threatening a split if their demands are not granted. The fight against splittism can succeed if it is developed on a wide front and to the extent that the whole Party and the masses can be drawn into the fight.

Fifthly, we have learnt that neutrality in the fight against splittism is in fact a retreat from the fight which objectively helps the splitters.

Sixthly, it is necessary to expose the real aims of the splitters to the widest masses, to show them what the policy of the splitters means in practice for their struggles for a better life.

Seventhly, the fight against splittism should be linked with a positive struggle to build the unity of the working class and all progressive forces. Our positive campaign for the ULF was a powerful reason why we were able to isolate and beat back the splitters.

The fight against the splitters and those who support them is not over.

The splitters are kept alive by the massive support that they receive from the CPC leaders and sections of reaction.

They can, therefore, still do damage.

There also exists in Ceylon an objective social basis for nationalism and petty-bourgeois adventurism to exercise a temporary attraction.

But, on the basis of our own experience and in unity with the rest of the international Communist movement, our Party should and will continue this struggle.

END POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE U.S.A.

ECONOMIC PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

In his State of the Union message, President Lyndon B. Johnson said: "And this Administration, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America, and I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort."

We are prepared to join wholly and without reservation in such a war.

But if it is to be truly "unconditional war," we need to go far beyond the very limited program which President Johnson proposes. Such a war cannot be half-hearted or limited to "band-aid" remedies. It must be determined and unrelenting, and must go to the heart of a *total* war.

Its goal must be nothing less than guaranteeing to every American able and willing to work, peace-time employment at a decent wage or salary, and to all unable to work, adequate provision against want.

We reject the view that technological advance — the ability to produce in ever greater abundance—must lead to unemployment and poverty. We repudiate any idea that automation is making workers socially unnecessary. So long as there is human need, there is need for human labor. In our land, while one-fifth or more of the people live in dire poverty, there is a mounting lack of low-rent housing, of schools and hospitals, of facilities for medical training and research, of civic centers and recreational facilities. To put America to work to meet these needs alone could provide jobs for all for years to come.

We reject, too, the slanderous view that people are poor because they are shiftless, unintelligent or abnormal, or because they are victims of personal misfortune, to be regarded as nothing more than objects of charity. Nor is it correct to look upon the poor as some sort of "sub-class," as a group set apart from the main body of the American people. And no less wrong are those who attribute poverty merely to lack of education.

If coal miners are poor, the basic cause is the greed of the big coal operators. If Negroes are poor, it is in the first place because they are victims of the shameful Jim Crow system in our country. If old people are poor, it is because of the inadequacy of our social security setup. And so it is for others as well. The poor are part and parcel of the American working people, and poverty is an affliction from which no workers is immune. All are its potential victims.

The basic cause of unemployment and poverty, therefore, is not automation, nor is it personal shortcomings or misfortunes. On the contrary, *the cause is an economic system in which production is for maximum private profit instead of for maximum public good.* It is an

economic system in which prices are jacked up while wages are held down, in which tens of billions of dollars a year are wasted on armaments and other unproductive expenditures while the people are deprived of vital social needs, in which human needs go unfulfilled while millions go hungry and jobless, in which abundance itself leads to poverty and privation.

In short, the cause of poverty today is monopoly-dominated capitalism, and the war against poverty is a war against monopoly greed.

THIS IS YOUR WAR

The war against poverty is a war of all the people—of all victims, actual and potential, of monopoly oppression. In the ranks of its army are not only the poor and unemployed themselves but first and foremost all of organized labor. In the forefront today are the Negro people, whose all-out struggle to end their Jim Crow status is vital to the interest of all Americans. Side by side with them stand the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American people, the youth and the senior citizens, small farmers and small business.

All these must join hands, all must lend their voices and organized strength to the struggle if real gains are to be won. For winning this war will not be easy. The people's army will meet with the most ferocious opposition from corporate wealth and its political stooges, who will do everything possible to preserve the enormous profits and power of big business. Already the Goldwaters, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Dixiecrats, and others of their ilk are raising the battle-cry of reaction. Already the big business publication *Baron's Weekly* has headlined: "The Wrong War: In 1964 Communism, Not Poverty, Is the Enemy."

The war on poverty is closely interlinked with all the struggles and aspirations of the American people. All are parts of one war—a war against corporate greed—and none can win their own struggles except in alliance with the others.

The fight against poverty is inseparable from the fight for peace and disarmament, for the billions now squandered on arms are obtained at the expense of the public welfare and social needs of the people. The war chest for the war on poverty must be swelled by sharply reducing that of the cold war. *What is called for is a cut of no less than $20 billion in military spending within the next two years, and the allocation of that $20 billion to combat poverty.*

A central battlefront of this war is the fight for civil rights, which has become the focus of all struggles for democracy and economic welfare in our country today.

If, as President Johnson declares, one-fifth of America is poor, among the Negro people poverty afflicts *nearly one-half.* To fight poverty, therefore, is in the first place to fight poverty among the Negro people—to fight to end segregation and discrimination. To wipe out poverty is to wipe out the shameful slum ghettoes which are its breeding place.

The Negro people are heroically waging this battle today. Indeed, it is their militant struggles which have served more than anything

else to dramatize the fact of poverty and to bring it forward as the central issue of the day.

The fight of the Negro people for Freedom Now is thus in the direct interest of all who would fight poverty. The myth of white superiority which today prevents the masses of white working people from recognizing this tie must be fought. The crusade against the evil of poverty must be dovetailed with the crusade against the evil of Jim Crow. Without this it cannot succeed.

WHAT DOES IT TAKE TO WIPE OUT POVERTY?

The war against poverty will be long and far-reaching. The needs of the American people go far beyond the measures proposed by the Johnson Administration. And if the need is so great now in a period of economic upswing, how much greater will it be when the inevitable downturn thrusts millions more into joblessness and want.

What is required first of all is an immediate program involving large-scale federal economic action, with government spending on a level sufficient to raise substantially the purchasing power of all low-income groups.

But the war does not end there. A longer-range fight must be waged for changes of a more basic character, changes which will invade the sacred territory of big business, curb its powers and subject its operations to a growing measure of democratic control for the benefit of the people.

Final victory requires even more. The *abolition* of poverty can be achieved only by abolishing capitalism itself—by putting an end to an economic system of exploitation and oppression which generates fantastic wealth at one end and poverty at the other.

Mankind does not exist for the sake of profit. Men work and produce not to enrich a few but in order that all may live better. To wipe out poverty means to wipe out the profit system, which stands in the way of this aspiration. It means that the factories, mines and mills of our country must be owned by the people themselves and operated for *their benefit*—for use, not for profit. In such an America—a socialist America—abundance will cease to be a "problem." No one will be unemployed and no one will be poor. Our tremendous productive capacity will provide for the well-being and security of all.

Toward this noble goal of ending poverty, of securing the right of every person to the prosperous and happy life which the ability to produce abundance makes possible, we here offer our proposals for the great battles ahead.

A PROGRAM FOR TODAY

The call for "unconditional war" has already been taken up by leading organizations and spokesmen of labor, the farmers, the Negro people. These have come forward with bold programs of action—programs which merit the most vigorous support of every American who seeks the elimination of this monstrous social evil.

We fully endorse all such programs. We particularly applaud the

call of the recent UAW convention to "mobilize America for a total war against poverty" and for a program of "bold and affirmative action at every level of our governmental structure." We greet the convention's placing as a top priority in the struggle the passage of civil rights legislation "as an essential step in the crusade against segregation, discrimination, and the denial of basic rights of citizenship to the Negroes and other minorities with resulting poverty and injustice." We likewise greet the call at the recent convention of the Farmers' Union for a 20 per cent cut in arms spending to finance the war on poverty.

Incorporating all the positive points of these programs and approaches, we offer the following program for the fight to curb the growth of poverty and unemployment in our country.

1. Provide jobs for all able and willing to work. Launch a crash public works program at union wages, starting with a minimum outlay of $10 billion the first year and rising to $20 billion a year thereafter, the funds to come from a progressive reduction of military expenditures. Such a program should concentrate especially on building housing, schools, hospitals, etc., in Negro ghetto and other depressed areas, and on providing suitable employment in areas affected by reconversion to peace-time production.

Reduce the standard work week to 30 hours with no cut in earnings.

Increase trade with all nations, with removal of all bars to extending trade and credit to the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of China and Cuba.

Prohibit American firms from exporting jobs of American workers by shifting their operations abroad, and from utilizing lower wage scales in other countries to compete with American-produced goods, thus increasing unemployment.

Establish double-time pay as a minimum for all overtime, to discourage its use while workers remain unemployed.

2. End segregation and discrimination. Wipe out the ghetto. Designate all Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American ghettoes as depressed areas, with special crash programs to provide jobs and aid, and with special consideration given to employment of Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American workers on public works projects.

Launch a massive program of construction of housing, school, hospital and recreational facilities to convert the ghettoes from slums into high-grade residential areas attractive to all citizens and within their means.

Enact all pending civil rights legislation, with strengthened provisions against all discrimination in hiring, subsidized training and other measures to wipe out differentials in employment and earnings.

Eradicate all housing and school segregation through appropriate legislative and executive action.

3. Provide adequate relief to the country's poor and jobless. Improve and expand the food stamp plan, while guarding against the use of surplus food allotments to subsidize below-union wage scales or as a weapon against the struggles of the workers or the Negro people.

Enact the medicare bill as a first step toward adequate hospitalization and medical care for the elderly.

Institute a federal free school hot lunch program for all students.

Provide special assistance to school children and youth in needy families to enable them to continue their education.

Establish a federal system of public assistance sufficient to permit those unable to work to live in decency.

Provide free child-care centers to enable women who must support their families to go to work.

Modernize unemployment compensation through a uniform federal system providing payments of not less than two thirds of former earnings, including all wage workers without exception, and continuing for the duration of the period of unemployment.

Institute a moratorium on foreclosures and repossessions in the case of unemployed workers.

4. Increase the purchasing power and living standards of the working people. Raise the minimum wage to $2.00 an hour and extend coverage to all wage workers.

Enact basic tax reforms which will plug all loopholes and shift the tax burden from the working people to the giant corporations and wealthy individuals. Raise personal exemptions to $1,200 and abolish the withholding tax. Eliminate excise and sales taxes on necessities, which bear most heavily on the lowest income groups.

Establish a federal price control commission empowered to establish the strictest safeguards against all monopoly price-gouging.

Initiate a system of rent controls, with stiff penalties for failure in upkeep and with rent subsidies where needed to enable low-income families to secure decent housing.

Raise social security pensions to a minimum of $200 a month for a single individual with $100 additional for spouse.

Permit retirement at 60 years of age with full benefits.

Launch a 10-year program to construct 5 million low-cost public housing units toward a goal of ending slums in America.

5. Secure the future of America's youth. Enact a National Youth Act designed to meet all job, training, educational, recreational and health needs of American youth, with effective representation of youth, labor and civil rights organizations in its administration.

As part of such a measure, enact the Administration's job corps, work-training and work-study proposals for unemployed youth and students, on a greatly expanded scale and with strict guarantees against undercutting union wages, against all forms of discrimination and against military control or influence over the proposed conservation camps.

Provide federal aid to education sufficient to end all teacher and classroom shortages and to make possible extension of compulsory education through fourteen years of school by payment of living stipends to students.

Make college education available to all through a national system of tuition-free colleges, with special aid to facilitate the attendance

of Negro youth and complete enforcement of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision.

Make all young people entering the labor force and unable to find work eligible to receive unemployment compensation.

Expand apprenticeship training programs to twice their present size, with guarantees against displacement of older workers and with preferential enrollment of Negro and other minority youth.

6. Aid the small farmers and farm workers. Make low-interest government credit and other forms of government aid, now confined to the big capitalist farms, available to small farmers to enable them to remain on their farms and to secure a decent livelihood from them.

Provide price supports to small farmers in the form of direct payments to farmers of the difference between market prices and 100 per cent of parity.

Extend unemployment compensation, minimum wage, social security and other benefits to all farm laborers.

Give special assistance to Negro and white share-croppers to enable them to secure and maintain their own farms.

7. Rehabilitate the depressed areas. Provide an emergency appropriation for immediate direct assistance to all victims of impoverishment in these areas.

Establish an Appalachian Authority along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and corresponding authorities in other major depressed regions, to harness their natural resources through large-scale projects for conservation and production of cheap electric power and for other federal construction and industrial projects that will spur economic renewal and expansion.

Launch public works projects for road building, scenic restoration, creation of recreational areas and similar purposes in the Appalachians and other regions.

8. Establish public control over the uses of automation. Create a public commission on automation with effective labor, Negro and other people's representation, empowered to exercise control over mass lay-offs, closing of plants, shifting of operations to new areas and other decisions affecting the lives of entire communities.

Establish a public planning board, with labor, Negro and other groups adequately represented, to coordinate economic development in the public interest against monopoly, in accordance with population distribution, manpower and training needs and related factors.

9. Protect the rights of organized labor. Repeal all existing anti-labor legislation and return to the principles embodied in the Wagner Labor Relations Act, to secure the ability of labor to safeguard and raise the living standards of workers in all states and regions.

Enact new legislation to abolish regional wage differentials, end the runaway shop evil, and guarantee equal pay for equal work regardless of age, sex, race or religion.

CURB THE POWER OF BIG BUSINESS

The above program is necessary to combat poverty and joblessness. But it is not enough. The growing impact of automation, which wipes

out an estimated 40,000 jobs each week, combined with economic stagnation and other factors such as discrimination and segregation, points up the need for economic and social measures of a more advanced character if the rise of poverty and unemployment is to be more than slowed down:

These are measures designed to place more effective curbs on the power of the trusts in American life. They involve the establishment of a growing degree of government regulation—and where necessary of government ownership—of the big industrial enterprises, with democratic controls effected by assuring a substantial voice to the working people through their organizations in all controlling bodies. They involve the utilization of the power and resources of the federal government for the welfare of the common people, and not in order to fatten the profits of the big monopolies. The fight for such basic reforms requires a more advanced level of political activity on the part of labor and the common people, aiming at a basic political regrouping powerful enough to impose limitations on big business.

We believe that such reforms, which will lay the basis for moving toward an ultimate reorganization of our society along socialist lines, must go in the following direction:

1. Growing invasion of "management prerogatives" with the establishment of controls over hiring policy, work standards, scheduling of operations, moving of plants to new locations, institution of automation and other new techniques, price setting, etc.

2. A drastic revision of the tax structure, with a) a steeply graduated corporate tax aimed at taxing the biggest corporations most heavily (instead of the present uniform 48 per cent tax for all corporations making $25,000 a year or more), and b), closing of all loopholes and taxing of all personal income above a certain level at a rate of 100 per cent. These measures would go in the direction of placing a ceiling on corporate and personal income.

3. Designation of any corporation with gross assets of $250 million or more, or accounting for more than 10 per cent of the market of any industry, as a firm affecting the public interest and thereby subject to special regulation and supervision with regard to its operations, price structure, etc. Also, federal chartering and regulation of all corporations with $50 million or more in gross assets.

4. Nationalization of industries directly related to public service such as transportation, public utilities, atomic energy and power production, and their operation under democratic control on a non-profit basis. Nationalization of other industries such as coal mining or oil production or of plants closing down, where necessary to protect natural resources and to guarantee jobs and living standards. Conversion of arms plants to civilian production under government ownership. Nationalization of all natural resources.

5. Halting of the immense handouts given to private industry through government subsidies and through government financing of industrial research, and utilization of these funds for research and other purposes of direct public benefit. An end to give-aways of natural resources and a federal program of conservation with strict

penalties against corporate interests which waste or destroy these resources.

6. Special measures to protect small business against encroachments of the monopolies, including lower taxes and control of monopoly prices. Establishment of a federal Department of Small Business making funds available for loans and credits and giving other assistance. Aid to small businesses uprooted by urban redevelopment programs in relocating elsewhere.

7. A vast expansion of social welfare and social security expenditures, with establishment of a federally-financed and administered comprehensive cradle-to-grave security program, embracing unemployment, industrial and disability compensation, full medical and dental care, old age pensions and other benefits.

KEY TO VICTORY: UNITED ACTION

The fight against poverty and unemployment is a fight against the giant monopolies. It is a fight of all sections of the American people ground down by these monopolies—the working class, the Negro people, the small farmers, small business. All have a common stake in this war.

The key to success lies, therefore, in uniting all these forces in common battle against the trusts. And for this, the primary responsibility lies with organized labor, which must mobilize all workers in the struggle, organized and unorganized, employed and unemployed, Negro and white, young and old. The combined action of labor with other sections of the people is equally vital, above all its unity with the Negro people.

Without such united action, not even the most meager program can be won. With it, the foundation can be laid for the building of a political coalition against the trusts headed by organized labor and powerful enough to wrest basic concessions from them—a coalition which can go far toward the elimination of poverty in our country.

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

14

Included in this issue

FOR UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP
W. Gomulka

REPORT TO CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT
Ben Bella

APPEAL OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF ARGENTINA

supplement to
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 14

contents

FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP

W. Gomulka, First Secretary, Central Committee Polish United Workers' Party 5

THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

Resolution of the Eighth Congress of the Swiss Party of Labor 31

FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Report by Ernest Burnelle, Chairman of the Communist Party of Belgium at Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPB, May 9-10, 1964 42

RESOLUTION OF PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM 49

THE NEW SITUATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RADICAL DEMOCRATIZATION

Resolution of the Seventh Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Greece 52

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

Ben Bella, General Secretary, Political Bureau, National Liberation Front of Algeria 57

DEFEND MARQUETALLA!

Appeal of the Communist Party of Colombia 73

APPEAL OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF ARGENTINA 75

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

42-46 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
July 25, 1964

FOR UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST CAMP

W. GOMULKA, FIRST SECRETARY, CENTRAL COMMITTEE, POLISH UNITED WORKERS' PARTY.

Both the tasks in the field of building socialism and the tasks of the foreign policy of our state are inseparably linked with the worldwide struggle between socialism and capitalism.

The progressive and revolutionary forces of the contemporary world are headed by the Communist and Workers' Parties, united by their community of aims, international solidarity and their common ideology of Marxism-Leninism. The policy and development of the socialist states, the progress of the workers' movement in the capitalist countries and, to an ever-greater extent, the direction of development of the national-liberation movement, depend on the correct strategy and tactics of the Communist movement. The principles of this strategy and these tactics were jointly worked out by the Communist and Workers' parties and are contained in the Statement of the conference of 81-Parties in Moscow in 1960, and previously in the Declaration of the parties of the socialist countries of 1957. These documents, unanimously accepted by the participants of both conferences, mapped out the general line of the fight for peace, the freedom of the nations, and socialism, thus creating a platform of unity and solidarity for all the Communist and Workers' parties.

What is the most important content of the present stage of development of the world, of the great, revolutionary transformations that have changed its face so profoundly during the last 20 years?

The Statement of 1960 gives an answer to this question: "The main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism, which was initiated by the Great October Revolution." This is an epoch of "struggle between two systems, of socialist revolutions, of national-liberation revolutions," "an epoch of the downfall of imperialism and the liquidation of the colonial system," "an epoch of the victory of socialism and communism on a world scale."

---

*Section of the "Report of the Central Committee and Directives for the Development of the Polish People's Republic in 1966-70". Fourth Congress of the **PUWP**. Reprinted from a supplement to **Trybuna Ludu**, June 16, 1964.

A new relation of social forces has come into being on a world scale.

Imperialism has lost its dominating position for good. The factor which is now becoming decisive in the development of the human community is the world socialist system.

The Statement recognizes the prevention of a world war—a total nuclear catastrophe which threatens the very existence of human civilization — as the most important task of our times.

The cause of preserving peace concentrates into one stream and intensifies all the revolutionary, liberation and progressive aspirations of mankind:

—the efforts of the socialist countries, which, in competition with the capitalist countries, aspire to gain superiority in the economic field, to achieve a bigger production potential and a better standard of living;

—the revolutionary movement of the working class and the popular masses in the capitalist countries aimed against the omnipotence of monopoly capital;

—the liberation movement of the nations against imperialism for the complete abolition of colonialism in all its forms, for full sovereignty and for overcoming the economic and cultural backwardness of the newly liberated countries.

All the Communist and Workers' parties accepted in the Statement, as a fundamental strategic principle, the thesis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU which states that in the present epoch, with the present relation of forces, war has ceased to be inevitable, that for the first time, a real possibility has arisen of curbing imperialist aggression and preventing war, a real chance of eliminating war from international relations.

Basing themselves on this, all the parties at the helm in the socialist countries have taken the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence as the unshakeable foundation of their foreign policy with regard to the capitalist countries.

The jointly worked out and unanimously accepted general line of the Communist movement and the socialist states has been — as is known—questioned by the Communist Party of China (CPC).

True, the CPC has not made a direct attack on the content of the Declaration and the Statement of the international conferences. While referring to those documents and declaring loyalty towards the principles they contain, the CPC came forward, in all basic matters, with its own distorted interpretation, with its own, separate ideological and political platform, and then started a violent propaganda campaign and factional activity aimed at causing a split in the international Communist movement and in the socialist camp.

The Communist Party of China is directing its main attack at the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And in all this, the CPC has been doing everything possible to becloud the main issues of the controversy and to make a business-like discussion and polemics impossible. For the method applied by the Communist Party of China in this controversy is one that attributes to the CPSU and the other Communist parties absurd views that these parties have never proclaimed and then, to the accompaniment of an appeal to "distinguish truth from lies," condemns those views as "revisionism" and "betrayal of Marxism-Leninism," "capitulation to the enemy" and "cowardly pacifism."

This inadmissible method of polemics has led to simply incredible discussions:

"The road taken by the leadership of the CPSU," declare the leaders of the CPC, "is the road of alliance with the forces of war against the forces of peace, alliance with imperialism against socialism, alliance with the United States against China, alliance with the reactionary forces of all countries against the nations of the whole world." *(Jenminjiphao,* September 6, 1963.)

Or:

"The capitalist forces in the Soviet community have swept over all fields of life in the USSR like a flood, including political, economic, cultural and ideological life." *(Jenminjihpao,* March 31, 1964.)

Or, the one referring to the French Communist Party:

"During the past ten years and more, the leaders of the French Communist Party have been following the colonial policy of the imperialists and have been coming forward as helpmates of French monopoly capital . . . " *(Jenminjihpao,* October 24, 1963.)

Equally absurd and slanderous statements of the Communist Party of China could be quoted without end. Refuting all these charges would be too futile a task to waste time on. All discussion on such a platform would be useless. It can only lead to bouncing back the same ball at the Communist Party of China, which would not clear up any of the issues either.

Let us therefore reject all mystification and seeming divergencies. Instead, let us get at the rational ideological and political core of the dispute with the Communist Party of China. Let us confront its stand with reality.

In what way does the Communist Party of China approach th key problems of our times?

One of these key problems, the most urgent of our times — as we read in the Statement of 1960—is the problem of war an peace. The Communist parties regard it as their historical mi sion to free mankind from the nightmare of another world wa

and have put this mission in the first place before all other tasks.

The Communist Party of China, whose signature can also be found under this Statement, does not uphold this central idea in any of its documents; on the contrary, it rejects it as "ignoring the historical mission of the world proletarian revolution and departing from the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninsm." (Letter of the CPC of June 14, 1963.) In its political platform — presented in 25 points in the letter of June 14, 1963, to the Central Committee of the CPSU — the CPC brings to the forefront of the tasks of the Communist movement "the leading of the world proletarian revolution to a full victory and the creation of a new world without imperialism; without capitalism and without exploitation."

In this way, the CPC wants to impose upon the Communist movement the dilemma of choosing between the struggle for the socialist revolution and the fight for peace. Actually, such a dilemma does not exist. The struggle for revolution and construction of a new, socialist system cannot be separated from the struggle for peace, for preventing a new world war. For there is no question more important for the fate of the peoples than the preservation of peace, there is no more dangerous threat to their future than a thermonuclear war.

The scientific and technological revolution which has taken place in the course of the past 20 years, has led to the mastery of the energy of the atomic nucleus and to the construction of precision rockets of unlimited range of action on the earth. In the course of the armaments race thousands of atomic and nuclear missiles have been produced, including some whose destructive explosive power exceeds the total power of all shells and bombs used in both world wars. Prof. Pauling estimates that the stockpiles of nuclear weapons in the world in 1963 exceeded the power of 320 thousand megatons which is equal to 100 tons of controversial explosive per inhabitant of the earth. If the present tempo of the arms race is maintained, then—according to the forecasts of specialists—in 1970 the supply of missiles and nuclear warheads will suffice to kill each inhabitant of the earth 1,000 times over. The new rocket and nuclear technology in possession of both the imperialist and socialist camps makes modern war an absurdity.

The Chinese comrades assure us that if imperialism provokes a new world war it will obviously "end with the annihilation of imperialism and the victory of socialism." *(Jenminjiphao,* December 31, 1962.) In their publications preceeding the Moscow Conference of 1960 they even maintained that "on the ruins of destroyed imperialism the victorious nations will create at an exceptionally rapid tempo a civilization a thousand times higher than that in the capitalist system, they will build their truly splendid future."

(*Hungchi*, No. 8, 1960.) In the spring of 1963, polemizing in the same paper with Comrade Togliatti, they again defended that thesis, expressing suprise that "some people condemn this Marxist-Leninist point of view." (*Hungchi*, No. 3-4, 1963.)

If the leaders of the Communist Party of China really believe this — they only give evidence of how for they have become divorced from the realities of the contemporary world. For in fact, the sataclysm of a thermonuclear war would sweep entire states and nations off the face of the earth; it would completely destroy the most densely populated areas of the world—centers of industry and human civilization, it would menace the genetic future of man.

Can one, under such circumstances, question that the prevention of war is the supreme problem of our times and the most important task of the socialist world, of all the Communist and Workers' parties?

Is it not a matter of fact that without a persistent and effective struggle of all forces of peace against the danger of war, without a consistent policy of peaceful coexistence and without crippling the aggressive activities of the imperialists, it is not possible to lead a struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution?

FOR THE NEW, SOCIALIST SYSTEM TO WIN, THE CAUSE OF PEACE MUST WIN

There is no stronger attraction to socialism than the relentless struggle of the socialist states against the danger of war, for the destruction of all means of mass annihilation, for general and complete disarmament. The people of all nations and races desire peace, they increasingly realize the horrors and the immeasurable disasters which a new war can bring. And, therefore, they will ultimately choose that system which defends peace and provides a guarantee of putting an end to wars — to all wars. This cannot be the capitalist system, since from its very birth it has generated and continues to generate militarism, arms races and aggression. This truth has been revealed to the peoples by both world wars which, therefore, could not but end in the overthrowing of capitalism in vast areas of the world. What matters now is not only to lay bare the warlike, aggressive and anti-human countenance of the capitalist system in the struggle for peace, but also to impose peace upon imperialism, to paralyze the warlike essence of imperialism.

The appearance of atomic and hydrogen weapons has not changed the nature of imperialism, but it has changed the character of war itself, of war conducted by means of those weapons. Nuclear war can no longer serve to achieve political goals. It can only be a means of total destruction.

This is not only our view. The same conclusions are ever more frequently drawn also by the leaders of imperialist states, recognizing the actual balance of power and the strength of the Soviet Union.

To quote President Johnson's address to a conference of construction workers on March 24, 1964, the world is no longer what it used to be. He said that once it was possible to wage wars even on a large scale without the risk of putting an end to civilization. But what was once is no more, for general war is impossible. In a few moments, fifty to a hundred million people on the other side could be wiped out, or they could wipe out fifty or hundred million of our citizens, destroying in an hour, half of our area and half of our population. General war is thus impossible, said President Johnson, and alternatives acquire essential importance.

The Chinese leaders as a rule define such statements as an "imperialist swindle." If they really believe this, then they immensely simplify their image of the world and give evidence that they continue to be enslaved by outdated images and definitions.

At the time when Lenin was developing the theory of imperialism, the conflicts splitting the world and giving birth to war were of a different character than today, and weapons of mass annihilation did not exist. The first world war was one between imperialist states and the risk of defeat boiled down to losing the colonies, the spheres of influence and the positions of power, to the advantage of other imperialist states. Today the situation is fundamentally different. Though the struggle between imperialist states continues, the dominating contradiction of the contemporary world is the struggle of the two systems—socialist and capitalist—for the direction of further development of the world. Imperialism realizes that the risk of determining the issue of this struggle by way of war is deadly for it. To be or not to be would now be the stake in war and not this or that division of spheres of influences. War could break out if the leading circles of the imperialist world came to the conclusion that they can ensure victory for their side. But the fact is that the present balance of power in the world, the defensive force of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp give no basis for such conclusions.

The Chinese comrades maintain that "U.S. imperialism never withdraws from the impossible. The greater the difficulties which stand in its way, the more desperately it fights." (*Jenminjiphao*, January 21, 1964.) Can such an evaluation based on the assumption that the opponent is never able to calculate soberly, that the politicians who direct the imperialist world are ready to commit suicide together with their states and peoples, can such an evaluation be treated seriously as a foundation for our policy?

The premise of our policy can only be a striving for the creation of such balance of power in the world, for the attainment of such a supremacy of socialism over capitalism, that even the most adventurous and desperate forces in the imperialist world could not cherish any illusions as to their chances of defeating socialism by means of war, so that the ruling circles of the capitalist states must accept peaceful coexistence as the only reasonable alternative.

The task of saving peace has become real only in our time, when the socialist system has grown to sufficient power so that it can play the role of a factor determining the development of the international situation. In order to avoid war and to ensure peace, it is necessary to relentlessly conduct a policy of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries, a policy which excludes use of armed force in solving international conflicts and envisages peaceful competition between the states of different social systems as well as normal diplomatic, economic and cultural relations between them.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China do not simply reject the principle of peaceful coexistence, but give it an interpretation which undermines its mostly essential content.

They say that "imperialism will never agree to living in peace with socialist states . . ." (*Jenminjihpao*, December 28, 1963), and they condemn as revisionism the view that peaceful coexistence is a "categorical imperative of contemporary history."

"It is quite possible," they write, "that the socialist countries may establish relations of peaceful coexistence with the countries which have recently acquired their political independence," but "as the international balance of class power increasingly shifts to the advantage of socialism, the socialist countries acquire a possibility of compelling one or another imperialist country to establish with them a sort of peaceful coexistence."

What does "sort of peaceful coexistence" mean?

It means, according to the Communist Party of China, either a situation in which the imperialists "are compelled to accept a truce," as was the case after the armed intervention against the Soviet Union in 1920, or "a state of cold-war coexistence" . . . "when there is no hot wars, the imperialists conduct cold wars," whereas "the cold war is an inevitable essential manifestation of international struggle of classes." (*Jenminjihpao*, December 28, 1963.) These are not purely theoretical arguments. They find concrete reflection in the policies of the CPC, particularly in the endless attacks on all efforts to reach an understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States, on all agreements whose aim

is the relaxation of international tension and putting a stop to the arms race.

In their approach to the question of an understanding between the socialist states and imperialist states, the leaders of the CPC clearly apply two gauges—one for themselves and another for the Soviet Union. For example, they consider the understanding between the Chinese People's Republic and France, which we all support, good for China and for all nations. On the other hand, any understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States they treat as a betrayal of the interests of socialism, as an alliance against nations fighting imperialism.

This double gauge which the Chinese comrades use in evaluating their own agreements and those concluded by the Soviet Union is not in the least an outcome of antithetic political contents of these agreements. For, in actual fact, the contents of both are the same, both are equally advantageous for the cause of peace and socialism. However, the leaders of the CPC argue from the premise that no agreement signed by the Soviet Union with capitalist countries can be considered of advantage to the Chinese People's Republic, if it dos not take part in them.

The leaders of the CPC are also constantly attacking the idea of universal and complete disarmament, as the "propagation of illusions," "a deliberate misleading of the nations of the world" and "an aid to the imperialists in the realization of their policies of war and aggression." (Letter of the CPC to the CC, CPSU of June 14, 1963.) The CPC accedes to the postulates of universal (though not complete) disarmament "for the exclusive purpose of exposing and combating imperialist armaments and war preparations."

If the idea of disarmament is a fraud and the propagation of illusions, and the struggle for disarmament can be no more than a propaganda trick to expose the imperialists, then it follows logically, that the idea of peaceful coexistence with the imperialist states is the same kind of a fraud and the same kind of propagation of illusions.

In our day, peaceful coexistence is in the long run impossible without entering upon the road of disarmament. The gigantic arms race in itself has become the most important factor of international tensions. If this destructive arms race is not stopped then—sooner or later—it will lead to deliberate war or to war by accident.

No government, no state today will dare to come out openly against the idea of disarmament, while the proposal for universal and complete disarmament put forth by Comrade Khrushchov was

accepted unanimously by the UN under the pressure of world public opinion.

We do not have any illusions as to the fact that the realization of the idea of disarmament will call for a long and difficult battle.

In fact, casting doubt on the policy of peaceful coexistence and rejecting the slogan for universal and complete disarmament, what road for the prevention of war does the CPC see?

The CPC repeats after Stalin: "In order to eliminate the danger of war, it is necessary to annihilate imperialism" (*Jenminjihpao*, May 21, 1963), and adds from itself: "imperialism will not destroy mankind, but mankind will destroy genocidal imperialism."

The abolition of imperialism is the common aim of all Communists. However, the proclamation of this slogan or the most ardent agitation in support of it are not alone sufficient to accomplish this. If we reject the absurd idea of the abolition of imperialism by way of thermonuclear war, and we believe that the leaders of the CPC share our views on this matter, then there remains but one road, that of the victorious socialist revolution in the highly developed capitalist countries, the chief strongholds of imperialism.

The Chinese comrades fervently invoke this revolution, but they fail to provide an answer to the question as to how they intend to do this in the concrete situation. For it is not possible to accept the following generalized instructions as a reply to the question: that "violent revolution is the universal law of the proletarian revolution," that "the proletariat must wage armed struggle to destroy the old state machine and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat," that "the proletariat must master all forms of peaceful and military, open and underground struggle"; or the recommendations that "Communists should separate themselves sharply from the social democrats" and "should attract to their side the masses which are under the influence of the Social--Democratic parties." (Letters of the CC, CPC to the CC, CPSU, June 14, 1963.)

Everybody knows that in the present circumstances, when there is no critical revolutionary situation in any of the large capitalist countries, these invocations find no response.

It is not surprising that all Communist parties in the developed capitalist countries reject the stand of the CPC as dogmatic and completely divorced from the actual situation and conditions of class struggle in these countries.

The CPC calls upon the socialist countries to be guided by proletarian internationalism and "give their support to the revolutionary socialist proletariat in the leading countries."

How can the socialist countries contribute to the conduct of

the working-class struggle in the West?

In our times, socialism has passed from the sphere of ideas and theories to the sphere of the practical life of one-third of mankind where it is passing its historic test.

In our epoch, socialism appeals to millions of people by its economic achievements, its technological power in the service of peace, its dynamic economic progress — the material and social achievements of nations who have entered upon this new course of development.

For years now, the achievements of the construction of socialism in the socialist countries, are a factor which revolutionizes the thought and the consciousness of the working class and of the most progressive forces of the Western societies. The greater our successes, the closer we shall be to attaining economic supremacy over the entire capitalist system, the more powerful will be the influence of socialism on the human mind and the more mature will be the premises for the emergence of "a world without imperialism," capitalism and exploitation.

The peaceful competition with the capitalist world and the struggle of the socialist states to prevent a new war, for universal and complete disarmament and for peaceful coexistence — this may constitute the only correct foundation for the revolutionary strategy of the Communist parties that stand at the helm of the socialist countries.

The question arises, why do the Chinese comrades in their entire platform deny these decisive factors of the development of socialist revolution and the growing importance of socialism in the world, why are they trying to discredit us in the eyes of the masses? Do they really believe that by rejecting these basic principles of policy of the Communist parties and supplanting them by appeals about "conducting the socialist revolution to the end, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat," they will bring the victory of socialism closer even by an iota? They certainly do not believe in this. Surely they know, just as we do, what the situation is in the developed capitalist countries.

Why then do they take this negative stand on this matter?

Though the Chinese comrades avoid direct statements on this subject in their publications, it can be assumed that at the basis of their position lies the great discrepancy in the production potential and economic development of individual countries of the socialist community. It goes without saying that if the Chinese People's Republic possessed a production potential corresponding in per capita terms to that of the level attained by the Soviet Union or the European countries of people's democracy, the impact of socialism upon the working masses of the capitalist world

would have been many times stronger and the very process of the ripening of the socialist revolution in the developed capitalist countries would have been substantially faster. But this cannot justify the negative attitude of the CPC towards the competition of the two systems as a revolutionary international strategy of the Communist movement in the struggle for the world victory of socialism.

The discrepancy in the level of the development of the countries of the capitalist world—where this discrepancy constantly increases—is much greater than that in the countries of the socialist world, where it is decreasing. This is of paramount significance from the viewpoint of the socialist countries experting an impact upon the developing countries of the capitalist world. The share of the countries of the socialist community in world production becomes ever greater and will grow with each year and with that will increase the attractive character of socialism, both among the developed and the developing nations in the capitalist world.

The Soviet Union's catching up with, and surpassing of, the most developed capitalist country—the United States—to say nothing of the further shifting of the balance of world power in favor of socialism which thereby will follow, will be of immeasurable significance for raising the socialist consciousness of the working class and the working masses in the capitalist countries and for intensifying their struggle. For the Chinese People's Republic the possibility of attaining the economic level of the USA is still far away, but for the Soviet Union it is close. It is in the interests of all socialist countries, the Chinese People's Republic included, that the economy of the Soviet Union should as quickly as possible, surpass the economy of the USA.

The great disproportions in the economic development and in the living standards of individual nations which exist today both in the countries of the socialist and capitalist world, are a legacy of the past development of the world, first of all of the old indivisible rule over the world by a few imperialist powers. The disproportions can only be eliminated by socialism, though from the nature of things this process must be of long duration. The socialist revolution has been the cradle of the national-liberation revolution. Hundreds of millions of people have risen from the depths of misery and starvation, from humiliation and age-old slavery to fight for their national sovereignty, for their right to an equal share in solving problems of the contemporary world, to benefit from the achievements of modern civilization. This history's greatest "Spring of Nations" rends asunder those time-honored frameworks of international and racial relations, destroys at the very roots the entire system of rule by a handful

of highly developed countries over the majority of the world population.

Numerous countries of Africa and South-East Asia are liberating themselves from the imperialist dependence. A new situation has been arisen. The colonial hinterland of the capitalist world lies in ruins. A new, dynamic force, of colossal population potential, of unlimited needs and radical social aspirations—the countries of the so-called "third world"—has entered the historic arena of the world, today divided into two opposing socio-political systems.

The struggle against imperialism is, to a great extent, a fight of this "third world", and at the same time it is a struggle for that world. On its results, on when and how hundreds of millions of people in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America will achieve full national sovereignty, liberate themselves from economic dependence and raise themselves from backwardness, largely depends the tempo and character of the further socio-political transformations on our globe and its future face.

The Communist and revolutionary parties of the nations of the "third world" fight for a consistent completion of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic revolution, for the economic development and liberation of their countries from all forms of colonialism.

The Communist parties in the developed capitalist countries, faithful to their international traditions, support the national-liberation struggle, oppose imperialist intervention in the former colonies and neo-colonial enthrallment of the newly established national states by the capitalist monopolies and governments of their countries.

The socialist states—rejecting in principle the interference in the internal affairs of the young national states—render them political assistance in their struggle for the consolidation of independence, defend them against armed intervention by imperialism, and in the measure of their possibilities, render them help in creating a national industry and in training cadres; they develop trade with those countries, free of all discrimination.

The socialist camp cooperates on the international arena with the states of the "third world" in the struggle for the final liquidation of colonialism, for peace and peaceful coexistence, for economic and social progress.

The principles of this policy, which have found expression in the resolutions of the two international conferences of the Communist and Workers' Parties, were also approved by the CPC. The Chinese people, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, made its historic contribution to the struggle against colonialism. The military defeat of Nazi Germany and Japan created

a situation in which the Chinese revolution, while liberating the 600-million nation from semi-colonial bondage, could effect a breach in the system of imperialist rule over the world a breach which for its importance is next to that of the October Revolution. The victory of the Chinese revolution shook the foundations of colonialism not only in Asia, but in the entire world, and gained for the Chinese People's Republic respect and authority among the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, among the newly arisen national states.

Until 1959 there were no significant differences of opinion as to the attitude to the national-liberation movements and to the states of the "third world" between the CPC and other Communist parties in general and the parties of the socialist countries in particular. If such differences have now arisen, this happened not because the policy of the socialist states in this matter had changed, but because the position of the Communist Party of China had changed.

In a letter to the CC, CPSU (of June 14, 1964) the Chinese leaders state that "different kinds of divergencies in the modern world concentrate on the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America," that ". . . these are the weakest links as far as the territories under the domination of imperialism are concerned and the storm-centers of world revolution."

This is true to fact. The essence of the divergencies is not whether the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are or are not "the weakest link" in the capitalist system; the essential thing is what should be done to accelerate the final liquidation of colonialism in all its forms, how those countries can overcome poverty and economic backwardness and how the socialist countries can help them in this respect.

However, the CPC platform does not give an answer to these concrete questions. For in the present, final stage of the disintegration of the colonial system the slogan of "revolutionary armed struggle" which predominates in CPC documents cannot be regarded as a sufficient answers.

The slogan of "revolutionary armed struggle" as the main task of nations in the fight with imperialism corresponded to the actual needs ten or fifteen years ago, when colonialism still held hundreds of millions of people under its rule. It did not lose its true meaning even today in those countries where colonialism still exists in its old, traditional form and also in the countries where mercenary, reactionary governments have become obedient tools of neo-colonialism. When undertaking an armed struggle for independence, these peoples may rely in full on the solidarity of the socialist countries. And not only on their solidarity, but also on

their real assistance. The USSR and the other socialist countries have done everything they could to help the colonial peoples gain their independence both by peaceful means and, if necessary, by armed struggle. This is very well known to those who fought for the independence of Egypt, Algeria and other Arab nations; this is well known to the Indonesian people and other peoples in Asia. Nor can it be unknown to the CPC leaders.

But this does not prevent them from accusing the CPSU and other Communist parties of "having sold out the nations' right to freedom" and of having a "passive, scornful, negative attitude toward the struggle of the oppressed nations for liberation." (Letter of the CC, CPC of June 14, 1963.)

The CPC leaders, having created the fictitious dilemma between the struggle for peace and for socialist revolution, are also trying to forge a false theory of a contradiction between the policy of peaceful coexistence and economic competition of the two systems, on the one hand, and the aspirations for liberation and revolution of the "third-world" nations, on the other.

The Communist parties and the socialist countries have not left a shadow of doubt as to the fact that the policy of peaceful coexistence does not mean the freezing of the *status quo* in social relations within the capitalist countries, or in the relations between the colonialists and the oppressed and exploited nations. Only contempt for facts could induce the CPC leaders to suggest that the CPSU wants "to replace revolutionary struggle by peaceful coexistence," that "the oppressed nations must wait for the collapse of imperialism as a result of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, which is tantamount to calling on the oppressed nations to reconcile themselves with imperialist robbery and slavery." (*Jenminjihpao,* October 22, 1963.)

In many countries of the "third world", enmeshed in the net of neo-colonial dependence, a relentless struggle is developing with the aim of becoming masters in their own home, to free themselves from the domination of foreign monopolies and planters, to get rid of imperialist military bases, and to remove the reactionary, mercenary cliques from positions of power.

A mass revolutionary movement is on the increase in those countries; lack of stabilization is a feature of their political and economic series of *coups d'etat* and upheavals. In Latin America, for example, the last two decades saw fifty *coups d'etat* and upheavals. Wherever the rule of governments which remain in the service of American capitalists and planters is jeopardized, wherever a democratic movement arises against the feudal system and local chieftains, in all those places reactionary military gangs, the notorious "gorillas", helped by a nearly open intervention of

the United States, impose their military dictatorship.

In South-East Asia, in South Vietnam, for more than ten years now a people's war has been going on against the puppet governments which owe their rule only to the immense financial assistance and increasingly open armed intervention on the part of the United States. In Laos, too, the people has been fighting for years against reactionary military cliques which, aided by the imperialists, are trying to seize power.

Does the peaceful coexistence policy pursued by the socialist countries facilitate or hinder the struggle of the "third-world" peoples to break the fetters of neo-colonialism and gain real independence? What do those nations need in order to win victory in this struggle?

They need, above all, termination of foreign interference and of armed intervention into their internal affairs. Left to face on their own the democratic and revolutionary movements within their nation, the imperialists' puppet governments would not in the long run be able to retain power. This indispensable defense against external interference and against forceful imposition of neo-colonialist regimes can be best achieved by the consolidation of peaceful coexistence at the roots of which lies the principle of respect for state sovereignty and repudiation of armed intervention into the domestic affairs of other countries and nations. This confounds and dooms to failure the efforts of the CPC leaders to convince the nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America that the problem of peaceful coexistence is of secondary importance, that there is a contradiction between the interests of freedom and the interests of world peace.

The central problem for the overwhelming majority of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America at the present time is the question of their economic development. They must find an answer to the question: how to bridge the gulf separating their countries from the industrialized nations, how to free themselves from the dependance on, and exploitation by, monopoly capitalism, how to accelerate the growth of national income and turn it to the benefit of their peoples?

In the era of free-competition capitalism, there still existed possibilities for a retarded country to shake off the bonds of feudalism, to develop its productive forces within the capitalist system, build up its industry and catch up with the more advanced countries. This was the path of development followed by Japan in Asia as well as by many European countries.

Today the capitalist road of industrialization and economic progress is already closed to the countries lagging in their development. It has been blocked by the capitalist monopolies, which

by dictating prices have imposed unequal terms of trade on the world market that discriminate against the countries producing raw materials and favor the industrialized countries.

It has been closed off by imperialism through its maintenance of the one-sided and primary-production nature of these countries, through its pumping of enormous profits from capital investment and through ruthless exploitation of cheap labor.

The toll which the underdeveloped countries pay the capitalist monopolies runs into thousands of millions of dollars annually. The losses suffered by these countries as a result of the unfavorable movements of prices in recent years amount to 2.3-2.5 thousand million dollars each year with a simultaneous decline in the "third world's" share in world trade. These losses are not compensated even minimally by the West's much publicized aid to underdeveloped countries. Their 1962 trade deficit is calculated at 2.6 thousand million dollars, but if we exclude the small number of oil-exporting countries then this deficit comes to 6.4 thousand million dollars. The imperialist countries have been systematically draining the underdeveloped nations of profits greater than the total of their investments and credits.

As a result, these countries, which for centuries have been milked dry by the colonialists, do not have adequate resources for the investments which would enable them to work their great natural resources and put to use the creative energies of their people.

The gulf dividing the economically developed and the emerging countries, instead of contracting, is only widening.

The average per capita national income in all the countries of the "third world" came to $131 in 1961, compared to $558 for the world as a whole and over $1,400 for the developed capitalist countries.

In South-East Asia national income per capita came to barely $85.

The drift towards widening and deepening the gulf between the wealthy and poor countries was not arrested by the latter's achievement of independence. On the contrary, between 1950 and 1960 national income per capita in the developed countries rose by $330, that is some 30 per cent. In the underdeveloped countries, however, the overall increase per capita in the same period came to only $26, that is 24 per cent. Ten years ago, the per capita output in the developed capitalist countries was already ten times greater than that in the underdeveloped countries. Today the gap is already 11-fold.

Thus the rich become ever richer and the poor remain poor.

The blot on contemporary civilization cast by capitalism and

imperialism defies all incantations and appeals for "revolutionary armed struggle." The achievement of independence, now attained by the vast majority of the peoples, is only an introductory step to the solution of this problem.

The breaking of the vicious circle in which the developing nations have found themselves depends, above all, on their choice of the proper road of socio-economic development. Experience shows that this can only be a non-capitalist road. Such a road has been paved by socialism.

Socialism, which began its historic march in the most poorly developed countries of Europe, not in the West, but in Russia and then in Central Europe, irrefutably demonstrates that under the conditions of social ownership of the means of production and socialist planned economy it is possible to attain an economic growth rate two or three times higher than in the developed capitalist countries.

For that reason the eyes of the peoples in the underdeveloped countries are on the socialist social system, and in its example they seek a model and inspiration for themselves. That is why the leaders of most of these peoples advance the slogan of socialism even when their concept of that political system has little in common with socialism.

In its political platform the Communist Party of China voices the conviction that ". . . in the course of revolutionary struggle by the oppressed nations and peoples the party of the proletariat can carry to a conclusion the cause of the national-democratic revolution on to the road of socialism only on condition that it advances its own separate program of a consistent struggle against domestic reaction, for national independence, for people's democracy." (Letter of CC, CPC, June 14, 1963.) This thought contains the essence of the classical theory of the hegemony of the working class in the liberation and democratic revolution as well as of the development of this revolution into a socialist one. Specifically, this theory has been confirmed by the popular democratic revolutions in Europe and Asia after World War II. It is probable that it will find application in other countries as well.

It would be dogmatic, however, to suppose that this theory will constitute the final word in the experience of socialist revolution, particularly today when the choice of a road of social development has confronted dozens of nations of the "third world," frequently entirely without any working class and industry, and at various levels of social development.

The truth of life is always more profound, wiser and more manifold than is the theory of yesterday. As the inapplicability of the capitalist road of development becomes increasingly obvious,

some truly independent governments of young national states, although led by forces which are non-Marxist ideologically and non-proletarian from the class standpoint, are not only proclaiming a socialist direction of development for their countries, but are undertaking and implementing social reforms which, in essence, are similar to those implemented by the countries of people's democracy. Of the Arab countries, Algeria and the United Arab Republic have already entered on to this road. Other countries of Asia and Africa are drawing closer to it.

Life is confirming the thesis on the non-capitalist road of development which was advanced in the Statement of 81 Communist and Workers' parties and which is completely ignored in the documents of the CPC.

What attitude should Communists take with regard to these new phenomena? Should they call upon the proletariat of those nations which under the leadership of non-Communists are undertaking socialist reforms to carry out a revolution with a "special program"? Or should they, contrary to sectarian prejudices, support these progressive and socialist tendencies and give these countries and governments political, material, scientific and technical, and military assistance? The answer to this question is unequivocal.

As Lenin foresaw it, the roads leading to socialism, have proved to be immeasurably richer, more variegated and complex than our former theoretical concepts. This has always been the case in periods of great changes in history.

The transition from feudalism to capitalism in Europe and America took almost three centuries. The experiences of that period by no means confirm the thesis of the Communist Party of China that "even a bourgeois revolution cannot be carried out without war" *(Jenminjihpao,* March 31, 1964.) The transition from feudalism to capitalism proceeded along various roads, non-peaceful and peaceful, both through violent revolution and civil war, and also through gradual, arduous evolution, under conditions of "grass-root" pressures by the masses and reforms carried out "from above."

There is nothing to indicate that in our epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism, life must always stick to the oft-repeated thesis of the CPC that "violent revolution by the proletariat and the dictatorship of the proletariat" constitute an indispensable and necessary condition for the march towards socialism.

It is highly probable, particularly in many newly-liberated countries, whose leaders at the outset did not set socialist goals for the national revolution, that life itself will impel the patriotic

forces to combine national revival with socialist transformations in new, hitherto unknown forms.

The possibility of such a course of events is inseparably bound up with the prospects of peace in the world. It will grow in measure as socialism attains economic and political superiority over capitalism, as the power of attraction exercised by the socialist example on the minds of the peoples of the developing countries grows, and as the socialist world gains the possibility to render increasingly more effective social and technical assistance to those countries.

International solidarity of all Communist parties, all anti-imperialist and liberation forces and, above all, unity of the socialist community of nations constitute the most important and decisive condition for progress in the struggle to accomplish the historic tasks of the Communist movement in every country and on a world scale.

Unity of action and concordance of policy of all Communist parties and of all socialist countries in relation to the imperialist world is an injunction stemming from the essence of the struggle between socialism and capitalism, is one of the principal factors in achieving superiority of the socialist world and of all revolutionary forces over the forces of imperialism and reaction.

At the current stage of the international Communist movement, when it has become a worldwide movement and the individual parties operate under widely different social and political conditions, in countries with different traditions and at various stages of development, differences of views on specific international problems and even differences on ideological issues are unavoidable. Such differences need not undermine the common front of the world Communist movement, and all the more so need they not pose the menace of a split if they are sensibly and calmly discussed, confronted with reality, with the intent of attaining a common position and with concern for unity.

The differences between the CP and the majority of the Communist parties, however, have assumed a different character.

The entire conduct of the Communist Party of China indicates that it began the dispute with other parties and advanced its own separate platform not in order to get at the truth and obtain a common position for all parties, but in order to bring about a split. For what purpose have the leaders of the CPC accused the CPSU and the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties of revisionism, of deviation from all the principles of Marxism-Leninism and betrayal of the revolution?

They themselves provided a clear answer to this.

In the article headed "The Leaders of the CPSU are the Greatest

Splitters of Our Times" (*Jenminjihpao*, February 4, 1964) the Chinese comrades write: "What does the history of the development of the international Communist movement demonstrate? . . . It demonstrates that like everything else, the international working-class movement tends to divide itself in two . . . Unity, struggle or even splits, and a new unity on a new basis—such is the dialectics of the development of the international working-class movement . . . Unity bought by forsaking principles and by wallowing in the mire with opportunists ceases to be proletarian unity."

The matter is crystal clear. The CPC leaders needed to charge the CPSU and other Communist parties with revisionism in order to have theoretical justification for a split. Therefore, they paid little attention to the justification of their charges or the soundness of their arguments.

In this light the CPC's attitude to public polemics becomes understandable. There was a time when the CPC was prepared to carry on the discussion through an internal private exchange of opinion between Central Committees of the Communist parties. But having lost hope, following the conference of 81 parties in Moscow, of securing the support of the leadership of other parties for their position, the CPC leaders unleashed a large-scale public polemic, from the start loading it with accusations and name-calling maledictions and execrations which ruled out all honest exchange of views and confrontation of arguments.

Many Communist parties, seriously alarmed by the situation, have taken a number of steps to stop this polemic. Such an initiative was also displayed by the leadership of our Party. We met with understanding on the part of the leadership of the CPSU, which in the autumn of last year unilaterally discontinued polemical publications in defense of its position. Last February the CPSU leadership, at the request of other parties, held up for six weeks the publication of the materials of their plenum on the situation in the international working-class movement.

The CPC leaders, however, have not met the proposals of fraternal parties. On the contrary, their response has been a fierce defense and approval of public polemics. They have declared: "Through this great debate, all the revolutionary forces in the world will be mobilized and all Marxist-Leninists will be tempered ideologically and politically." (*Jenminjihpao*, February 4, 1964.) "What was a bad thing is becoming a good thing . . . The present debate is undoubtedly the prelude to a new revolutionary upsurge." (Letter of the CC, CPC, February 29, 1964.)

In this way the CPC has officially served notice that it does not want to end the public polemics or change their form.

The CPC has not confined itself to sparking a public polemic but has in practice embarked on splitting activities in international organizations and within the international Communist movement. At every international meeting, conference, or congress of the trade unions, women's or peace movement, and even at gatherings of the Afro-Asian solidarity movement, the Chinese delegates have put forward their own separate platform and launched brutal attacks on the other socialist countries.

The CPC has now taken the path of provoking splits in other Communist parties, supporting small opposition groups which have designated themselves as "the central committees of genuinely Marxist-Leninist parties."

The stand taken by the CPC and its separate platform, its attacks on the CPSU cannot be reduced simply to ideological differences. The source of the current policy of the CPC should be sought in its desire to make the Chinese People's Republic one of the world powers.

The Chinese nation is the most numerous in the world. It has created a rich, ancient culture. It has carried out a great people's revolution which helped to change the face of the contemporary world. On the other hand, in its modern history this people has been subjected by imperialism to untold humiliations, inhuman exploitation and infinite misery. The Chinese people has a justified sense of injury and also a justified sense of its greatness and its rights. People's China has the right to be a world power, the right to exercise an outstanding influence on the course of international affairs.

The Chinese People's Republic's road to its due place among the great powers has been blocked by the policies of American imperialism. The United States refuses to admit China to the United Nations, has cut it off from direct influence on the course of world affairs, occupies Taiwan which is an integral part of the territory of China and surrounds it with an economic blockade.

Despite all the conceivable efforts on the part of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, it has not so far been possible to create a situation in which the United States would find itself compelled to change its hostile policies towards the Chinese People's Republic. Contrary to the obvious facts, however, the CPC leaders not only refuse to acknowledge that the Soviet Union has done everything in its power to strengthen the international position of People's China, but have even made the absurd charge that the Soviet Union has allied itself with the United States against the Chinese People's Republic. A singular example of this, in their view, is the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. This pact, to

which over a hundred states have acceded and which has helped to alleviate the cold war, has been called a "big, dirty fraud," a "tool of nuclear blackmail against the nations of the world" by the CPC, which has unleashed a slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union.

What are the causes of this?

The Chinese leaders, in their desire to secure for their country a position among the great powers, have decided that People's China must have atomic weapons. The Moscow Treaty forestalled their hopes that the Soviet Union would help People's China to master the production of these weapons. This is the primary source of their fierce attacks on the CPSU.

Let us examine this matter rationally.

In our times nuclear weapons have become a kind of badge of great-power status. The U.S. considers itself at liberty to ignore People's China's right to a voice in deciding on major international affairs because the latter does not possess nuclear weapons. Seen in this light, one can understand — but this does not mean approve —the desire of the CPC to obtain these weapons, one can understand why China did not sign the Moscow Treaty. It is all a question of their great-power aspirations.

But this is a matter of much wider aspect.

If the Soviet Union helped People's China to master the production of nuclear weapons and this were followed by a proliferation of these weapons, in the imperialist camp the arms race would be intensified on a wide scale and, with it, the danger of nuclear war. Moreover, the advanced capitalist countries which do not as yet possess nuclear weapons could manufacture them much more rapidly than China. Countries with the resources of France or Great Britain which for years have been expending enormous sums on the production of these extremely costly weapons and their means of delivery, possess barely two per cent of the nuclear capacity of the United States. Given even the greatest efforts and Soviet scientific and technical assistance it would take People's China many years to create a nuclear capacity equal to one per cent of the potential of the Soviet Union. This being so, the military balance of power, far from bringing the socialist countries any advantage, would in fact swing against them.

For these reasons the Soviet Union could not provide People's China with assistance in mastering the production of nuclear weapons. The Soviet position on this matter wholly conforms with the general line of the international Communist movement, laid down at the Moscow meetings, concerning the struggle for peace, nuclear-test bans and universal disarmament. Precipitation of the arms race and extreme aggravation of tension in international re-

lations simply in order to satisfy the atomic aspirations of the CPC leaders would be a highly pernicious policy fraught with the gravest of consequences.

In the present situation atomic weapons in the hands of the Chinese Party and government leaders would not only fail to increase China's security one whit but would encourage the United States and the other imperialist states to extend their ring of nuclear bases poised against China. Its security, like the security of all the socialist states, is effectively guarded by the nuclear might of the Soviet Union.

As the whole behavior of the Chinese comrades shows, these are all considerations which they brush aside. They have identified the struggle for peace, for peaceful coexistence, for international detente with their ambitions to achieve great-power status for China. All this they reduce to a single denominator. The CPC leaders have equated the great-power aspirations of China with the interests of peace and socialism. It is from this angle that they have marked out the general line of their international policies. Anything which does not lie along this line is branded as treachery, revisionism, deviation from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Once again we emphasize that China is entitled to a place among the great powers. But we condemn absolutely the means and methods chosen by the Chinese leaders to achieve this end. In this matter their policies have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism or proletarian internationalism. The interests of socialism, the struggle for peace, for prevention of nuclear war, for the freedom and independence of all nations, everything which the Communist and Workers' parties set forth in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow conferences, is of immeasurably greater, broader and more momentous importance to the international Communist movement, to all nations, than the great-power interests of People's China and the atomic ambitions of the CPC leaders who are trying to subordinate everything to their ambitions. The present general line of the international policy of the CPC cannot and will never be accepted by the international Communist movement since this line has features that are alien to Marxism-Leninism, features of nationalism and great-power ambitions.

Following this line the CPC leaders have been attempting to form their own grouping of states, separate from the socialist camp, made up of certain socialist and some non-socialist countries of Asia and Africa.

With the help of this policy the Chinese leaders hope to induce the imperialist states to recognize People's China as a partner of equal standing.

Therein lies the basic cause of the disruptive policy of the CPC within the socialist camp and its attempts to sow discord between the national-liberation movement and the socialist camp and to set the economically retarded countries against the developed countries — socialist as well as capitalist.

This, too, is the only conclusion that can be drawn from the CPC's adjusting ideology to the needs of current policies and their overtly demonstrated willingness to change their position if the imperialist powers change their attitude to the People's Republic of China. It was enough for France to establish diplomatic relations with People's China and withdraw its recognition of the Chiang Kai-shek government for the CPC propaganda to overlook the direct armed intervention of French neo-colonialists in Africa. It was enough for influential political and business quarters in West Germany, Britain and Japan to change their tone towards People's China for the columns of *Jenminjihpao* (January 21, 1964) to propound a theory of 'intermediate zones," announcing that West Germany, Great Britain, France, Japan, Canada, were countries "oppressed and tyrannized by the United States."

Comparing the ideological platform of the CPC leaders and their splitting policy, one may doubt whether they really believe the views they profess. Do they really believe in the inevitability of wars as long as imperialism exists? If the CPC leaders were really convinced that U.S. imperialism "will never bring itself to live in peace with a socialist state" they would not create conditions that favor this imperialism, they would not bring about a split in the socialist camp, they would not weaken its power.

The ideological position and the policy of the CPC run counter to the principles of proletarian internationalism and mean subordination of the historic interests of socialism to the short-term state goals of the People's Republic of China. This is a short-sighted and dangerous policy. The rift in the socialist camp, which is a tool of this policy, can only be to the advantage of the imperialist states. The imperialist politicians are not fools; they will not let themselves be taken in by illusions. They are not going to be scared by the sharp words and propaganda fulminations of the CPC. In politics it is not words but deeds and real power that count. And the power that guarantees the effectiveness of the policies of the socialist camp is the military and economic might of the Soviet Union and the unity of all socialist states.

By attacking the USSR, by weakening the socialist camp, the CPC is cutting away the branch on which it is itself sitting; it is snapping the foundations on which the security of People's China also rests. The road on to which the CPC leaders are leading their Party and country exposes the cause of socialism to danger and

for this reason cannot bring about a raising of the status of China and achievement of its rightful position in the world. The strength and international position of People's China, its security and conditions of development are best guaranteed by unity with the whole community of the socialist nations.

By choosing a separate political line the CPC leaders would like to subordinate to this line both the national-liberation movement and the international Communist movement. They have arrogated to themselves the position of infallible mentor to all the Communist parties and hegemony of the Communist and national-liberation movement.

History, however, cannot be turned back. The international Communist movement has reached political and ideological maturity. It has already left behind the diseases of infantilism and adolescence, diseases of naive Leftism, revolutionary phraseology and the personality cult. Recognition of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU as the turning-point in the history of the Communist movement was, on the part of the Communist parties, neither a gesture of courtesy nor an expression of "obedience to the conductor's baton," as the leaders of the CPC claim today.

We expressed this recognition because the resolutions of that Congress most fully corresponded to the needs of that historic movement, freed the CPSU itself and the entire working-class movement from what had been obsolete and degenerated, what had impeded our onward march.

Since that time the Communist movement has assumed new strength and viability, its political thought has taken up new problems, freed itself from ossification, while the Communist parties consolidated their ties with the masses. All efforts to erase these achievements are doomed to failure.

Restoration of the unity of the Communist movement, and particularly the ensuring of a common line of action against imperialism, as well as of normal inter-party relations based on equality and solidarity, are in the best interests of the Communist and Workers' parties and in the interests of the socialist camp. In connection with this, a number of fraternal parties are calling for the convening of a new world conference. The Chinese leaders, however, do not favor the convening of a conference. In the letter of the CC, CPC to the CC, CPSU of May 7 this year they say that it "requires perhaps four or five years, or even more" to carry out the preparations for such a conference. They have thus withdrawn their earlier agreement to begin these preparations this year, postponing them till next year.

This playing for a delay is very eloquent. The leaders of the CPC are against the conference, for they desire to wait and see

what time will bring them, what "successes" they will score in their splitting activities in the international Communist movement, how the attitude of the imperialist states towards the Chinese People's Republic and its position in the world will shape up in the course of the next few years. They desire fully to test in practice their present line of international policy.

There is no doubt that the divergences which have appeared cannot be overcome in a short time. An international conference requires patient and good preparation. But the question of when these preparations are to begin and how long they should take must not depend solely on the arbitrary will of the CPC. The preparations for the conference should begin when the majority of Communist and Workers' parties says so. The date of the international conference, in which all parties will participate, should be set on the basis of such preparations. However, the refusal of one or of several parties cannot be considered as an insurmountable obstacle to the convening of such a conference.

It seems advisable in the existing situation to begin at the earliest possible date the preparatory work for the conference, with the participation of parties representing the most important regions of the world. A commission composed of those parties would hold a preliminary discussion on the problems to be dealt with by the future conference and prepare draft documents which, after discussion in the individual parties and between parties, would become the basis of the future joint resolutions.

Our Party is prepared to participate in preparatory work so conceived and will spare no effort to restore the unity and solidarity of the fraternal parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninsm.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

RESOLUTION* OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE SWISS PARTY OF LABOR

I

Our Swiss Party of Labor is celebrating its 20th anniversary. It has grown on the basis of common struggle by Communists, Left-wing Socialists and non-party people against the pro-fascist policy of the ruling Swiss bourgeoisie, and against the policy of civic peace and anti-communism pursued by the Social-Democratic Party and the Swiss Trade Union Federation, for the democratic rights of the people and the interests of workers.

Hitler's defeat and the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition was a turning point. The decisive role in it was played by the Soviet Union's heroic struggle and tremendous sacrifice. A new period began in world politics. New socialist states emerged in Europe. The bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries was compelled to make concessions to the working class and improve the condition of the working people. The militancy of the masses increased. Big workers' strikes and peasants' protests demonstrated their striving to advance their interests and challenge the rule of the big bourgeoisie, the trusts and monopolies.

The national-liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America surged forward rapidly. In 1949 revolution triumphed in China and in 1959, in Cuba. In 1962 independence was won by Algeria. New national states appeared, which shook off imperialist rule and took their own road of development. In some of these states the imperialists are trying to retain their influence and continue plundering their former colonies, often with the assistance of the local reactionaries and under the guise of so-called aid.

THE MAIN PROBLEM OF WORLD POLITICS

The decisive factor in world development in the last 20 years was the growth of the might of the socialist camp and, first and foremost, of the Soviet Union, which ended the U.S. nuclear weap-

*Vorwarts, May 21, 1964.

ons monopoly, became an atomic power itself, won superiority in key branches of science and technology, developed its industry and agriculture, built up modern transport, raised the living standard, and improved the social security system. Now it has come close to outstripping the United States economically.

Preservation of peace remains the main problem of world politics. A nuclear war would bring unheard-of devastation and the death of millions upon millions of people. It would wipe out major industrial centers, destroy cities and villages and the cultural values created in the course of centuries, and incur painful consequences for future generations. More, it could destroy all life on earth. Therefore, the struggle for peace has a decisive bearing on the struggle for socialism, for the building of socialism and communism.

War is not inevitable any longer; imperialism has lost world preponderance. History is being made today not only by slave-owners and feudals striving for territorial seizures, and capitalists driving for profit, but also, and to an ever growing extent, by the world community of socialist countries, the masses in the capitalist states, the peoples fighting for national independence, and peace-loving people the world over. These forces can thwart the warmongers' intrigues and prevent a new world war.

SUCCESSES OF PEACE POLICY

However, there still exist circles steering towards war. Besides the American "wild men" and the supporters of the Nazis and the revenge-seekers in the FRG, these also include sections of the world bourgeoisie and international monopoly capital which refuse to reconcile themselves to the existence of the socialist world. Of particular danger is the revived German militarism, whose longing to get atomic weapons directly endangers the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and creates the threat of a new world war. The refusal of the capitalist states, Switzerland among them, to recognize the GDR is, in effect, a support for this revanchist West-German policy.

The policy of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems has scored signal successes. The settlement of the Caribbean crisis precipitated by the United States, the agreement banning the most dangerous atomic-weapons tests, and the USSR-USA agreement not to send into space vehicles with nuclear and other mass destruction weapons are the first concrete steps showing that the struggle of the masses in all the continents may bring about a prohibition of all nuclear tests and nuclear weapons, and achieve partial, and then, complete disarmament. The peoples are also demanding the realization of the Soviet Union's latest

proposal to conclude an international agreement on the renunciation by states of the use of force in settling border and territorial disputes. Ever more people, including high-level statesmen and politicians in the capitalist countries, are beginning to appraise soberly the changed balance of world forces and to realize that international issues are best settled by negotiation.

PARTY OF LABOR FIGHTS FOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The unity of the international working class and the world Communist movement is a most important factor in the struggle for peace. Our Party opposes the stand of the leaders of the Communist Party of China, who are working openly for a split in the Communist movement. However great the services of the CPC in the struggle to wrest the Chinese people from age-old poverty, the dogmatic policy of revolutionary phrasemongering runs counter to the basic principles and spirit of creative Marxism. As exemplified by their hostile attitude to the Moscow Treaty, it leads to statements that echo the attacks of the most reactionary and rabid anti-communists, thus furthering the cause of the warmongers and oppressors of the peoples.

The Party of Labor will continue to fight for peace and for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. That is the only policy which promotes the struggle for the immediate and future interests of the international working class and the peoples still oppressed by imperialism, and conforms with the national interests of Switzerland and all other countries. The Party of Labor will fight tirelessly against atomic arming of the Swiss army, for the banning of nuclear weapons tests, for the establishment of atom-free zones that would include Switzerland, and for general, complete and controlled disarmament.

II

Switzerland is today one of the most highly developed capitalist countries in the world. Her science, industry, trade, crafts and finance hold a prominent place on the world capitalist market. This is the result of the hard and tireless labor of the people and the high skill of the factory and office workers, engineers and technicians, artisans and peasants. It is also the result of the fact that Switzerland was not involved in the wars of the past hundred years, the First and Second World Wars included. It is the result of the fact that while wars and war hysteria gripped other countries, Switzerland developed her industry and trade, built up her productive forces and extended her international contacts.

RISE OF THE SWISS ECONOMY

The Swiss economy has been on a constant, fairly steep upgrade, spurred by a continuous influx of foreign capital, the owners of which regarded Switzerland as a place for safe and profitable investment. The capital which could not be invested in Switzerland proper, went abroad again as Swiss loans. Switzerland profited greatly from the high demand, generated in most countries by the needs of postwar economic rehabilitation, to which she was able promptly to contribute with her technically skilled production apparatus, which had remained intact.

The economic situation was exceptionally favorable in the postwar years, and the Swiss bourgeoisie raked in colossal profits throughout that period. There was a constant increase in the number of enterprises and the people employed in them, in labor productivity and production, in domestic and foreign trade, in the export of capital and in contacts with foreign enterprises. Between 1937 and 1962 the number of factory-type establishments grew from 8,365 to 14,354 and employment in them grew from 360,003 to 750,453. In the same period, the number of joint-stock companies went up from 19,567 to 39,555. Switzerland's close ties with the world economy are illustrated by her items of revenue. From the middle of 1957 till 1961 her foreign trade deficit climbed to 1,500 million francs, but it was counter-balanced by an income of 900 million francs from tourism and 600 million from investments abroad. Switzerland's foreign investments amount to about 38,000 million francs, whereas her credit abroad totals only 17,500 million. There also was an increase in assets due to all types of insurance, including pension funds and social insurance enterprises paying benefits to old people, invalids and other disabled persons. Between 1939 and 1961 these accumulations grew from 800 million to 5,500 million francs. At the same time, from 1938 till 1962 the currency reserves of the National Bank increased from 3,200 million to 12,000 million francs.

The economic growth was so great that local manpower became insufficient. A shortage of factory and office workers, technicians and shop attendants affected the whole country. The bourgeoisie recruited them abroad, concerned solely with higher profits and oblivious of the economic and social implications. Towards the end of August 1963 the number of foreign workers in the country added up to nearly 690,000, with men numbering 480,000 and women 209,400. According to official data, at the beginning of 1964 foreigners accounted for 27 per cent of the gainfully employed.

The successful economic development of Switzerland is, as a matter of fact, a result of adroit exploitation of both the Swiss working class and foreign workers by the owners of the means of

production. With the help of their propaganda and by maintaining a certain standard of living, the Swiss capitalists want to create the impression of general prosperity. However, although the living conditions of the working people did improve, often due to overtime or female labor, with the resulting higher family income, this was due only to the additional exertion of hired labor. The employers raise labor productivity through streamlining, cutting down unproductive time, and intensifying labor, thus adding to the nervous strain and fatigue of the working people. In capitalist society labor productivity is raised even at the expense of the workers' health. Switzerland does not have the system of labor protection that exists in some other capitalist countries; it has no effective legislation on, or control over, safety measures in production involving poisonous substances.

REVERSE SIDE OF THE SITUATION

Inflation and a high cost of living are the reverse side of the economic picture. The prices of consumer goods, food-stuffs and clothing, and above all house-rents, are rising from day to day. The Swiss franc of 1939 has depreciated to less than half its value. In the past four years the cost of living has risen 14 per cent (8 per cent in the last two years). Particularly hard hit are the old people and the pensioners, whose savings and pensions are depreciating and are already barely enough to make ends meet. Besides the high cost of living there are the taxes, especially the turnover tax which is still being levied on important consumer goods and already exceeds 1,000 million francs a year.

As in the other capitalist countries, the Swiss bourgeoisie relies more and more on the direct support of the state and its machinery and finances. The tax policy and the policy of armaments, the guarantees in case of export losses, aid to underdeveloped countries, the politico-economic program of the Bundesrat and the confederation councils—all this serves the interests of capital, the big enterprises, cartels, trusts and monopolies. A program called "Measures to Combat the High Cost of Living" is being implemented at present, but none of the measures really help to combat the high cost of living. Nothing is done to solve the house-rent problem. Moreover, there are plans to abolish rent control and to increase the bank rate. The price of milk has been raised four rappes (which is fair to the peasants) at the consumers' expense. Beer, mineral water and chocolate have also risen in price, and petrol is to go up again, too. As regards military expenditures, which add greatly to the inflation, they are to grow even more. In 1960 they amounted to 924 million francs and in 1962 to 1,264 million while in the 1964 draft budget they are estimated at 1,490 million francs.

These military expenditures, colossal for our small country, are officially justified by the so-called armed neutrality of Switzerland. In reality they are the result of the policy of the big Swiss bourgeoisie and Swiss finance capital, which follow the most reactionary groups of Western Europe and the United States. "Neutrality and solidarity," i.e., solidarity with the capitalist West, proclaimed by the Swiss bourgeoisie after the Second World War, remains the main political course.

DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACY

Despite the strength of the Swiss bourgeoisie, the rulers of our country fear the growth of the forces of socialism, which they seek to retard with the help of a reactionary anti-communist policy. Although Switzerland's relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states have improved, anti-communism is still the general political line of the ruling Swiss bourgeoisie. Trade discrimination, undisguised anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda in the army, the schools and institutions of higher learning, especially in the German-speaking part of the country, the boycott of goods from the East and the ban on public appearances by representatives of the culture of the sociailst countries in the German-speaking part of the country, show that the Swiss bourgeoisie still adheres to cold-war positions, which leads today to the isolation of our country and to the estabilshment of control over its policy by the big capitalist powers. This runs counter to Swiss neutrality. Broad sections of the Swiss people and part of the bourgeoisie, however, are beginning to realize that anti-communism is a sterile policy.

The first indications of an international detente are still often received by the more reactionary quarters with anti-communist hysteria and neo-fascist outrages. Similar phenomena are to be observed also in domestic policy. Democratic rights are grossly violated, especially in the German-speaking part of Switzerland, where the Party of Labor has to wage its struggle under difficult conditions. Confronted with strong pressure on the part of the bourgeoisie, which is supported by the Right-wing Social-Democrats, our Party is compelled to combat this abnormal state of affairs, although it often does not even have premises for meetings. Members of our Party are threatened with dismissal from work and even with eviction. This makes it practically impossible for many Party members to use their constitutional rights.

Things are different in the French and Italian parts of Switzerland, where the working class has been able to preserve its democratic rights.

Thus, there is a big difference in this respect between the German part and the French and Italian parts of the country. The tasks of

the working people and of the public at large is to put an end to this situation by demanding restoration of democracy throughout the country.

This can be done, for the majority of our people should not be confused with the men obsessed by anti-communism. There are many people even in the German part who want the democratic freedoms to be respected.

The restoration of democratic freedoms will make it possible to enliven political life in our country and extend democracy. There is a widespread opinion that Switzerland is not only the oldest, but also the most exemplary democracy in the world. The Swiss bourgeoisie is at great pains to sustain and propagate this illusion. The real picture is different: the ruling bourgeoisie and the authorities more and more often ignore the will of the people. Decisive matters of military policy are systematically removed from the sphere subject to popular decision, while foreign policy remains, as before, the prerogative of the Bundesrat. Women are still denied suffrage at the confederation level and have it only in three out of 25 cantons. The workers do not have even a formal right to take part in managing enterprises.

It is the task of the Party of Labor to fight for the restoration of genuine democracy, for the preservation and for the extension of constitutional and trade-union rights on the entire territory of Switzerland.

III

DEFEND IMMEDIATE INTERESTS OF THE PEOPLE

To fight for these interests, for the material and social security of the working people, is an important task of the Party. The cost of living is rising rapidly, bringing down the purchasing capacity of the franc and of wages and incomes of the working people. The measures regulating the economic situation are directed against the workers, office employees, artisans, small and medium manufacturers, and peasants. At the same time, the capitalist magnates have enlarged, strengthened and modernized their enterprises and trading establishments. They can make new investments out of their own means. But the small and economically weak enterprises depend on loans and credits, which are becoming ever more difficult, if not impossible, to get. Under the pretext of the need to regulate the economic situation the employers oppose higher wages, shorter hours and three-week paid holidays for all. They resist improvements of benefits, pensions and public house-building, and rent controls. The reduction and discontinuation of public construction is directed against canton- and community-planned construction of

houses, which in most cases is carried out in the interests of the working people. Thus, the measures to regulate the economic situation lead, in the final count, to the concentration of capital, consolidation of the positions of the monopolists, and the weakening and removal of small producers.

The Party opposes wage-freezing and all attempts to prevent increases of benefits and pensions. The wages bear no proportion to the sustained economic advance, the growth of labor productivity and the enormous profits of the capitalists over all these years. The Party continues to fight for subsistence-level benefits and pensions, for pensions that would ensure a trouble-free evening of life to their recipients.

The rising cost of living is particularly affected by the rents, which often swallow up 20, 25 and even 30 per cent of the income of wage and salary workers. The high rent also weighs heavily on the middle strata, on artisans and small businessmen. The Party demands re-establishment of universal price controls, above all rent controls and the rights of the tenants, as well as large-scale construction of cheap and good flats, and effective measures against the ever more shameless real estate profiteering.

DEMANDS OF PEASANTS

The Party supports the just demands of the peasants and opposes the agreements which have been or are to be concluded within the EEC and EFTA framework under the pretext of European integration, leading to a reduction of the incomes of peasants or even threatening their ruin. The Party considers the unity of workers and peasants to be essential for the struggle against the domination of big industrialists, banks and monopolies, and for higher living standards.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN

The Party of Labor has always fought for the equality of women. The growing participation of women in the economic life of the country demands and makes possible an extension of this struggle, especially for women's suffrage in the confederation and the cantons, for the principle of "equal wages for equal work," for the right of mother and child to assistance, for legislation on additions to the wages of breadwinners, for the expansion of the network of creches, kindergartens and playgrounds and for the setting up of modern community service establishments.

The Party supports the demand of the youth for democratization of the educational system and the right to free education and vocational training; it advocates shorter working hours and longer

holidays, proper organization of leisure, and the building of more houses for young people, playgrounds and sports facilities.

PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN MANPOWER

The Party's attitude towards the problem of foreign manpower is governed by the principle of proletarian internationalism, which also calls for defense of the rights of the Swiss working class. Mindful of their profits only and ignoring the possible consequences, the employers invite workers from abroad, but in many cases do not even guarantee normal working and living conditions for them. The size of the foreign labor force must be determined today with due consideration for the general interests of the economy and guarantees as regards normal conditions of life and work. The recruitment of foreign workers must be placed under the control of the trade unions. Foreign workers, must be provided the same working conditions as the Swiss workers and guaranteed corresponding trade-union rights. Optional Swiss citizenship must be made available to them without any political discrimination. The Party calls upon all working people to ignore the campaign of baiting foreigners organized by chauvinist and elements hostile to the working class, and to show solidarity with the foreign workers in their struggle for their just demands. The Swiss and foreign workers must join hands irrespective of nationality, language or customs in common struggle for common rights and interests.

The policy of civic peace and cooperation with the big bourgeoisie, long pursued by the Right-wing Social-Democratic leadership and the Swiss Trade Union Federation, has found fresh expression in the refusal to fight for a 44-hour week. It is a disgraceful surrender, a typical sample of the "class peace" policy which binds the working class hand and foot and helps the capitalists to exploit it. All this is taking place at a time when big capital is raking in the highest profits in its history.

The Party of Labor urges all workers to reject resolutely this policy of capitulation, to rally and launch determined mass actions in defense of their working conditions and a decent living.

Unity is more important today for the Swiss working class than ever before. Unity of action of the working class in the struggle for working people's interests, for peace, democracy and socialism, is a powerful weapon and a colossal force. Therefore the Party of Labor again calls upon Social-Democratic workers, trade union members and non-organized workers to unite fraternally and act in the everyday struggle for new social demands.

The alternative to the monopoly policy and to the "Measures to Combat the High Cost of Living" mapped out by the Bundesrat, is indicated in our program. In contrast to the measures of the

Bundesrat, our program will satisfy the growing requirments of the population and end inflation in the course of the development of production. Therefore we propose the following four points:

1. Establishment of universal control over prices and price-building, including control over house-rents with an eye to differences in the tenants' incomes.

2. A tax reform with an eye to speculation profits and superprofits, and measures to preclude persistent non-payment of taxes.

3. A considerable reduction of expenditures on the army and armaments.

4. Establishment of control over investments, foreign trade and the trade balance so as to increase production and raise the technical standard of enterprises.

These measures will make it possible to restrict the domination of the big trusts and monopolies, pending their nationalization. They are the first step towards the future socialist Switzerland.

NEW POSSIBILITIES, NEW PROSPECTS

New possibilities and prospects are opening up before the Party of Labor. New strata of the working class and the people, Left Socialists, young people and the intelligentsia are beginning to understand the changes taking place in the world, to oppose the reactionary policy of the ruling bourgeoisie, and to see through the reformists' double game. They are alarmed to see that the trusts and monopolies shape the country's destiny, that the country is controlled by moneybags and speculators.

The policy of peace, the road to relaxation of tension and the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, to disarmament and the prohibition of atomic weapons, constantly indicated by our Party and the entire world Communist movement, and also the struggle for genuine democracy in our country and other capitalist, semi-colonial or fascist states, such as Spain and Portugal—all this provides new possibilities for unity of action with the Social Democrats (even if partial unity at first with its individual sections or activists), with the trade unions and the pacifist and Christian groups.

Given good faith on all sides, these actions can be broadened and the joint struggle can give rise to an extensive popular movement in which all citizens aspiring to progress and happiness — young and old people, women, students and intellectuals — will take part. Only this unity and this pooling of forces of the people will enable our country to emerge from the impasse into which the big bourgeoisie is leading it.

Twenty years old today, our Party knows that it has a great and inspiring mission to accomplish. The Party is the militant and

resolute vanguard of the Swiss working-class movement, serving a lofty ideal. The ideas and actions of this vanguard are based on the great revolutionary life-giving force of our epoch, Marxism-Leninism. The Party of Labor will realize the hopes of the working people for a better future. It will lead the country to socialism, which will turn Switzerland into a country without classes and exploitation, a country of prosperity, social justice, and freedom for all.

FOR UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

REPORT* BY ERNEST BURNELLE, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM AT A PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC, CPB, MAY 9-10, 1964

Since the beginning of the year the leaders of the Communist Party of China have stepped up the attacks which they intensively conducted throughout last year against the CPSU and the entire international working-class movement. Their factional activities have gone so far as to face the international Communist movement with the imminent danger of a split.

The leaders of the CPC are deliberately courting such a split which they evidently are out to provoke at any price. They stop at no fabrication and make the most absurd and ridiculous accusations. For example, they allege that the Program of the CPSU adopted at the 22nd Congress is directed against the revolutionary movement and at the restoration of capitalism, that there is a process of "embourgeoisement" going on in the USSR and that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country. As regards our Party, the Peking *Information Bulletin* has gone so far as to allege that we condemned the decisive assistance which the USSR rendered the Hungarian working people at the time of the counter-revolutionary putsch in 1956. The falsity of this assertion can easily be proved. More than that, the Chinese leaders have the temerity to accuse our Party of having attempted to paralyze the militancy of the working class during the general strikes of 1960-61.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China are resorting to the most reprehensible methods of subversion in their efforts at all costs to organize groups of their supporters in opposition to the international Communist movement. They are trying to weave intrigues inside all Communist parties and even inside the Communist Party of Spain, which as everyone knows is working under the arduous conditions of illegality. They ally themselves with any renegades expelled from the Communist parties, with inveterate anti-Communists and anti-sovieteers. Thus we are dealing here not with a contribution by the Chinese Communist Party to the discussion within the international Communist movement; the

---

*Abridged. Translated from **Drapeau Rouge**, May 13, 1964.

polemic initiated and carried on by the leaders of the CPC is not aimed at strengthening the socialist camp, the working-class and national-liberation movements; nor is it aimed at consolidating the unity of the various Communist parties of the world.

The Communist parties have not remained passive in the face of the dangerous activity of the CPC leaders. A little more than a year ago a considerable number of Communist parties joined the CPSU in proposing that the public debate be discontinued, that a serious examination be made of the points at issue, and the differences ironed out in the course of exhaustive and thorough discussion. In view of this, the report of our Central Committee to the 14th Congress of our Party in Antwerp, it will be remembered, contained no allusion to the responsibility of the Chinese leaders for the factional activities which should indeed have been censured.

In order to close the public polemic and to contribute to the success of the negotiations that were to begin last summer between the Soviet and Chinese leaders, no mention of the activities of the Chinese leaders either on an international plane or in Belgium was made in the report or in the theses of that Congress. This was an important concession on our part, for by refraining from denouncing the interference by the Chinese leaders in the internal affairs of our Party, we were unable fully to expose the nefarious activities of the factional group which we were obliged to expel from our ranks.

Hence it was only natural that when the attempts made by several fraternal parties to appeal to the Chinese leaders ended in failure, and also in view of the fact that in February of this year the latter intensified their frenzied attacks on the USSR, the Central Committee of the CPSU shed full light on the true purpose and content of Peking's sallies, revealed the social and ideological roots of the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, and publicly denounced the anti-Soviet, anti-Marxist character and Trotskyite tendency of their positions.

Our Party holds that the report delivered by Comrade Suslov at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU is a document that serves the cause of unity in the international Communist movement. The Party is circulating this report widely, organizing a thorough study and discussion of the ideas contained in it.

WHY DID THE CHINESE LEADERS NOT START A DIALOGUE WITH US?

One of our chief criticisms of the Chinese leaders is that they distorted the character of the political discussion on an international scale from the very outset and, in effect, prevented it from being conducted. Political discussion on the scale of the world Communist

movement is absolutely essential in view of the profound changes that are taking place in the world today.The unprecedented scope of the class struggle and the growing responsibility this lays on the Communist movement makes it imperative for us to compare our conclusions, our interpretations, our points of view, our experience and our tactics. These exchanges are all the more necessary since the political evolution in the world today is marked by a great diversity of specific conditions in each country, which makes it necessary for the different Communist parties to show greater initiative in their activity and to make a deeper study of their own problems.

In view of the diversity of conditions, the difference in numerical strength, social composition and the concrete results of their policy of united action, the various Communist parties of the world do not have the same problems and the pace of their advance is not the same. It is therefore quite normal for their progress to be accompanied by temporary lags, occasional misunderstandings and even profound disagreements which are the negative aspects of the broader process of growth. The only way of overcoming these disagreements is through free, uninhibited and perhaps even public discussion among the Communist parties, extension of bilateral contacts with frank expression of views undeterred by considerations of prestige, and transmission of experience in good faith. This is admittedly not always easy, but it is undoubtedly within the powers of all Marxist-Leninist parties.

The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party did not adopt this attitude in their relations with the Communist Party of Belgium. We last had direct contact with the Central Committee of the CPC in 1960 at the time of our 13th Congress in Liege, At that time the Communist Party of China responded to our invitation and the Chinese comrade who was present at our sittings handed us a telegram from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China which stated in part:

"The Communist Party of China and the Chinese people are following with fraternal sympathy the struggle you are waging in defense of world peace, for the preservation of the vital rights of the working people and for social progress.

"Your struggle is an integral part of the great liberation movement which has been joined by progressive people the world over.

"We wish your Party further success in the cause of uniting the entire working class, all laboring people, all progressive and democratic forces."

If the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party had cause subsequently to alter its appraisal of the activity of our Party, why did it not inform us accordingly in the customary

manner? Why did it not offer to discuss the matter directly with us instead of resorting to factional methods and underhand maneuvers? We would consider it quite normal if a fraternal party, having been informed by us direct, were to present its own views to us openly and frankly and to criticize us if need be.

DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITY OF THE CHINESE LEADERS

Comrade Suslov in his report exposes the petty-bourgeois character of the ideology of the CPC leaders. It is precisely this petty-bourgeois deviation that one finds at the root of their nationalistic position and Trotskyite behavior. It determines the wavering, unstable and febrile character of their political positions not only on the international plane but in internal policy as well. This is evidenced by the failure of the "Big Leap" by means of which the Chinese leaders proposed to by-pass essential stages of industrialization, disregarding the objective laws of political economy. Opportunism, leftist phraseology and revolutionary rhetoric which in the given instance serve merely as cover, predominate at present in the views of the leaders of the Communist Party of China. We know that the origins of the faction which for some years has been conducting clandestine activity within our Party can be traced to the Communist Party of China. Shortly before the 14th Congress, the heads of this faction, on the advice of the Chinese leaders, organized their own propaganda center which circulated its own leaflets and advanced its own slogans contradicting the line of the Party. On the eve of the Congress the factionalists concentrated their efforts on objectives of a definitely revisionist character: recognition in the Party Rules of the right to factional activity, in other words, legilization of their own factional activity within the Party. It is therefore not surprising that the Antwerp Congress decided unanimously by nearly 300 votes, with one against and 8 abstentions) to expel the factionalists. The decision was taken not because of the personal opinions of individual members of the group, but exclusively because of their refusal to renounce their disruptive activity, for this is incompatible with and contrary to the Rules of the Party.

Nevertheless we had many political discussions with them. We spared no effort to try to convince them that they were taking an erroneous course. We opened the columns of our press to them as a debating platform in order that they might see for themselves how isolated they were. Repeated attempts were made to persuade them to abjure their factionalist activity. But evidently the encouragement they received from Peking outweighed all other considerations.

After their expulsion from the Party, the leaders of the faction

founded the so-called "Belgian Communist Party". The reaction was jubilant. The splitters claimed that the Communist Party of Belgium had split into two more or less equal parts. But the failure of many of the splitters' undertakings and their inability to organize their groups showed the reactionaries that they had rejoiced too soon. It would, however, be a mistake not to see that the small sects of splitters are doing the working-class movement grave harm at the present time. They are carrying on their factional activity among the workers, advancing ultra-leftist slogans in and out of season, thereby impeding the progress of the working-class struggle. Of course the splitters do not need a large and powerful organization in order to carry on activity consisting exclusively in muddying the waters.

THE LONG STRUGGLE AGAINST LEFTISM

Fortunately they encountered a strong rebuff wherever they appeared and especially at the enterpriss. And not only on the part of the Communist Party organizations, but also of the trade unions and the people's movement in the Walloon districts.

It does not require great courage nowadays to advance revolutionary-sounding slogans, for the masses everywhere are voicing their dissatisfaction with things as they are. To be a revolutionary today does not mean merely indulging in revolutionary phraseology. It implies above all the ability to find the particular slogans and forms of activity that will unite the masses, make their actions more effective, ensure their victory in the fight for peace, for their economic demands, for democracy and political reform.

Incidentally, it is worthwhile noting that the shift to the Left has occurred latterly in our country is not the fruit of Leftist declarations, but the result of the political experience acquired by the working class itself over quite a long period of time, the result of numerous battles which were never based on ultra-Left slogans, battles in the course of which the workers learned that the policy of class collaboration has nothing to offer them.

It is by no means accidental that the history of our Party is a long record of persistent effort to extricate ourselves from the swamp of sectarianism. It is to the great credit of Joseph Jacquemotte that during the big shift to the Left in 1935-36 he carried on a stubborn fight against the Leftist danger, against irresponsible slogans leading to the isolation of the Party at the very time when alliance with other forces was the only way out.

Jacquemotte's activity from the very foundation of the Communist Party of Belgium was distinguished by his constant efforts to extend the Party's work among the masses and in the trade unions, despite the provocations of the Rights. He also waged a persistent

struggle against the Trotskyites and ultra-Left anti-Soviet elements.

Firmly adhering to the Jacquemotte tradition, our Party is working with redoubled energy for a program of peace, social progress and for the broadest alliance of all the forces of the working people. It may be recalled that toward the end of his life, Joseph Jacquemotte on behalf of the Party and in pursuance of its struggle to bar the road to fascism and war, invited the Workers' Party of Belgium to affiliate with our Party as an autonomous organization. And today, faithful to this tradition, we regard our Party's adherence to the "Common Action" organization to be a decisive step toward uniting the forces of the working class.

NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

It is apparently impossible under the present circumstances to hope for an end to the public debate as we proposed last year. We feel, therefore, that the Communist and Workers' parties must obviously orientate on convening another international meeting.

In our opinion such a meeting should continue the efforts undertaken at the 1957 and 1960 meetings with a view to the further elaboration in solving the problems facing them. It would be useful to study developments since the latter part of 1960 in order to draw some conclusions. New problems have arisen which demand analysis in the light of the present situation and the changed balance of forces. It would be a good thing to define the objectives which the international Communist movement may reasonably set itself for the coming period. Thus, we feel that it would be desirable if the Communist parties came to the meeting resolved not to permit the differences to predominate or allow mutual recriminations to overshadow constructive activities. There are enough Communist and Workers' parties which condemn the position and the disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders and which endorse the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the joint decisions of 1957 and 1960 and the world program of communism advanced by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, to be able to arrive at a common view with regard to a perspective and tactics capable of giving new impetus to our movement and to all the progressive forces.

The meeting could also define the rules governing relations between the Communist parties. Needless to say, these relations have always been based on standards which, when observed, guarantee the independence of the parties and the unity of the entire international Communist movement. However, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that important changes have taken place in this sphere in the past ten years. In our opinion it would be a good thing to examine these changes and jointly explore ways of strengthening

the unity of our movement on the basis of the equality of all the parties.

Less than ten years ago the Communist parties embarked on the path of bilateral contacts. The same may be said of the practice of regional meetings. This method is comparatively new. Hence it is understandable that it has not yet yielded the desired results. In our opinion the bilateral relations have often been of a rather too formal nature. It is up to us to improve them. The same applies to regional meetings, which in our view should be practised on a broader scale and which could be useful in preparing for international meetings of the Communist parties.

Before the projected meeting is held it would be well to take the opportunity to increase contacts between the Communist parties, arrange extensive exchanges of opinions and joint study of the objective situation and the future perspectives of the struggle.

The reactionaries hope that the serious conflict that has arisen between the CPC and the international Communist movement will disorientate the Communist parties, weaken and demoralize them and plunge them into the bog of sectarianism. But they are gravely mistaken. Even if the relations between the majority of the parties and the Chinese leaders continue for some time to remain abnormal, and even if the Chinese leaders commit the folly of splitting the movement on the international plane, the Communist parties will continue to grow stronger, to carry on ideological work in order to defeat the Leftist splitters. The Communist parties have always emerged stronger from struggle against attempts by sectarians and opportunist elements to divide their ranks. And so it will be this time too.

RESOLUTION* OF PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium, which met in Brussels on May 10, 1964, heard a report by Comrade Ernest Burnelle, Chairman of the Party, on the issues which are today agitating the international Communist movement.

After discussing and approving the report it adopted the following resolution:

The dangerous activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China have created a very serious situation in the international Communist movement.

At this historic period which is characterized by the victorious advances of the forces of peace, freedom and progress, and the forces of the national-liberation movement, by the growing impact of the ideas of communism and the achievements of the countries where the power belongs to the working class and the people, the actions and attitude of the Chinese leaders bear the stamp of anti-Sovietism and disbelief in the effectiveness of the working-class movement.

This is manifested in three main directions.

To begin with, the Chinese leaders are continuing the open polemic in a hostile and insulting tone. Ever since the Meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, where they had every opportunity to expound their views, the Chinese leaders have been adding fuel to the polemic.

While directing their main attacks against the USSR, the CPSU and its 20th and 22nd congresses and against its leaders, notably Comrade N. S. Khrushchov, the Chinese leaders before long began attacking the other Cómmunist parties and their leaders.

The CPC leaders disregarded the proposal made by many Communist parties to cease the open polemic and return to the commonly worked out standards of fraternal discussion; instead, they stepped up their slander campaign against the Communist parties and the Soviet Union.

The anti-Soviet and the anti-working class attitude adopted by the Chinese leaders is evident also in their splitting activities.

They support and organize factional groups in many countries

---

*Drapeau Rouge, May 13, 1964.

whose task is to attack the Communist parties and hamper their activities and, if possible, to destroy them. These splinter groups of adventurists also attack the working-class movement generally in an attempt to undermine its unity. Such a group has already been exposed by the working class of Belgium. It is to be deplored that by its activities this group has only tended to discredit in a certain measure the People's Republic of China and its people.

The disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders also imperil the unity of the socialist countries; they leave out of account the decisive role these countries play in the fight for peace, freedom and the happiness of peoples, for the triumph of the world working-class movement over the forces of reaction and the capitalist monopolies.

But even more serious is the behavior of the Chinese leaders in the sphere of international politics.

The irresponsible attitude taken by them at the time of the Caribbean crisis and also on the occasion of the signing of the Moscow Treaty played into the hands of the NATO ultras.

In the first case they risked making ineffectual the energetic and considered actions of the USSR and impelling the world toward an atomic catastrophe. In the second case their attitude tended to sow doubts among the popular masses regarding the effectiveness of the struggle for peace, the sincerity of the aims pursued by the international Communist movement, thus retarding the day of final victory over the militarist forces of imperialism.

Only world reaction, the magnates of capital, the munitions manufacturers stand to profit from this activity.

A major contribution to analyzing and assessing this activity is Comrade Suslov's report to the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU in which he points out to the danger of Trotskyite "theories" and petty-bourgeois nationalism. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium urges all Party organizations to study this document.

Comrade Suslov's report contains a proposal to convene a new international meeting of Communist parties. Considering the present situation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium thinks such a meeting would be useful.

If this meeting is to be effective it should not, the Central Committee believes, confine itself to polemics with the Chinese leaders, whose abstract theories, which are blind to reality, do not promote the progress of communism.

The basic aim of the meeting could be to make a deeper study of the international situation, rich in new elements, and to chart a line of action that would promote the unification of the international Communist movement, the working-class movement and all

popular forces generally who are working for peace, the liberation of the oppressed peoples, for democracy and progress in all spheres of life.

With a view to strengthening the movement and, at the same time, the independence of each party separately, the meeting should also perfect the standards of fraternal relations to take into account the diversity of the conditions in which the struggle is waged.

In this way the meeting will add to the attractive force of communism and make for a new upsurge in the struggle of the international Communist movement for peace, the freedom of peoples, democracy, progress and the happiness of man.

THE NEW SITUATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RADICAL DEMOCRATIZATION

RESOLUTION OF THE SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

1. The overthrow of the power of Right-wing reactionaries marks the culmination of a grim struggle waged by the people against the fascization of the country, and opens a new stage in the struggle for the restoration and extension of democracy, for a genuine democratization of Greece.

The main features of the new situation in our country are the following: firstly, by virtue of a powerful mass movement headed by the democratic Left forces, the National Radical Union (ERE), this obedient tool of the oligarchy and the foreign imperialists, is no longer in power, and a certain turn towards democracy has taken place; secondly, the movement of the masses continues and is gaining momentum, and new prospects have appeared of the country's advance towards democracy, peace, and social progress.

The correlation of political forces has also changed. The ERE has lost much of its popular support, whereas the Union of the Center polled the absolute majority in the parliamentary elections. The democratic Left forces, whose influence was not duly reflected in the election returns, have strengthened their bonds with the people. They remain the decisive forces in the struggle for the country's democratization.

The Union of the Center is not socially and politically homogeneous. Its Right wing, which is closely connected with the local and foreign plutocratic oligarchy, holds sway in the party leadership and in the government. The local plutocratic oligarchy and its foreign patrons constantly strive to win complete control over the policy of the Centrist government. But their efforts are opposed by the democratic masses which follow the Union of the Center, and by its democratically-minded functionaries, who want democratic reforms.

The Seventh Plenary Meeting of the CC, CPG notes that the mere substitution of a Union of the Center government for an ERE government does not guarantee a democratic solution of the national problems and the problems troubing the people. The people must not roll up, but rather raise still higher the banner of their struggle for democratization in all fields.

2. During their years of rule, the Rightists aggravated the country's unsolved political, economic and social problems, while new ones arose.

Pressed by the people, by its supporters and many of its functionaries, the Centrist government has taken or pledged to take some effective measures. So far, however, its program statement and all its activities do not meet the people's most insistent demand for bold radical steps to democratize the country. It goes back on its own promises, subordinates the country's foreign policy to NATO interests and orders, and has not reduced military expenditures. It has even gone to the length of bringing pressure to bear on the government of Cyprus to force it to accept the shady machinations of the Americans and the British.

It was only on the demand of the people that the government declared that the Zurich-London agreements could not be carried out. It has not launched a radical democratization of the state machinery. It vacillates and retreats. It delays the dissolution of semi-government organizations and refuses to satisfy the people's demand for a general amnesty, legalization of the CPG and the granting of the right to repatriation to political emigres. It has not rescinded the extraordinary measures and supports anti-communism, which is disastrous for the country. It continues to assist the penetration of foreign monopoly capital into the country's economy, thus hampering its independent development. As regards its declared intention to industrialize the country, it relies not on state investments but on private initiative and the plunderous plans of foreign capital.

The policy of the Union of the Center perverts the essence of the democratic change for which the people voted. The needs of the country and the interests of all sections of the people are best expressed in the "program of Struggle for the Restoration and Extension of Democracy, for the Economic and Social Progress of the Country", which the CPG proposed to the people and the parties on February 28, 1964. Organization of the popular forces and further development of the struggle of the people are indispensable for the realization of this program.

3. The central task of the Party is to rally the democratic forces of the people in the struggle for the radical democratization of the entire life of the country, and of all its political, economic and social institutions.

The Party must:

Launch a struggle for the repeal of all the anti-democratic and anti-constitutional measures adopted during the civil war and in the subsequent period, for a general political amnesty, legalization

of the CPG, and recognition of the political emigres' right to repatriation;

Launch a struggle for peace and the independence and self-determination of Cyprus, for arms reduction, for a rocket-free zone in the Balkans and the Mediterranean, for a policy of neutrality, for an economic policy which would promote the country's all-round economic development and improve living standards;

Improve and intensify its work among all the classes and strata of the people and in all mass organizations, coming out in defense of their specific and general national demands. As far as work among the working class is concerned, the chief task is to launch and broaden the struggle for the democratization of the trade unions, for better living and working conditions;

Eliminate the lag in the work among the peasants. Promote actions among the middle urban strata, the intelligentsia, the women and the young people. The democratic Left forces must become more active inspirers, organizers and leaders of the everyday struggle of the masses for all demands;

Organize work for the democratization and development of local self-government bodies. This must become the main content of the preparations for the forthcoming municipal elections. To this end, the Party must campaign in cooperation with the other democratic forces for the nomination of active and honest democrats to the self-government bodies, and for the widest possible representation in them of the democratic Left forces.

4. Struggle of the whole people and unity of the democratic and patriotic forces is a decisive factor in the radical democratization and solution of the problems confronting the masses. Restoration and extension of democracy is not the concern of our Party alone. Our Party works for the closest possible unity of all who want restoration of democracy. It strives resolutely for cooperation, constant or temporary, for joint or, at least, parallel work with any forces, political groups, parties or individuals, if this contributes to the solution of this or that problem in the interests of the people and the nation.

The foreign imperialists, the local oligarchy and the royal court fiercely oppose the will of the people and resist any step towards democratization. The people are fighting in common against the ERE, this most obedient instrument of the oligarchy and foreign capital. The ERE is the most reactionary political force, the bearer of neo-fascism, in our country. The people are also combating the Right in the Union of the Center as well as the present government, since it pursues a policy of conciliation with the reactionaries and serves the interests of the oligarchy and foreign capital.

Concretely, our attitude towards the Centrist government is as follows:

a) Our Party supports any positive steps taken by it;

b) It severely criticizes any retreat it makes, exposes its anti-popular and anti-national measures, and fights them;

c) It organizes the struggle of the people, demanding that the government take measures to solve the national problems and to satisfy the demands of the people.

Our political activities, our tactics, all our ideological and organizational work must help the masses judge political parties by their deeds and see from their own experience the correctness and realism of our policy. Only in this way will it be possible to do away with the illusions and confusion created by the Union of the Center with respect to its role and policy. The masses will rally round the working class and the democratic program of the Left.

Expansion of unity at lower levels facilitates and makes more realistic any cooperation in the higher echelons. A firm basis for democratic unity will be provided by the unity of the working class, by the consolidation of the alliance of workers and peasants.

Our Party, especially in the present difficult conditions, should be more flexible in carrying through the policy of alliances. Its success in this will depend on how firmly it pursues the fundamental Leninist line which demands that a Party should in all circumstances retain its political physiognomy and its organizational independence. Our Party repudiates as Right-opportunist both the view that it should become an appendage to the Union of the Center and the sectarian conceptions which virtually reject the policy of unity, especially today, on the ground that power is in the hands of the Union of the Center.

Drawing on the experience of the masses and cooperating closely with them, the Communists will fight for the satisfaction of partial demands, employing such resolute forms of the struggle as mass political strikes in conditions of a militant upsurge of the masses.

The CPG aspires to equal cooperation with other political parties and groups which agree with the program for democracy, national independence and peace. It wants this cooperation not only for the achievement of the immediate objectives of democratization but also for subsequent revolutionary democratic and socialist changes in Greece.

5. Despite the certain amount of progress attained of late, the paramount problem of eliminating the gap between the influence of the Party and its organization has still to be settled. This gap becomes especially dangerous today, when the Party and the people are confronted with much more serious tasks of mobilizing the masses, which have awakened to action.

The present upsurge of the democratic movement makes elimination of this lag even more imperative. In this connection, great importance attaches to a correct, principled cadres policy. People must be boldly promoted, and both young and old Party activists should be used. In this, the Party should proceed from how effectively they work and should see to their Marxist education.

6. The new situation and the new tasks facing the Party demand a corresponding change in the Party's ideological work and raising it to the proper level. In our ideological propaganda we should stress the problems of the struggle of the people for democratization and ensure correct propaganda and popularization of the immediate goals of the Party and their correct and convincing combination with the program of national democratic reforms.

Our propaganda should be more systematic in exposing the hostile ideology of anti-communism, both in its general forms and in the form in which it is preached by the Union of the Center.

The Party must intensify ideological work against the Right and "Left" distortions of Marxism-Leninism, against the disruptive actions and views of the Chinese leaders; it must expose the views and subversive work of anti-Party groups and renegades of the working-class movement.

In present conditions it is of particular importance to raise the ideological and educational level of the Party activists and rank and file.

Ideological work among the emigres should also be improved considerably, with special attention to the problem of repatriation, with a view to imparting a concrete and practical character to the struggle for its solution.

* * *

As always, the growth of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace all over the world is to the Greek people a source of inspiration and support in their struggle for radical democratization. The people of Greece are taking an active part in the struggle for peace and complete disarmament. They believe that peace, democracy and socialism are inseparable. Firmly determined to march forward along the road of democracy, peace and social progress, the Greek people display optimism and confidence in the victory of their just cause as they enter a new phase of the struggle.

April, 1964

REPORT* TO THE CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

BEN BELLA, GENERAL SECRETARY, POLITICAL BUREAU,
NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT OF ALGERIA

This Congress is the first big discussion in which so large a number of leaders and activists is taking part. What is more, the entire nation is taking part in it through the public rallies held all over the country. This is unique in the history of Algerian political life and a rare fact in the history of the world revolutionary movement.

The Congress is a constituent one and its main purpose is to normalize the present situation. What we have to do is advance the process of revolution and chart a continuous, organized and well-considered course in the direction of socialism.

POLICY CONSISTENT WITH PRINCIPLES

Our Congress is taking place in a special political situation. It marks the fact that our policy has been successful and correct, a fact that nothing can obscure or hide. Let us glance back at the road we have travelled since the Evian agreements. It will be recalled that they formalized a relationship of dependence. The fundamental reorganization of the country's institutions, especially in agriculture, was qualified in accords with our former colonial master. But by virtue of our policy and by virtue of our determination to follow the general course mapped out in the Tripoli Program, our disengagement from imperialist influence has now become more tangible. The country's administrative machinery has been put into working order. True, we did not manage to avoid errors and failures, and often groped in the dark. However, I should like to commend the consistency and sense of purpose that has guided the revolutionary government at all times since it came to power.

The time has come to end the declamations which impute every advance the revolution makes to mere improvisation. That is a groundless charge, inspired by publications hostile to our people

---

*Abridged translation of text in **Algiers Republicain,** April 17, 1964, here reproduced at the request of the Algierian Marxists for the benefit of other Communist and Workers' parties.

and our experience. These publications are put out in Algeria by counter-revolutionary elements or elements bent on sowing confusion. The empiricism of our measures never signified absence of principles or of a solid revolutionary plan of action. Our measures were prompted, as a rule, by the prevailing situation in our country.

This purposeful empiricism did not lead us away from socialism. On the contrary, it brought us nearer to it by making the advance less trying and, at once, rapid.

Judge for yourselves.

A brief recapitulation of our principal actions will show that our policy was consistent with our basic principles. It also shows that we never failed to benefit from the experience of other countries.

There is deep-going unity between the decree of October 23, 1962, which prohibited purchase, sale or lease of vacated properties, and the decree of March 18, 1963, which made land abandoned by settlers a national possession.

Let us examine these two initiatives, which may appear to be independent of each other.

The first measure prevented the transfer of property abandoned by the French to the big Algerian landed proprietors, the national bourgeoisie and the war profiteers. It prevented the privileged from adding to their wealth, from enlarging their economic base and thereby increasing their political influence. It enabled us to reverse the balance of forces in favor of the working people, unlike other countries, where national independence gave the wealthiest people a chance to line their pockets, to corrupt political leaders and government officials, and to seize power.

The second measure partly destroyed the pillars of imperialism and neo-colonialism. It enabled us to formalize the initiative of the laborers who had seized possession of the farms and enterprises of their former masters, and thereby assured continuous production.

Economic self-administration was thus made a reality. The decrees of March 22 and 28 gave it legal status and ensured the emergence of a socialist sector in an economy that had previously been founded wholly on private ownership of the means of production.

Our whole policy was focused on creating favorable conditions for socialist construction and avoiding economic upheavals, which would have generated social unrest. Take agriculture. The sowing and harvesting campaigns revealed the benefits of technical and financial government aid to the small individual peasants. This

and the afforestation campaign were without precedent in the history of our country.

Nationalization of the big estates, followed in October 1963 by the expropriation of land held by settlers, are also complementary measures, and tend to put Algerian agriculture on a new foundation, turning our peasants into free producers untrammelled by Nature and exploitation. In other sections of our economy, nationalization has been equally substantial.

Both the French technicians who stayed in Algeria and the experts we consulted overlooked or underrated the human factor. Their ostensibly scientific forecasts were sombre. We were told that it was impossible to work a million hectares of land, to keep up the vineyards and continue making wine, to maintain the fruit orchards at the desired level, and, lastly, to avoid a famine. They went as far as to advise us that in order to avoid certain degradation we should keep the French settlers in the country, keep all the Borgeauds, de Calans and their like at any price, and enlist their services in mixed agricultural societies, like the ones we have in the industrial sector.

TO BE FREE

Contrary to these pessimistic forecasts, we have worked three instead of one million hectares. Far from decreasing by 30 to 40 per cent, as the experts predicted, our production has increased—thanks to the good rainfall no doubt, but also to the dynamism and diligence of the working people and fellahs. Also, the departure of the settlers did not destroy the vineyards and did not prevent the wine-makers from doing well.

Our first year of independence has been a year not of misery, but of prosperity. We owe these magnificent results to the concerted efforts of the people and, let us stress it, the selfless aid rendered to the countryside by city volunteers—the mechanics who overhauled tractors and other agircultural machines, the masons and electricians who repaired various structures and installations, the accountants, etc.

Striking solidarity has been shown by the people of this land only recently bathed in the blood of the freedom fighters. This solidarity is added proof that the people are ranged solidly behind the policy of the National Liberation Front and that they participate actively in the building of socialism.

We see more proof of this in the splendid success of the National Solidarity Fund campaign, which enabled us to help the victims of the natural calamities in the South and assist the stricken in the economically backward areas—all those bootblacks and beggars whom our painful legacy has, alas, condemned to suffering. We

are determined to mend all these chinks in our wall, for we shall never be really free as long as there are people still suffering like that in our country.

That is why we have worked so hard in the social field. Ours is one of the few countries to allocate almost one-eleventh of its budget for public health. Our measures in behalf of destitute children and orphans have yielded results few countries have been able to attain after years of effort. The children of men who gave their lives in the fight for our independence, and all those little bootblacks who delighted tourists as a special feature of the Algerian scene, have been comfortably accommodated in children's centers, where they are given a chance to develop their abilities and become builders of our new society.

AFRICAN UNITY IS UPPERMOST

Liberation of the still dependent African countries is a condition of the liberty, unity and development of the continent.

We believe that our own independence and development are closely linked with the independence and development of the rest of Africa. Conversely, all the African countries have a vested interest in the success of our revolution. This community of interests, a source of mutual enrichment, strengthens our bonds.

Our proposal to augment the Afro-Asian group with the Latin-American countries is another illustration of our positive efforts. These new dimensions will enlarge the forces of progress and world peace. The united forces will play a decisive role in world affairs and, notably, in the search for peace, which should not remain the business of only the Great Powers.

But, while sincerely desirous of giving all our help to the consolidation of world peace and the establishment of peaceful coexistence, we will not let any of our basic problems out of our sight.

This is why, while saluting the Moscow Treaty as a first step in the right direction, we declare that the liberation movement of the peoples against colonialism and fascism, far from being incompatible with the struggle for world peace, is its essential element. The atomic peril has to be averted, because it signifies the destruction of mankind. However, it does not eliminate the difference between just and unjust wars.

A PROGRAM IS NOT DOGMA

Today, we say safely say that the National Liberation Front is a homogeneous party drawing its strength from essentially workers' and peasants' support, and capable of erecting structures

suited to our socialist choice. That is, indeed, the purpose of our new program.

Why a new program?

The Tripoli Program, which has so far been our charter, has had the essential merit of being the first to define clearly the social forces that shaped the character of our revolution. It enabled us to broaden our knowledge of revolution in the ideological context and to identify the forces of inertia that obstructed our advance. Also, it served as a point of departure in our approach to national and international problems. But new factors have appeared since it was framed and put into practice. New, effective steps forward have been made.

The program presented to you is a program of the ruling party. It contains not only what the Party wants to realize, but what it has already partially realized. You will learn from it of our successes and our mistakes, and you will learn of what should grow and assert itself in our country, and what should disappear and die. What is to die is exploitation of man by man and the reactionary mentality nourished by it, and also thievery, plunder, the itch for privileges and illicit profits. That is why all of us must understand the propositions of the program, and the spirit that animates them. It is essential that revolution be made not only by, but also for, the people. That is the basic truth for Algeria. Anyone who departs from it, will inevitably incur the wrath of the nation. It was broad and profound participation of the Algerian people that assured the advancement of revolution and prevented it from stooping to compromises. This participation alone can make its future secure. So it is our duty to give it the unity and clarity that symbolize a revolutionary party.

The destiny of our people must not be decided in battles and in discussions about the best way of governing the nation. Our principal motto is the following: "No revolution by proxy. Everything by the people, and everything for the people."

KEEP STEP WITH PEASANTS AND WORKERS

Our revolution has been democratic and popular in the broadest sense of the word from the very beginning. By occupying the abandoned estates and factories, the peasants and workers of our country have created an objective basis for socialism in Algeria in conformance with the spirit that moved the first freedom fighters.

Thanks to the actions of the people we realized the nature of the mistakes and deviations made by the leaders who had until then shaped the destiny of the Algerian nation. This is the reason why we have analyzed our history from the standpoint of our

political choice. Today, it is necessary that we continue to act upon the perspective opened up by the working people, in order to arrive at a society based on socialist principles, namely:

— just redistribution of wealth,
— equal distribution of culture, and
— power to the producers.

The struggle for socialism will be long and difficult. Only windbags and irresponsible people can think that a deficient economy, still strongly plagued by the consequences of the colonial regime, can be converted into a socialist economy by the stroke of a magic wand. It is always the economic, social and cultural conditions inherited from the past that are the starting point for any new step forward. To ignore these conditions is to be politically and socially irresponsible and to perform so much wasted labor.

What are these conditions?

When the first government of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic was formed, the country was only just emerging from a state of chaos. Its economy was still gripped by paralysis. The factories were either shut down, or tormented by sabotage. Maritime transport was at a standstill. The machinery of distribution was inoperative, etc. Unemployment grew due to the influx of rural and regrouped people to the towns. The big decrease in the number of technicians affected productivity and the condition of the productive potential. Shipment of capital out of the country was at its height. Proprietors took advantage of the confused political situation to withdraw their investments, to stop replenishing their stocks and to transfer their money to France. With respect to finances, there was a bad shortage of cash, aggravated by the fact that most Europeans discontinued payments. The cash in the banks, which covered the greater part of the exchanges between enterprises, was 60 per cent of what the banks had in December 1961.

On top of this, the State was no longer getting the taxes and saw its resources shrink. Furthermore, some political cadres abandoned public activities to devote themselves to their own affairs. The reigning spirit was one of quest for personal gain and material well-being. The work of the administration was retarded by complicated regulations, by administrative barriers and rivalry between the services. All these negative things proceeded against the setting of a feeble, underdeveloped economy largely dependent on France, and a political power harassed by a class war, but determined to revive production in industry and agriculture, to put the administration in order to create political conditions that would ensure non-interference from abroad and clear up the internal situation in order to advance the revolution.

We can safely say that we have coped successfully with our tasks.

There are objective reasons for our difficulties and our limitations. Our errors are those of people who are making headway and rectifying their mistakes as they march ahead. We keep in step with our peasants and workers, who were loyal guardians of the national wealth in a tragic hour of the country's history.

The contradiction between our needs and our resources will not lessen until our economy attains a high level of development. It is inevitable at present that there should be forces hostile to socialism. These forces cannot be destroyed by decree or by any government measures. The enemy at home will have a base of support until we finally extirpate the very roots of capitalism. We must therefore lean firmly on the peasants and workers, consolidate their alliance, reinforce their social positions and wage a merciless struggle against the counter-revolution, represented by such groups as the Socialist Forces Front, the Party of Socialist Revolution, and others, and combat the abstract liberalism propounded by the middle sections and some of the intellectuals.

That is the role of the State and of the Party.

STATEMENT OF FACT

Before dealing with the question of the State, its nature and the importance of its role in abolishing the capitalist and invigorating the socialist institutions, we must set out a few facts that will make our subsequent evaluations more objective.

First, we have no traditions of statehood.

Second, during the war of liberation the efforts made in the matter of developing cadres were not always consistent with the needs of the coming independence.

Third, foreign technical assistance occupies an important place in the life of the State.

Fourth, the administration in some parts of the country is understaffed.

THE URGENT TASKS

Those are the basic facts, and we must bear them in mind, for they will help us understand that the problem of purging the administrative machinery is to be considered in strictly political terms, and not to be taken lightly. The problem of political control over the administrative machinery and its reorganization in the light of our decisions has been the principal problem for quite some time. It is in battle that the new State matures and improves. It is forged in the defense of the interests of workers and peasants, in the fight against the privileged sections.

In view of this we must pitilessly combat the contention that building the State must necessarily precede the revolution. That is false. To accept it means to relinquish power to those who possess culture and political experience, that is, generally speaking, to elements connected with the bourgeoisie. We must therefore denounce the notion that building the State should precede revolution, and prove to the masses that it is a theory of the confiscators.

Our State belongs to the working people and to all those who pronounce themselves in favor of socialism. It will be by dint of their efforts and through the mobilization of the masses that the enemies of socialism will be crushed.

It should be our essential aim in building the State to diminish to the minimum the distance between the governing and the governed, and to enlist the citizens, especially the producers, in leadership and planning. Therein lies the sense of economic self-administration. It is also necessary to reduce and simplify the machinery of State, to act vigorously against the red tape of central administrations in general with regard to the administered.

On the other hand, it is time to regulate in a judicious way the division of work between the central organs and the communes, and to do it with due regard for all the aspects of self-administration.

However, our desire to reduce the distance between the governing and the governed must not let us lose sight of the role of the State. The State is not simple submission of the minority to the majority. It is a body that imposes its laws on the privileged in the name of the working people. So long as seats of capitalism exist and there is the itch for private enrichment, organized restraints should be imposed on citizens to prevent them from squandering the national wealth and from appropriating more than their share of the consumer funds. So the State poses three urgent tasks:

1. To begin the first reorganization of the communes by integrating the socialist action committees with the people's communal councils, and at once hold communal elections.

2. To exercise rigorous control over the machinery of state.

3. To establish at the Political Bureau level a service whose function it will be to collect suggestions and criticisms from activists and citizens generally; this will enable us to repair our mistakes, to end abuses of power and sabotage, and combat the ostracism to which socialist militants are often subjected.

Now, I shall deal with question of the Party. Today, it is not a question of reviving the past forms of the National Liberation Front, but of constructing an instrument on the basis of what

we already have, capable of defending and advancing socialism.

To be sure, no fixed formulas will help us build socialism if Algeria is not ripe for it. But it is a fact all the same that our society needs a motive force. Provided it is united, the Party is just such a motive force—a force conscious of the interests of the working people, a resolute force, a force capable of grasping the true implications of all the popular initiatives.

To reinforce its bonds with the people, the Party must appreciate its relationship with the masses. Our activists must avoid acting like advisers, because, though they do represent the most conscious part of the nation, they must not substitute themselves for the people and must learn from them and always urge them to act as directly as possible. Any authoritarian tendency and all self-complacency should be combated vigorously, because they weaken the Party and benefit the forces hostile to socialism.

THE RIGHT KIND OF POLICY IS NOT ENOUGH

It need be said here that although Party unity is an essential condition of success, it is fraught with dangers. We must be very careful in this respect and prevent the Party from becoming a docile instrument, a body of *claqueurs,* a group of yes-men, or yet a monster that would enslave the people. To avoid these dangers, we must institute democratic methods guaranteeing freedom of discussion and criticism within the Party organizations, on the one hand, and a continuous dialogue with the masses, on the other.

The organizational principle of the Party is democratic centralism, meaning that:

1. all governing bodies at different levels are elected;
2. all governing bodies at different levels must heed the opinion of the inferior organizations;
3. all inferior organizations are accountable for their activities to the superior organizations;
4. all governing bodies act on the principle of collective leadership. However, this principle presupposes individual responsibility;
5. all members of the Party must submit to the Party organizations, the minority to the majority, the inferior bodies to the superior bodies, and all bodies of the Party to the National Congress and the Central Committee.

We must devote particular attention to a few other questions related to the Party rules. This applies to the enlargement of the Party branches, to the social composition of the Party, to the role of Party branches at enterprises, and cohesion of the Party. Until now our conception of the vanguard Party has been limited. The importance of the branch as the decisive link between the Party and the masses escaped us.

EXTENSION OF PARTY INFLUENCE

The social composition of the Party gives rise to questions of principle. The draft Party Rules require that a Party member should not exploit the work of others. As socialist construction progresses, there will be less exploitation of man by man. But there still exist exploiters and the spirit of exploitation. To avoid the risk of degeneration and embourgeoisement, our Party cannot tolerate exploiters penetrating its ranks.

Also, the draft Party Rules stipulate that the Party must draw for its strength on the peasants and workers. That stands to reason. Socialism aims first and foremost at the liberation of those particular social forces. It is their democratic organization, their activities within the Party, that are the source of its strength. It should be the general rule in the course of this year to admit none but poor peasants and workers to the Party in order to invigorate Party work at production level. The branches at the enterprises will play a big part in that respect. But in order that the Party membership at the factories should not take the place of the trade unions and turn the latter into mere transmission belts, we have assigned it the task of encouraging people and being vigilant, while the economic and social fields will remain trade union responsibilities. Since members of the Party will perform all the political tasks at the enterprises, they must do their work in the workers' quarters and assist the development of Party activities. The activists must serve as examples by their behavior, their devotion and their dedication to the people.

Party cohesion and unity are necessary to enhance Party influence. The Party does not develop in isolation from its environment. It does not develop under a glass hood. The aspirations of the different social groups, and various bureaucratic tendencies, too, inevitably seek political expression within the Party. For this reason, any elaboration of Party opinion should not exclude discussion. But the realization of Party decisions, and its unity, also depend on the education of its members.

To provide better leadership, we must learn, we must extend ideological work at all levels, spot the trends hostile to socialism, and combat them. Red tape and absence of Party education are the biggest enemies of Party unity. It is essential that we take urgent measures to banish careerists and opportunists, the people who use the Party for their personal ends, from our ranks. The Party activists must meet certain conditions before being pronounced worthy of the people they want to serve. These conditions bring us to the conclusion that a revolution really dedicated to serve the people can be brought faithfully to completion only by men who are of the people and live the people's life.

The success of our revolution, too, depends on the merits of our Party cadres. It is therefore essential that our cadres consist of the best activists steeled in struggle, equipped with a lucid mind and a revolutionary consciousness.

We must bear in mind the cardinal role played in the building of socialism by the peasant and workers trade unions. In addition to the trade unions, which express the needs of the working people, we should not overlook the youth organization of the National Liberation Front and the National Union of Algerian Women, which represent a revolutionary potential it would be wrong to underrate.

THE PARTY AND THE STATE

Let us examine the relationship between the Party and the State. It is a field in which any confusion is especially harmful. If the matter is not clarified properly and in good time, it will no doubt culminate in the destruction of the State and the Party—and all of course in the name of the revolution, past services, etc.

Our Party is in power. For this reason it holds a leading position in the State. But this is no reason for it to change its role, which has so far consisted in giving political impulse, and no reason for it to govern all the machinery of state and interfere in all administrative matters.

If that is what it will do, the Party will be reduced to a bureaucratic apparatus and will no longer be a weapon of political action.

How then are we to regulate the relationship between Party and State?

To begin with, all Party members holding State offices must obey Party directions. It is also necessary for the Party to hold discussions from time to time on political issues and organizational problems of the State.

Lastly, it is necessary for the Party to know the working conditions in the administrative bodies in order to exercise realistic political control over them.

But all this is not enough to avoid confusion between Party and State; a few more conditions should be added. Most members of the governing bodies of the Party should not enter the machinery of state. If the majority of the members of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee would occupy government offices there would again be confusion between Party and State, between political orientation and direct administrating.

We shall go forward and build socialism. In so doing, we shall be respectful of our Arabo-Islamic traditions. Let anyone who wants to besmirch Islam by trying to use it for purposes hostile

to progress, remember that he will not be able to do it forever—since he did it in the past solely due to our excessive tolerance and the confusion he is now seeking to sustain—for Islam, far from contradicting our choice, is identified in the minds of the masses with the concept of equality and therefore follows in the direction of socialism.

ECONOMIC SELF-ADMINISTRATION

Now I am going to deal with a problem which is at once political and economic. I mean economic self-administration. Everyone should know that this form of government was won in a tense struggle by the working people and that it has done more for the glory of Algeria than all utterances and speeches about revolution and socialism. Irrespective of all the possible critical remarks —some of them quite legitimate ones—it is thanks to the working people that the land was worked and that operation at enterprises was put back to normal despite the absence of financial, technical and other assistance from the administration, which was completely disorganized at the time. That is why economic self-administration is and always will be our basic choice. To reduce economic self-government to the ordinary right of the working people to be consulted from time to time, as some suggest, will mean reducing it to ordinary workers' control and, in effect, reducing the role of the working people to that of ordinary hired laborers employed by the State.

But economic self-administration has opponents not only outside the enterprises, but also within them. We must fight against such management committees and chairmen of management committees who put themselves above the working people and behave as a kind of new employer, who borrow the style of the former employers and scorn control by conference or councils of working people.

However, I should like to warn activists against one undesirable distortion. Our choice of economic self-administration must not distract us from the fact that in some cases, due to economic and social conditions, it may be necessary to promote development by putting enterprises under State control. We know that this is a dangerous thing to do. It is the duty of the Party to appreciate the dangers and to remove them, and to find formulas that will enable the working people to prepare for assuming responsibility to direct those enterprises.

THE SECOND AGRARIAN REFORM

At this point we ought to talk about the agrarian reform or, to be more precise, a second agrarian reform, because we have al-

eady had a first reform (effected due to the mass departure of the colonizers) which we supplemented with the acts of nationalization passed in March and October.

Consequently, we should conceive this second reform as a means of achieving greater participation of the small and landless peasants in the country's economic and political affairs.

There are still 8,500 private farms in Algeria of more than 100 hectares each, and 15,000 of more than 50 hectares each. These 23,500 farms have something like 4,500,000 hectares, while the other 7,000,000 hectares are worked by more than 600,000 farms. Two million fellahs are either unemployed or work short hours, which is almost the same thing, while most of the big landowners visit their estates simply to see whether the harvest has been good, and to collect the rent from the peasants.

Revolutionary Algeria is obliged to do something about this, for it leads to insufficiently active exploitation of the big estates and to excessive exploitation of the land of the small peasants, to an incomplete use of manpower and, lastly to a substantial portion of the national income being controlled by a handful of privileged people. To pursue the revolution means to attack the privileged without hesitation, whoever they may be. For this reason, our draft of the reform envisages restrictions on landed property, but will affect only the big and some of the medium landowners.

But although the reform is necessary, do not think it will solve all our problems. I must tell you that the key to all our problems is to be found in just one word—"production". Every man and woman of Algeria must think of just one thing all the time: we must produce, and produce continuously more in all fields and with all the resources at our disposal. People speak of industrialization, and that is quite correct. But where are we going to get the funds to pay for the factories if we do not try, for a start, to derive the maximum profits from the resources we already have? Will it be through foreign aid? It stands to reason that we will accept such aid gratefully, whoever gives it. But who will believe that this is enough? Could anyone think that we will obtain the resources to wipe out unemployment and raise the living standard—in other words, to produce more and better commodities—anywhere but from our own labor and our own accumulated wealth?

WE WILL CAMPAIGN FOR THE PLAN

If certain countries wish or can afford the luxury to squander their resources because of disorderly coordination, they are at liberty to do so. That is none of our business. What is our business is Algeria, and we know we cannot afford to allow any waste

of energy, no matter how small. What we need, therefore, is planning.

Before getting down to planning, however, we have to establish what may impede it. Nobody questions the necessity of planning or, at least, nobody does it publicly. But some people put the problem in a fashion that would seem to rule out any sort of solution. Let me tell you what argument they make most frequently. They say: making a plan is a scientific job. To do it one needs to have statistics, reports and documents or, to put it briefly, all the "economic information" that experts need for their work. But one also needs to have the experts. Consequently, they have to be trained. Or else we would have to call on an army of foreign specialists who will still have to get acquainted with the country, to study its structure, the habits of its people, and all the things they will have to reckon with, before they can start their work. Let me tell you the following: the people who say all this make me recall those who said on October 30, 1954, that instead of starting the war of liberation we would do well to wait until we have tanks and warplanes, and troops trained to employ these modern armaments.

We will not let ourselves be dragged into this impasse. We will draw up an interim plan with the means we have, and the knowledge we have. We do not need to acquaint ourselves with the country, for we know it already. And that is no mean advantage.

It does not matter that this interim plan will be for a term of only two or three years. But it will be drawn up to accomodate the essential aims we wish to achieve. It will also give us a chance to marshal the means we need to work out a more comprehensive development plan. This will be done with the help of the entire people, the agricultural and industrial management committees, and of the beneficiaries of the agrarian reform.

OUR SOCIALISM

In conclusion, I would like to reply to those who want to see the State acting as an arbiter between the different trends, the different forces that may exist in our country, to those who want the government to play the part of a balance, in particular between the revolutionary currents and those who yearn nostalgically for the bourgeois order.

It should be brought home to people that this sort of situation is out of the question. Government policy is defined by the Party, and the Party must be the place of assembly for all the real revolutionary militants. It follows that if there is any arbitration, it will be the kind of arbitration that always tilts in favor of the revolutionary currents. So let there be no more talk about any deceiving

equilibrium. Nothing and nobody here can claim to be a counterweight to the whole of the people.

Needless to say, the agrarian reform will be our basic action, the first step towards industrialization. Its realization is no less important than its conception. As we have said time and again, it should be a real agrarian revolution, a revolution in the relation of our peasants to Nature and a revolution in the social relations in the countryside. Liberation of the productive agricultural forces, on the one hand, and progress for the peasant, especially in the handicapped areas, and creation of living conditions fit for humans on the other, those are the commanding aspects of the matter.

A MEASURE TO RECONSTRUCT SOCIETY

It is equally necessary in the context of mobilizing the masses to put into practice the decisions of the two economic self-administration congresses. Let us emphasize the importance of keeping the public properly informed and the necessity of enlisting the active participation of the masses, because realizing our decisions is not the business of the bureaucrats, just as our diverse congresses are not mere talking feasts without practical implications. It should be appreciated that we have embarked upon the reconstruction of our society from the bottom up.

As far as the State is concerned, we can make it sound by organizing democratic municipal elections under the guidance of our Party with the object of giving the reins of local government to the people. But it is also urgently imperative, and to a still greater extent, to make the machinery of state all-Algerian. The principle we have to adopt is not to entrust any post of even an indirectly political nature to foreigners, and to appoint proved activists to all the key posts. It should be clear to all of us that the country's independence depends on this question, and on giving all offices of leadership a political complexion.

As far as the Party is concerned, it should also forthwith commence to shape its social and humane character, for that alone will enable it to perform its task successfully. Let us repeat that it must above all be organically tied to the masses and their interests through the very life of its members and not only by their professions of faith. It also needs real internal democracy in conformance with the Party rules, so that there should be the free discussion that alone furthers a serious search for adequate solutions of the concrete problems of socialism.

THE WIND OF SPRING

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have in their struggle found in the European socialist countries true allies, to

whom we should render due homage. It is a valuable alliance for both sides, because imperialism is our common enemy.

So may our Congress show the confidence that the situation demands, and the courage and sagacity that it demands, and be the embodiment of dignity and grandeur. May it be the harbinger of the spring, the key to which is held by the people of Algeria. May it be a new November 1,* the November 1 of socialism.

*November 1, 1954, was the date of the armed uprising in Algeria—**Ed.**

DEFEND MARQUETALLA!

APPEAL* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF COLOMBIA

In view of the preparations of a fresh offensive by nearly 20,000 soldiers against the peasants of the vast areas in the south of Tolima and the north of Huila, the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia called on all patriots to take action and bar the way to the aggression and support the imperilled peasants. The appeal reads:

Workers, democrats and patriots of Colombia,

The violence that has been part of the official policy launched in 1948 has never really ceased, although practised on a much lesser scale in recent years due to the democratic struggle. Today, Colombia stands on the threshold of a new stage in this criminal "scorched land" policy.

For all of three years Alvaro Gomez Urtado has been demanding that the peasant areas, which he provocatively describes as "independent republics," be laid waste. This monstrous demand is prompted not only by brutal political considerations, but also by insolent foreign pressure, primarily by the U.S. military mission, on the Army.

The so-called "independent republics" are peasant areas which have frustrated the brutal plans of the latifundists and the government by building a united front and organized self-defense groups of people of diverse political beliefs.

The visit to our country of a representative of the Inter-American Defense Council coincides with the completion of large-scale preparations for an offensive of government troops against the region known as Marquetalla** — a large area in the Central Andes embracing the provinces of Tolima, Huila and Cauca. Attempts are already being made to justify the attack by describing it as a routine operation "to mop up the bandits who harass the honest peasants." However, the offensive is being planned against tens of thousands of peasants cultivating land which was vacant only a few years ago. Today this land, developed by the hard-working peasants, is coveted by the latifundists.

The imminent aggression against Marquetalla marks the beginning of a fresh outburst of violence against the people of Co-

---

*Voz Proletaria, April 9, 1964.

**As we go to press, Prensa Latina reports that fighting has broken out in Marquetalla.

lombia, who are discontented with the outworn oligarchic system and protest against it.

After the March 15 elections showed how low the prestige of the regime has fallen, the so-called "national front" government is trying to conceal this by restoring to new brutalities and violence, and to shabby anti-communist slogans to attack the opposition.

Today, by means of "operation Marquetalla," the government of the oligarchy plans to abolish the already curtailed constitutional guarantees and to introduce some form of marital law, clearing the way for militarism and a terrorist dictatorship in keeping with U.S. imperialist designs.

We urge all revolutionary and leftist forces, and democrats and patriots, to protest against the new stage in the policy of "scorched land" prepared for Tolima, Huila and Cauca. Let them show, in most diverse forms, their proletarian and people's solidarity with the courageous peasants who are always ready to uphold their legitimate right to protect themselves against any reactionary aggression!

Down with the scorched land policy!

Long live the struggle of the people against violence!

Central Executive Committee, Communist Party of Colombia.

APPEAL* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF ARGENTINA

Comrades, friends,

The imperialists and reactionaries are planning a fascist military coup similar to the one they accomplished in Brazil.

Seven months after the formation of the Illia government rumors are again circulated that the military intend to present their "demands" and that plans for a coup are being made at clandestine meetings, the purpose being to abolish the few democratic liberties still enjoyed by the people, to set up, as in Brazil, a reactionary fascist military-civil dictatorship with the object of blocking the road to democracy opened on July 7 last year**, and preventing the working class from realizing the just demands contained in the "Plan of Struggle" of the General Confederation of Labor.

Aramburu's Union of the Argentinian People, the Radical Left Movement of Frondizi-Frigerio, the conservatives of Cueto Rua and Alsogaray's Independent Civic Party are trying to outdo each other in their attacks on the government. They accuse it of incapacity, demand a change in policy and the replacement of the present ministers with men more consistent in protecting their anti-popular and anti-national interests. For their part, the Rojas and Toranzo Monteros are busy reconstructing their own groups.

At the same time, the reactionary and pro-fascist church groups headed by Cardinal Caggiano are working hard to discredit the government on the pretext that the Cordoba provincial authorities support secular education and there is discontent over the increased government control over private educational establishments.

The Association for Free Trade, the Rural Society and the Chamber of Commerce, all bulwarks of the big landowners and capitalists, agents of foreign monopolies, demand that the government proclaim a state of emergency and forcibly suppress the struggle of the working class, and of the people in general, for their political, social and economic demands set out in the GCL "Plan of Struggle," which are designed to improve the conditions of the

---

*Nuestra Palabra, May 26, 1964.

**The majority in the last general elections on July 7, 1963, was polled by Arturo Illia, now President of Argentina.

working people, restore all democratic rights, and abolish the infamous repressive laws.

Besides, the reactionary and fascist commanders of the armed forces, who are in charge of the National Guard, are magnifying the incident with the guerillas in the north in order to justify the brutal measures taken against them. It is their obvious purpose to intimidate the people and justify the credits solicited in the United States for the purchase of arms and for the struggle on the "domestic front."

All these reactionary forces, which ordinarily act separately, have united to oppose the just demands of the workers and of all the people. They are doing their utmost to behead the movement of the masses with the help of their agents in the trade union movement and in the GCL. They intend to split this movement at a time when the need for unity in the struggle to foil the plans of economic and political reaction is particularly great.

★ ★ ★

The working class and the whole people demand higher wages, guaranteed employment, bread, land and democratic freedoms. The ruling and privileged classes respond with preparations for a terroristic dictatorship, while the Tacuara* groups contribute to this end with outrages and crimes.

Enraged by the annullment of the oil contracts and by the intention to convert SEGBA into a national enterprise, the North-American and European monopolies utilize all the powerful means at their diposal in a virulent "psychological" campaign against the government in order to discredit it and bring about its downfall. At the same time they have increased the pressure on it, demanding "guarantees" for their investments. They insist on the unrestricted right to bring capital to our country, to make short-term investments in enterprises yielding fabulous profits, to take profits out of the country and to withdraw the invested capital when and how they see fit.

The events in Brazil show, it is Yankee imperialism that stands behind the putschists in our country. Other facts also prove this. In 1963 the Pentagon and State Department engineered four anti-popular and anti-national coups in Latin America: in Guatemala in March, in Ecuador in July, in the Dominican Republic in September, and in Honduras in October. In 1964 they encouraged the coup against the constitutional and progressive Goulart government in Brazil. Now they contemplate another attack on Cuba, which is building a new life for its working class and all the people.

Kennedy's successors in the United States do not even bother

*Tacuara is the organization of Argentinian fascists.

to disguise their sinister plans with high-sounding phrases about "American solidarity," Western Christrian civilization," or "Alliance for Progress." Thomas Mann, the new U.S. Under-Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, proclaimed a Johnson-Mann doctrine," at a conference of U.S. officials to the effect that the United States will no longer distinguish between "representative democracy and military coups," but will regard all coups in Latin America from the standpoint of their "conformity with the national interests of the United States." Inasmuch as the annulment of the oil contracts prejudices what he described as "the national interests of the United States," the Yankee government will not stop at engineering coups and recognizing putschist governments in order to have the oil contracts restored and its other colonialist demands satisfied.

This "doctrine" has as its first result the fascist coup in Brazil, prepared by the North Americans and accomplished by the reactionary military command.

Now, they say, it will be Argentina's turn if they fail to break in the Illia government. This was made perfectly clear by former Ambassador McClintock in his public statements against the annulment of the oil contracts.

In addition to the traitorous military-fascist government of Brazil, which is tied to its apron-strings, the United States would also like to have a reactionary government in Argentina, which would cooperate with it in the realization of its criminal plans against Cuba and serve as a base against democracy in Chile in the event the Popular Action Front wins in the coming elections, and also against popular movements in the other neighboring countries.

The struggle for democracy is not separable from the struggle for national independence. That is why if we want to defend democracy in our country we have to defend heroic Cuba against criminal Yankee aggressions.

* * *

The Argentinian putschists profit by the growing difficulties in the country and the suffering of the people, and also by the sluggishness of the Illia government in eliminating these difficulties.

Indeed, the cost of living is soaring constantly and has already become unbearable for those who live on their wages or salaries. Unemployment continues. Furthermore, the outrageous repressive laws against the Communists and Peronists remain in force. What is more, under pressure of the reactionary forces the administration proposes to make amendments to the Criminal Code dealing with "social crimes" and institute a Statute of Political Parties, which will put them at the mercy of the judicial authorities.

The reactionary apparatus in the armed forces and the state administration has not been replaced. Instead of annulling the military agreements with Yankee imperialism, the government has not denied the recent reports that U.S. military "aid" to Argentina is being increased.

If the Illia government wants to prevent the putschists from realizing their aims, it must rely on the support of the masses. But first it has to satisfy their legitimate demands. Its failure to do so will testify to its inability or unwillingness to learn from the lesson of Brazil. In that fraternal country the reactionary forces were able to unite and stage their traitorous coup because the Goulart government turned a deaf ear to the warnings made by the Communists and delayed positive measures to solve the serious problems confronting the Brazilian people and disarm the reactionary forces by boldly relying on the people, primarily the working class.

So if this lesson is lost on the government, let our people learn it!

* * *

Warning against the danger of a reactionary coup being prepared in our country, the Communist Party calls upon the working class and the entire people, on all Argentinian democrats and patriots, to unite on the basis of their trade union, social and political organizations in order to block the reactionary and fascist forces, prevent them from liquidating the few democratic freedoms they have won, and pave the way for the new development initiated on July 7 last year.

The Communist Party urges all working people to set up joint struggle committees at factories and other places of work, in the blocks, in the communities, in schools and universities, in order to foil the plans of the reactionaries and to organize resolute actions to compel the government to carry out in full its election promises and, in the first place, to satisfy the demands formulated in the GCL "Plan of Struggle."

The Communist Party calls upon every one to be vigilant with regard to the reactionary forces. If, despite everything, a coup is attempted, the Party urges the people to go out into the streets in order to crush them and establish a genuinely democratic and popular government.

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

15

Included in this issue

RESOLUTION OF MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

LETTER FROM 22 CZECHOSLOVAKIAN HISTORIANS

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA'S ATTITUDE TO OTHER PARTIES
John Mahon

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 15

contents

RESOLUTION
of 5th plenary meeting of Central Committee, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party on differences of CPC of China leaders with world Communist movement. **5**

WE CANNOT REMAIN SILENT
Letter from 22 Czechoslovakian historians **9**

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA'S ATTITUDE TO OTHER PARTIES
John Mahon **24**

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT **35**

TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF NETHERLANDS **38**

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, PEOPLE'S PARTY OF IRAN **40**

STATEMENT ON ARAB UNITY
and apropos the revisionist distortions and splitting activity of the Chinese leaders **44**

LEFT-REVISIONISM—MAIN DANGER FOR MARXIST-LENINIST UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Oscar Kreidt **56**

DEFEAT OF PUTSCHISTS WILL PAVE WAY FOR THE BRAZILIAN REVOLUTION **67**

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
August 4, 1964

RESOLUTION*

OF THE FIFTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY ON THE DIFFERENCES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA LEADERS WITH THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND ON THE POSITION OF THE MPRP

A resolution on the differences in the world Communist movement and on the position of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party was adopted in December 1963 by the Fifth Plenary Meeting of the MPRP Central Committee. Acting in conformity with the decision of our Party and the other Marxist-Leninist parties to discontinue the public polemics forced upon the world Communist movement by the CPC leadership, the MPRP Central Committee refrained at that time from publishing the document.

Having discussed the differences in the world Communist movement, the Fifth Plenary Meeting of the MPRP Central Committee notes with deep indignation that in recent years the CPC leaders, who were the first to begin the polemic with the Marxist-Leninist parties on the most important issues of today, have openly launched a large-scale offensive against the jointly elaborated general line of the world Communist movement set forth in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

Departing from Marxism-Leninism and revising the basic propositions of the Declaration and the Statement concerning the common tasks of the Communist and Workers' parties in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, the Chinese leaders have worked out their own special "general line" and are trying in every way to foist their views, on the world Communist movement, views that are alien to Marxism-Leninism, to dictate their will to the other Communist parties and to the socialist countries.

In complete disregard of Lenin's teachings and of the general conclusions of the policy documents of the Communist movement, they hold utterly erroneous, anti-Marxist positions on such vital problems of our day as the definition of the character of our epoch

*Unen, June 13, 1964.

and of its basic contradiction, the role of the socialist world system in the international revolutionary movement, the question of war, peace and peaceful coexistence, of the personality cult, etc.

Laying claim to leadership of the world Communist movement, the Chinese leaders hurl the most absurd and slanderous accusations against the CPSU, the generally recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement, with a view to discrediting the great party of Lenin in the eyes of progressive mankind. They slanderously accuse the CPSU of revisionism, of having betrayed the interests of the Soviet people, the peoples of the socialist countries and of the rest of the world, of cowardice and capitulation to imperialism, of disarming the proletariat and all working people organizationally and morally and so on, and so forth.

The Chinese leaders openly seek to smear the authority of the leaders of the Marxist-Leninist parties, steeled in the struggle for the interests of the working people, specifically that of the leaders of the Communist parties of Italy, France, the United States and other countries, and to undermine the ties of the leadership of these Parties with the masses.

Especially monstrous and absurd are their slanderous attacks on the CPSU leadership and personally on Comrade Khrushchov, outstanding leader of the world Communist movement and tireless fighter for the cause of peace and international friendship.

All these unseemly actions by the Chinese leaders and their apology for the personality cult are designed to deify Mao Tse-tung and camouflage the cult of his personality which is intensely cultivated in the CPC and among the Chinese people.

In their attacks on the other Marxist-Leninist parties holding the same views as the CPSU, the Chinese leaders switched from slander and groundless accusations to actions aimed at splitting the parties and at setting up splinter groups in many of them.

Advancing a whole system of anti-Marxist views as their political platform, the CPC leaders are more and more departing from Marxism-Leninism and deliberately exacerbating their disagreements with the world Communist movement. They oppose the line charted by the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU and the fundamental propositions of the CPSU Program. By their adventuristic and disruptive activities, the Chinese leaders are causing great harm to the unity and solidarity of the countries of the socialist world system, of the international Communist movement, and the cause of socialist and national-liberation revolutions.

The Chinese leaders have extended their disagreements with the fraternal parties to inter-state relations, and have of late sharply worsened their relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, our country included.

An example of the gross interference by the CPC leaders in the

internal affairs of the fraternal parties and of other countries is their illegal distribution of printed matter containing their pernicious views. To this end they use all channels, even stooping to methods that are a violation of generally accepted standards of international relations.

The Chinese leaders have been conducting subversive work also in international organizations, with the discreditable aim of splitting their ranks and destroying their foundations and thus disuniting and weakening the forces of peace and social progress. They are taking particularly great pains to knock together regional organizations of Afro-Asian and Latin-American countries, with a view to counterposing them to the world democratic organizations, which uphold the vital interests and aspirations of all the peoples of the world.

In our epoch, whose main content is mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, the destinies of the peoples depend in no small degree on their concerted actions against imperialism and for a lasting world peace. In these conditions the policy of racial discrimination pursued by the CPC leaders not only against the national minorities in China—the Kazakhs, Uigurs, inner Mongols, and others—but also against the peoples of other countries, becomes especially dangerous.

The Plenary Meeting of the MPRP Central Committee shares the view that the differences of the CPC leaders with the world Communist movement stem from their dogmatism and sectarianism, from their petty-bourgeois Leftist opportunism, and nationalism.

The MPRP and the working people of the Mongolian People's Republic vigorously support the efforts of the Central Committee of the CPSU to resolve on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism, the differences that have arisen in the world Communist movement, regarding these efforts as a manifestation of sincere concern for the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries and of the world Communist movement.

The MPRP, which has invariably pursued a policy of strengthening friendship and cooperation with the great Chinese people, emphatically denounces and rejects the Chinese leaders' clumsy exertions to force their anti-Marxist line on our Party, break it away from the world Communist movement and its tried and tested vanguard, the CPSU, and push our people off the correct road of eternal alliance and friendship with the great Soviet people and with the peoples of the other socialist countries.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the MPRP instructs all Party organizations:

a) to continue to guide themselves in their ideological-political work among Party members and non-Party people by the directives of the Central Committee, systematically to explain to Party mem-

bers the position of our Party and the Marxist-Leninist views of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties concerning the differences in the world Communist movement, and also the nature of the anti-Leninist positions and activities of the CPC leaders;

b) resolutely to rebuff all manifestations of nationalism, which can only weaken friendship and cooperation between the Mongolian and Soviet peoples, and with the peoples of all the socialist countries, to resist provocations, constantly to heighten their vigilance, and relentlessly to combat the penetration into our midst of an ideology alien to Marxism-Leninism;

c) tirelessly to educate Party members and all the people of the MPR in the spirit of loyalty to the all-conquering teaching of Marxism-Leninism and to the great principles of proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of the fraternal solidarity of Communists and working people of all countries, in the spirit of the utmost consolidation of the unity of the countries of the socialist world system and the international Communist movement;

d) consistently to uphold and strengthen the unity of our Party, to nip in the bud any attempts to violate the norms of democratic centralism and collective leadership and weaken Party discipline, and to continue to strengthen the Party's links with the people.

The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the MPRP expresses its warm solidarity with and full support of the principled Marxist-Leninist stand of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties in the struggle for the ideological purity of Marxism-Leninism, for the unity and cohesion of the world Communist and working-class movement.

WE CANNOT REMAIN SILENT

The following is a letter from 22 Czechoslovak historians to the journal* Nova Mysl *commenting on the assessment given by* Jenminjihpao *and* Hungchi *of the development of the revolution in Czechoslovakia up to 1948.*

On March 31, 1964, the Chinese *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* essayed in an article entitled "The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchov's Revisionism" to explain why the Communist Party of China rejects the thesis concerning the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism contained in the program documents of the international Communist movement—documents, which, incidentally, bear the signature also of the representatives of the CPC.

The question of the forms of transition to socialism and unflagging and purposeful questing in this area is undoubtedly one of the basic problems confronting the international Communist movement today. The thesis concerning the possibility of the peaceful way put forward by the 20th Congress of the CPSU is a major step forward in Marxist-Leninist thought. It clearly plays an important role in the elaboration of the policies of the Communist parties working in conditions favoring the peaceful path.

To substantiate their denial of the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, the Chinese authors aver that history offers no confirmation of the feasibility of such transition, that all successful revolutions have triumphed thanks to the use of force. The illogicality of the argumentation is obvious. If a thing has not happened in the past, this does not mean that it is ruled out in the future. Revolutionaries who are blazing new trails can least of all accept this kind of reasoning, which can well be employed to "refute" even Marx and Lenin.

But leaving aside the absurdity of the Chinese leaders' concept which rules out any creative approach to new developments, we cannot accept the arguments they advance or the juggling with quotations they resort to in order to justify their position. And inasmuch as these arguments, apart from the examples cited from the time of the Hungarian revolution (1918-19), are based on the experience of Czechoslovakia in 1945-48, we can hardly remain silent.

★ ★ ★

Although we have made a special study of the revolution in

*Abridged translation from **Nova Mysl**, No. 6, 1964.

Czechoslovakia, we are completely unaware of the existence of any profound research on our history which would enable any one in distant China to draw such conclusions. We welcome any interest taken by Marxists of other countries in our history, but so far we know of no Chinese researches on the subject. We only know of one Chinese colleague of ours who at one time was in Czechoslovakia and made a cursory study of the period in question. What, then, are the assertions of the Chinese press based on? Why in giving its rather curious interpretation of some of the basic questions of our revolution does it disregard the facts, the position of our Party and the findings of Czechoslovak historians?

The peaceful way, as we understand it in the light of our experience, includes elements of direct coercion, just as armed struggle and violent revolution, as a rule, involve elements of peaceful development. Social processes and phenomena rarely exist in pure form; the character of such complex social phenomena as revolutions is determined by their principal, predominant element.. The Chinese press, however, engages in a polemic against a concept of its own invention when it assails the peaceful path of the revolution conceived as an idyllic road of purely parliamentary action.

The entire approach of the Chinese articles to this question is totally different from ours. In order to make it clear to the reader where this difference lies, we shall cite, word for word, what the Chinese press has to say about the development of the revolution in Czechoslovakia.

"It is a sheer distortion of history when the leaders of the CPSU allege that the Hungarian revolution of 1918-19 is a model of peaceful transition.

"Furthermore, they allege that the working class of Czechoslovakia won power by the peaceful road. This is another absurd distortion of history.

"The people's democratic power in Czechoslovakia was established in the course of the anti-fascist war; it was not taken from the bourgeoisie peacefully. During World War II, the Communist Party led the people in guerilla warfare and armed uprisings against the fascists, it destroyed the German fascist troops and their servile regime in Czechoslovakia with the assistance of the Soviet Army and established a national front coalition government. This government was in essence a people's democratic dictatorship under the leadership of the proletariat, i.e., a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"In February 1948 the reactionaries inside Czecholsovakia, backed by U.S. imperialism, plotted a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat to overthrow the people's government by an armed rebellion. But the government led by the Communist Party immediately deployed its armed forces and organized armed mass demonstra-

tions, thus shattering the bourgeois plot for a counter-revolutionary comeback. These facts clearly testify that the February event was not a peaceful seizure of political power by the working class from the bourgeoisie but a suppression of a counter-revolutionary bourgeois coup d'etat by the working class through its own state apparatus, and mainly through its own armed forces. . . .

"How can the above instances be regarded as precedents for peaceful transition?" (*Jenminjihpao*, March 31, 1964).

Unfortunately, the didactic tone of finality with which these far-reaching but totally unsubstantiated conclusions are set forth makes serious examination of the Chinese concepts rather difficult. Hence it is essential to enumerate at least the basic factors involved in the epoch-making turn in ourhistory. Otherwise the discussion would hardly be fruitful.

★ ★ ★

On the eve of the war Czechoslovakia was a comparatively highly developed bourgeois-democratic country. Of all the Central European countries it was the closest to the "Western" type of state. Ever since its emergence in October 1918 it experienced a succession of bitter class battles, none of which, however, developed into civil war. The Czech bourgeoisie was prepared to go to all lengths to consolidate its power; however, after the downfall of the monarchy it lacked a state apparatus strong enough to suppress the revolutionary movement by force. As for the revolutionary working class, even during the decisive struggle for power in December 1920 it did not have recourse to civil war.

The bourgeois order in the newly-emerged state was based on positions of power won not only by means of armed force. Subsequently too capitalist rule was maintained not only by the use of force by the state machine, although there was no dearth of terroristic acts. A significant role in strengthening that rule was played by the policy of deception pursued by the ruling class.

The violence employed by the state machine mainly took the form of repressions against the most active opposition and revolutionary forces, primarily against the Communists. To hold the mass of the population under its political influence, the bourgeoisie relied above all on bourgeois-democratic and reformist ideology: Masarykism-orientation on the West, and national illusions, especially among the Czechs; religious prejudices—Slovakia; and socio-economic measures—the half-hearted agrarian reform for example. As a result a complex socio-political and ideological foundation was laid for the ideological and political hegemony of the bourgeoisie; this neutralized a substantial part of the population, retarded the development of revolutionary struggle and consolidated the rule of the capitalist class.

The pre-condition of the successful advance of the revolutionary

movement at the time was not only the destruction of the capitalist state machinery but also the abolition of the ingeniously woven web of class and political deception. These two aspects were closely interlinked.

The first serious fissure upsetting the stability of the capitalist system in Czechoslovakia appeared when the deadly peril of German imperialism loomed over the country. Despite many difficulties, a powerful democratic, anti-fascist movement in defense of the republic, came into being. This movement ushered in a process leading to radical political change. Incidentally, the problems of the anti-fascist national-liberation movement should be clear enough to the Chinese theorists from the history of their own country; they should know how great the political opportunities are which this movement affords the revolutionary Communist Party constituting its core. The political relationships inside the new democratic front in Czechoslovakia, of which a substantial part of the bourgeoisie was a potential ally, were far from idyllic harmony, but, unlike the situation in China, for example, elements of civil war never entered into the picture. More, in the critical days of September 1938 the newly-formed political alignment was on the threshold of winning power and the Communist Party, which was the moving spirit of the alignment, was in some respects the leading force in the country.

This truly big success was achieved wholly in the course of a political struggle, without civil war, without the use of violent forms of struggle or an armed uprising, for which, incidentally, favorable conditions were lacking.

★ ★ ★

After the loss of state and national independence, all these processes assumed a new aspect. The fascist yoke and the threat of annihilation hanging over the nation facilitated the formation of a nationwide political movement which led to the establishment of the National Front taking in the proletariat, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, as well as the petty-bourgeois strata and part of the bourgeoisie, including some members of the big bourgeoisie. The two peoples of the country rose to fight Nazism and the big bourgeoisie associated with it. This struggle culminated in partisan action and two armed uprisings.

The relations between the two poles of the resistance movement, the Communists and the supporters of Benes, were, however, highly complex. Mao Tse-tung once applied to this type of relationships in China the formula "unity—struggle".

At times the relations between these two forces were extremely tense. But not once did this lead to a split; never did the struggle between the two transcend the bounds of political and ideological controversy and develop into an armed fight for power inside the

resistance movement. This important feature of the resistance movement in Czechoslovakia stemmed from the objective conditions (which were favorable to the proletariat and unfavorable to the bourgeoisie) and the tactics pursued by both forces.

The Nazi aggression not only weakened the Czech bourgeoisie politically but also undermined to no small extent its rule, eroding the factors which once had enabled the bourgeoisie to establish its ideological and political hegemony in the nation. The Czech resistance movement sprang up and developed in the main as a Left movement going beyond the bounds of traditional bourgeois policy. Gradually the masses came to trust and support the Communists. It is this and not the state machinery that gave the main spur to the political changes in 1945.

In the new situation the Communists were able to build up the channels through which they could exert political influence: a ramified network of illegal organizations and, above all, the partisan movement, the most active part of the resistance, which was mostly, but not wholly, led by them.

During the Slovak and Prague uprisings and in the course of the partisan struggle our people took up arms against the enemy. There is no doubt that the revolution, thanks to the military successes of the resistance movement and the direct aid rendered by the Soviet Army, weakened the bourgeoisie. But the Chinese comrades make the mistake of forgetting that it was a matter of the positions of the bourgeoisie being weakened as a result of the blows delivered at its pro-fascist, collaborationist wing. The other side of the question that should not be forgotten is that the armed actions were directed primarily against the invaders and in themselves did not decide who would win power, after the fascists were defeated.

The question of the power of the proletariat and the methods to be used to win it was resolved along different lines after the war. To understand how this was done the events of 1945-48 which led to the socialist revolution in our country must be correctly assessed.

★ ★ ★

The experience gained in the course of the armed struggle against the invaders showed that the Communists had no need to change their previous policy. They could carry on the struggle for their revolutionary aims on the basis of the broad alliance of working people represented by the National Front. Although the working class carried out a number of far-reaching actions toward the end of the war and the revolutionary movement was joined by other sections of the working people, in particular the peasants and the patriotic intellectuals, the Communist Party did not consider it expedient to make socialist aims and tasks the immediate

objective. It correctly held that continued cooperation with the anti-fascist part of the bourgeoisie, especially those of its members who still enjoyed considerable influence among certain sections of the population, was just as essential in order to ensure the success of the people's democratic and the rapid advance of the country's economic and political life as it had been to win complete victory over fascism. Had the Communist Party ignored the concrete realities of the situation, this would have weakened and not strengthened the leading position of the working class among the masses. Already at that time, as well as later during the broad public discussions of 1955-56, the Party had to combat erroneous, sectarian concepts concerning the character and content of the revolutionary processes in Czechoslovakia in 1945-48. The people's democratic revolution was then developing in exceptionally favorable external and internal conditions. The working class was on the threshold of the socialist revolution, a fact which made many feel that this was the time for radical action. We find it hard to understand why due recognition is not given to the fact that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia carried out with exceptional success its role of leader not only of the working class, but of the entire people. The Party did not take the path which at the face of it promised quick success, it realistically weighed not only the advantages but also the concealed dangers of the outwardly attractive path of a "big leap" to the revolutionary goal—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Although the majority of the working people instinctively wanted socialism, the question of "who would prevail over whom" after the successful completion of the people's liberation struggle was still far from having been finally decided. The notion that the regime established in our country in 1945 was essentially a "dictatorship of the proletariat" is an oversimplification which might be arrived at when looking at things from the distance but which certainly is disproved by a careful examination of the facts. The Party unquestionably had taken substantial strides towards its goal, but the National Front government, two-thirds of which were not Communists but mostly representatives of the bourgeoisie, could by no stretch of the imagination be called a dictatorship of the proletariat. It was indeed a transition period when the balance could easily tip in either direction. Therefore it is difficult to give a simple definition of the regime at the time, as the Chinese theorists now do.

The mistake made by the Chinese comrades is all the more serious for the fact that it stems from the idea that the question of power is decided once and for all with the seizure of the state apparatus. Actually, however, winning power involves winning political and ideological hegemony, especially in the highly devel-

oped countries. This was the case in our country too. It should be stressed once again that part of the people had not yet freed themselves from the ideological and political influence of the bourgeois emigre element. More time was needed for the rank and file of the non-Communist parties to see for themselves that their political leaders, their solemn avowals notwithstanding, had no intention of taking part in the building of the emerging democratic system. Ordinary people still under the influence of bourgeois propaganda could realize all this only through their own experience, by comparing the promises of the Communist party's political adversaries with their actions. The outcome of the struggle to win the trust of the majority of the people was finally decided only after liberation.

It was necessary to prove that the working class and its allies were able to guide the destinies of the nation and the state better than the bourgeoisie. Therefore the Party concentrated on the consistent realization of the tasks of the people's democratic revolution. The main area where the fate of this revolution was decided was struggle to implement the Kosice government program. Much depended on whether the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was able to preserve the unity of the people on the basis of the National Front and to channel their energy to the fulfillment of this program. Only in this way could it clear the way for carrying out tasks of a socialist nature.

Already during the war the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia abroad consulted with representatives of the international working-class movement concerning the possibility of the revolution developing along peaceful lines—a possibility the Communists had no right to disregard inasmuch as it corresponded to the interests of the broad masses as well as the interests of the national economy. In December 1944 Georgi Dimitrov advised our Party to bear in mind the difficulties of post-war rehabilitation that would face the country as soon as the hostilities were over. He pointed out that these tasks could not be solved by the efforts of one class alone, and that since the working class would cooperate with other forces it was necessary soberly to elaborate the political line, not insisting on sovietization, but seeking to win over the broad masses instead of impelling them by intolerant policies into the camp of the bourgeoisie, the class enemy of the proletariat.

Even Stalin, than whom there is no greater authority for the Chinese comrades when it comes to questions concerning violent revolution, gave at that time a highly favorable appraisal of the political orientation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. For example, he said to Klement Gottwald in 1946: "Our way was

the short quick way and cost much blood and sacrifice. If you can avoid that, by all means do so."

The Chinese comrades might be interested to know that in private conversations Stalin conceded the possibility of socialist development taking various paths after the Second World War, the possibility of ways to socialism which need not necessarily repeat the Soviet experience in every respect. Let the Chinese comrades decide for themselves whether these views of Stalin's were revisionist or not. We do not propose to engage in a hunt for quotations and hide behind recognized authorities. We merely wish to point out that already in the immediate post-war period the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism was recognized. In this connection we should like to ask: why, then, should we deny that peaceful transition is possible now when the forces of socialism in the world arena have unquestionably grown and conditions favorable to such transition are taking shape in a number of countries?

Proceeding from the situation at the time, the Communist Party in 1945 did not call for struggle against the whole bourgeoisie and for the abolition of capitalism. It was aware that such a slogan might have alienated the masses, who were not prepared to tackle the tasks of the socialist revolution as such, and would only have made the transition to socialism more difficult.

At the same time, cooperation with the bourgeoisie in implementing the government program by no means signified class peace. The program set forth a number of political and economic demands conforming to the will of the people and aimed against the big bourgeoisie, which had completely discredited itself by collaboration with the fascist invaders. The class struggle continued in specific forms, which were determined, among other things, by the position of the bourgeoisie. The working class must never underestimate this factor when choosing the means of struggle.

The view that the transition to socialism in Czechoslovakia was a peaceful transition also stems from a correct understanding of the balance of strength on the international plane. A big role in the development of the people's democratic revolution was undoubtedly played by the growth of the Soviet Union's prestige due to the fact that it was the Soviet Army that liberated the greater part of the territory of Czechoslovakia, and that the Soviet Union rendered our country all-round political and economic aid and support from the very beginning. The establishment of people's governments in the neighboring Central European countries and alliance with the USSR ensured for Czechoslovakia a stronger position in the international arena than she had ever occupied before. But it should not be forgotten that U.S. troops remained on part of Czech territory until November 1945. Although the

presence of the U.S. Army could not halt the development of the revolution in Western Czechia, it nevertheless was a secret ally of the Czech and Slovak bourgeoisie. The Communist Party had to take this too into account. It was essential to eschew adventurism in drawing up the program of the people's democratic revolution and defining its immediate aims.

The decisive factor in the further development of the revolution was the efforts of the popular masses towards consolidating the people's democratic state and social system. A number of revolutionary tasks were accomplished even before the corresponding decrees and government decisions were published. The peasants in Slovakia began carrying out the agrarian reform in the liberated districts as soon as the fascists were driven out. The workers set up factory councils, established control over the enterprises, and got production going again without waiting for orders from above. The property of the enemy and the traitors was taken over before the President had signed the decrees to this effect.

The Communist Party was aware that the state power established in the course of the people's democratic revolution could develop in one of two directions—either as the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. From the very inception of people's democracy the revolutionary line of the working class, represented by the Communist Party, and the counter-revolutionary line of the bourgeoisie clashed on all basic issues in the course of the formulation and implementation of revolutionary demands and the revolutionary program. Both trends sought to win the confidence and support of the numerous vacillating but nevertheless anti-fascist and patriotic-minded sections of the population. In the conditions then prevailing, this offered a favorable opportunity to disseminate socialist ideas. A new phase of the struggle for political and ideological hegemony began, a phase when consistent realization of the people's democratic revolution became the principal means of gradually bringing about a preponderance of the socialist elements. Consistent democracy is the beginning of socialism. The development of events in Czechoslovakia offers tangible proof of the interconnection between the two.

★ ★ ★

The very first year of the people's democratic republic showed that the orientation of the Communist Party on peaceful revolution was the correct line. The Party's Eighth Congress, convened mainly to elaborate the program of the people's democratic revolution, proceeded from this fact. The experience gained by then fully confirmed Lenin's thesis that consistent deepening of democracy is the best accelerator of advance towards socialism. The Congress therefore pointed out that the main task of the Communists for the immediate period was struggle to strengthen and extend political

and economic democracy. This was the most effective way to oust the bourgeoisie from the positions it had still managed to retain and to create the most favorable conditions for the transfer of full power to the working class. This was an orientation on continued advance along the path of the people's democratic revolution, on deepening this revolution and its gradual development into a socialist revolution.

The turning point in the progress of the revolution was the elections to the Constituent Assembly in the spring of 1946. The elections put an end to equal representation for all political parties. The Communist Party used its right to put forward its own candidate for the post of Chairman of the Government, thereby undertaking direct responsibility for the conduct of the affairs of state. At the same time the Party leadership verified in practice its views on the course developments would take and the need to make wide use of democratic and parliamentary means to promote the advance towards socialism. Moreover, the new situation had to be taken into account. After Churchill's Fulton speech in the spring of 1946 the anti-Hitler coalition of states clearly began to fall apart. Within the country the solution of the fundamental tasks of the revolution changed the basis on which cooperation with the bourgeoisie rested. The Rights in the National Front united with representatives of clandestine reactionary parties and groups and came out against the Communists and the Left Social Democrats.

Despite the deterioration of the situation, the Communist Party did not seek a way out by giving up its political orientation. On the contrary, it worked to implement it consistently. The Party sought to alert the broad masses of working people supporting it to the legal opportunities that existed for overcoming the resistance and subversive activities of the reactionaries. It now advanced the slogan of winning over the majority of the nation with a view to carrying more than half of the vote in the Constituent Assembly elections of 1948.

The Communist Party worked to preserve the National Front and to carry on the revolution along peaceful lines. Did this represent a concession to Social Democracy and revisionism? Certainly not. Above all the Party took cognizance of the fact that there existed a people's democracy possessing the means to foil any attempt the bourgeoisie might make to suppress the will of the majority. Its policy was based not on blind faith in the magic powers of the ballot but on a firm conviction that even with the revolution developing along peaceful lines it was possible to create a situation in which the bourgeoisie could not realize its counter-revolutionary plans. The policy of the Communist Party aimed at

winning over the majority of the people had nothing in common with the line pursued earlier by the Social Democrats.

The efforts of the Communist Party to win over the majority of the people were directed primarily at the small and middle peasants, the intellectuals and the urban middle strata. It also saw to it that the tasks posed before the working people at the various stages did not go beyond the range of possibility or depart from revolutionary ideas. At the same time it pressed for the realization of demands which weakened the bourgeoisie and helped to strengthen the positions of the working class.

The Party pursued the same line in all other issues—in the matter of confiscation, taxation of millionaires, regulating the wages of government employees, etc. In this way new sections of the working people were set in motion in the course of 1947. And this steadily improved the conditions for the successful completion of the revolution by peaceful means.

The concepts of the Chinese comrades, which deny, in effect, the possibility of the peaceful development of the revolution, the possibility of using democratic and parliamentary institutions to promote the revolution, to all intents and purposes reduce the National Front policy pursued by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia to a mere tactical maneuver. We hope they are aware that this is exactly what ultra-reactionary bourgeois writers say. The Chinese comrades must have noticed how much their concepts appeal to the "wild men."

Countless facts show that the Communists sincerely sought to cooperate with all genuine democrats, including members of the anti-fascist bourgeoisie, in building a just social system. The overwhelming majority of the population likewise wanted such cooperation. The difficulty, however, was that not all those who were so ready to talk about the need for far-reaching social change and even about socialism really sought to observe the basic condition making cooperation possible: they did not wish to live up to program commitments to which they themselves had subscribed.

In 1945-48 the prospects of the development of socialist democracy were still not fully clear to all and at all times. Things were complicated by the fact that the point of departure in examining the situation at that time was Stalin's one-sided interpretation of the forms and functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which, moreover, was often identified with the Soviets. There were also frequent sectarian sallies against the idea of the peaceful way to socialism and the National Front policy, sallies which differed little from the present concepts of the Chinese comrades.

The idea of working to win over the majority of the people as such was born in sharp struggle with Leftist and sectarian elements. In this struggle the Communist Party not only upheld the

need to use democracy and parliamentary traditions to promote the advance towards socialism but also arrived at the conclusion that the peaceful development of the revolution would lay its imprint on the ultimate image of socialism as such. In this way the idea of the National Front as the basis of our political system after final victory over the bourgeoisie gradually struck root. Today too we attach much importance to the conclusions our Party drew at that time.

★ ★ ★

At the end of 1947 the leadership of the Communist Party engaged in a profound study of the problems connected with the further development of the revolution. It saw that the final test of strength between the working class and the bourgeoisie was approaching. This was evident from the way the domestic reactionaries were stepping up their activity, partly because of the growing pressure exerted by the forces of foreign imperialism and partly because of the series of defeats suffered by the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie in the second half of 1947.

While the Communist Party was working to carry the revolution forward and to promote the advance towards socialism, the reactionary leaders of the National Socialist, People's and Slovak Democratic parties representing the interests of the bourgeoisie sought to destroy the people's democratic system and to restore the bourgeois social set-up. The reactionaries schemed to precipitate a government crisis and to set up a government consisting of civil servants which would have gradually given a new turn to the existing political relationship; the Communist Party, on the other hand, built its plans on the possibility of going over to socialism in a peaceful way. At the same time, however, the leadership of the Communist Party looked upon this possibility as only one of several possible ways of transition to socialism. Under certain conditions the extra-parliamentary forms of struggle might well become the main factor. For one thing, there was the possibility that parliament would be isolated and replaced by countrywide congresses of the working people, which is what actually happened.

But under all circumstances the transition to socialism could be peaceful only if the bourgeoisie did not, or could not, take armed action.

The beginning of 1948 saw the Party preparing for the elections. The Communists organized a campaign for the donation of 30 million man-hours of working time to the republic, and proposed that all enterprises with more than 50 workers be nationalized. This was, in a way, the Communist reply to the Right-wing politicians who sabotaged the implementation of the agrarian reform which provided for the distribution among the peasants of all holdings exceedings 50 hectares. The Central Trade Union Council

decided to convene on February 22 a congress of delegates of the factory councils and trade unions to discuss these proposals, and the chairmen of the Peasants' Committees called a national congress of peasant delegates for February 28 and 29.

On February 20 twelve ministers, representing the National Socialist, People's and Slovak Democratic parties, resigned from the government. This was the first step towards carrying out the plan of the bourgeoisie. The attempt made by the reactionaries to restore the old regime was countered by the revolutionary forces with a powerful counter-offensive aimed at completely destroying the political positions of the bourgeoisie. Inasmuch as only a minority of the members of the government had handed in their resignations, the government could carry on fully in accordance with the law. The Communist Party made good use of the situation and focussed attention on the demand that the resignation be accepted at once and the vacancies thus formed in the government filled with new members.

When the mass movement for accepting the resignations of the twelve reactionary ministers reached its peak, President Benes complied and gave his approval to a new government formed by Klement Gottwald. The extreme measure which the working class resorted to in February 1948 to bring pressure to bear on Benes was a general strike.

Chinese propaganda claims, contrary to the facts, that the decisive role was played towards the end of February by armed force and armed mass demonstrations. Nothing of the kind happened; the February events were not marked by mass armed action of any kind. The Chinese comrades have simply invented their version of these events in order to substantiate their dogmatic views on the transition to socialism. If the Chinese propagandists have in mind the part played by our people's militia when they speak of "armed mass demonstrations" they at best have basically failed to understand its role and tasks in February 1948.

The people's militia was formed as an answer to the attempts made by the reactionaries to engineer a counter-revolutionary coup. Its numbers, however, were negligible in comparison with other armed forces in the country. (In Prague, where the events centered, only 6,550 persons were armed.) It took no armed action throughout the February events. Its formation mainly had a psychological effect. But small though it was numerically, the people's militia was prepared to stamp out in the embryo any open attempt on the part of the reactionaries to spark off armed clashes. It is common knowledge that reaction was preparing to take to arms, and the working class too had to be ready for such an eventuality. Both sides envisaged the possibility of an armed collision. This, indeed, is a possibility that must always be borne in mind. But in

appraising historical events the main thing to go by is not what the subjective intentions were but what actually happened. And what happened in the given case is perfectly clear.

There are also other instances of distortion of the February events in the Chinese materials. For example, it is claimed that the Communist Party achieved victory "through its own state apparatus," which is what the reactionary emigres say. The purpose of this thesis is to make it appear as if there was a dictatorship of the proletariat in Czechoslovakia beginning with May 1945 and that hence there could not have been any peaceful transition to socialism. Yet the fact is that until February 1948 the state machinery was not wholly in the hands of the working class. Part of it was in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The struggle to take over the state apparatus was a component of the class struggle.

Only in February, after the state machine had been purged and the working class had defeated the bourgeoisie politically, did the state apparatus become an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In February 1948, when the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia suffered a complete political defeat and the working class won final victory, the process of development of the people's democratic revolution into the socialist revolution was completed. The Communist Party fulfilled its primary task, and did so using peaceful means, observing the constitution and the parliamentary traditions. There were no armed clashes during the February events, for the bourgeoisie lacked the forces and the courage to take to arms. Neither did the Communist Party have recourse to the force of arms. If it nevertheless seems to some people that the February events transcended the bounds of peaceful transition to socialism, this is only because they take a narrow view of what is meant by such transition. The peaceful way cannot be identified with the purely parliamentary way, which Czechoslovakia indeed did not take.

★ ★ ★

The successful transition to socialism by peaceful means showed that given a propitious international situation and a favorable balance of class forces within the country, the working class can achieve socialism in a peaceful way and the bourgeoisie find itself unable to resort to armed force and military resistance. The events of 1945-48 in Czechoslovakia, which led to the victory of the socialist revolution without heavy sacrifice, were a triumph for the policy of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, for the creative Marxist approach to the socialist revolution. They demonstrated in practice that in our time peaceful transition to socialism is a tangible possibility.

Much attention has always been paid in our country to studying

the Chinese revolution, which was carried out mostly by violent means. Our experience differs from the Chinese, yet it has never occurred to us to try to introduce "corrections" in the Chinese revolution. Needless to say, we expect the Chinese comrades to take the same attitude. For to reckon with the facts is an elementary principle of Marxism. No considerations of expediency can justify violation of this principle. That is where the main trouble lies.

Prague, May 8, 1964.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA'S ATTITUDE TO OTHER PARTIES

John Mahon

In the present controversy in the international Communist movement, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party have put forward a general line of policy contrary to that adopted by the National Congress of our Party, and to the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties.

Our Executive Committee statement of January 1963, the 29th Party Congress, and the E.C. Statement of September 1963 have stated our case against the general line of the Chinese, and made clear that to adopt it would put our Party in opposition to the basic interests of the British people and the international working-class and national-liberation movements.

Previous articles in this series have further developed our views, taking into account the latest Chinese statements. The purpose of this article* is not to repeat what has been said on the main political issues, but to direct attention to an additional aspect of the problem.

The Chinese leaders go far beyond arguing their case. They are not prepared to allow other parties to decide for themselves their attitude on the issues in dispute. They declare that Communists and Communist parties who do not accept their view are "revisionists," and have ceased to be Marxist-Leninist parties. They declare that the only true Marxist-Leninists are those, inside or outside the Communist parties, who accept the Chinese view. They call for factional struggle against the elected leaderships of those parties who do not agree with them, and they announce their determination to support such factional struggles to the extent of forming rival parties.

Our Party, therefore, has to be fully aware that in addition to the political struggle for our policy and program, we have to defeat organized attempts to break down our Party unity and discipline.

That one Communist Party should interfere in the internal affairs of other parties, should directly or indirectly assist factions, breakaways and splits, is so unprecedented an event in our

*Comment Supplement No. 5, May 16, 1964.

movement that many comrades find it difficult to believe. Unfortunately there is no room for doubt.

In June 1963 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China published its "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement." In section 12 of this document we read:

"If the leading group in any party adopt a non-revolutionary line and convert it into a reformist party, then Marxist-Leninists inside and outside the party will replace them and lead the people in making a revolution."

ENCOURAGEMENT TO DISRUPT

This is encouragement to disrupt parties which do not accept the Chinese view. The "Proposal" was followed by a series of articles amplifying its 25 sections. One article, "Leninism and Modern Revisionism," sought to justify the call for disruption. It sought to draw a parallel between the betrayal of the working class by the revisionist leaders of the Second International and Lenin's consequent call for a Third International, and the position in the international Communist movement today, where the Chinese charge of revisionism against leaders of the CPSU and other parties is accompanied by the call for a split.

The Chinese leaders do not confine themselves to words and appeals. They give active political support and practical assistance in many countries to factions and breakaway groups, often including people with anti-party records, which seek to popularize the Chinese view. The first stage is a wide circulation within and outside the Party of the Chinese statements. Then came appeals to "Marxist-Leninists" to carry on activities in breach of democratic centralism and of the Party constitution. Where the Party concerned expels such elements, a breakaway organization is formed. This may later be recognized by the Chinese as the "Marxist-Leninist Communist Party" of the country. If the Party does not expel them, they continue subversive activity to the point of calling their own "Party conference," electing their own "Central Committee" and claiming to be the Communist Party. The Chinese leaders then recognize them as though the legitimate party did not exist.

Such activities are going on in a number of countries. Breakaway groups with the declared intention of forming new parties are at work in Austria, Colombia, Chile and Peru, and what claim to be "Marxist-Leninist parties" have been formed in Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Ceylon and Switzerland. An international journal supporting the splitting effort is published in France in several languages.

The New China News Agency gives world-wide publicity to the statements of these groups, while suppressing the current political statements of the Communist parties concerned and even ceasing to report their public activities. For example, in recent reports of by-elections in this country, and of the Greater London Council elections, no mention is made of the Communist candidates.

That the world-wide attempt to split is the official policy of the Chinese Communist Party is made clear in the article "The Leaders of the CPSU are the Greatest Splitters of Our Time" published by the editorial departments of the Chinese papers *People's Daily* and *Red Flag* on February 4th, 1964. The article contains a section headed "Refutation of the charge of supporting the anti-Party groups in fraternal parties."

This is a very peculiar "refutation." Chinese support of factions and breakaways in Belgium, Ceylon, Brazil and elsewhere is not denied, it is glorified.

The argument is that the leaderships of the parties in these countries are "revisionists," those who oppose them are "Marxist-Leninists," the Chinese Communists "support all revolutionary comrades who adhere to Marxism-Leninism," therefore:

"The leaders of the CPSU describe our support for Marxist-Leninists in other countries as a divisive act. In our opinion, it is simply a proletarian internationalist obligation which it is our duty to discharge."*

So the "refutation" is in fact a justification.

WARNING IS CLEAR

The warning is clear. The Chinese leaders have assumed to themselves the right to pronounce that any party which does not accept their dictation, is "revisionist" and therefore a target for attack. This is an outrageous violation of Communist practice and of the 1960 Statement.

The Chinese leaders offer a pseudo-theoretical justification for their political line and for their splitting activities by an involved argumentaton around the theme that they are the only true defenders of Marxism-Leninism.

They at first claimed to be loyal to the 1960 Statement of the Parties. This claim was a subterfuge, for if they had no differences with the Statement, what was the need to rewrite it, as they did in their "Proposal for a General Line for the International Communist Movements"? The serious reader has only to compare the texts of the 1960 Statement and of the Chinese "Proposal" to see that there is a great political difference between them. In later articles the Chinese leaders abandon the pretense that they are

*Hsinhua duplicated edition of the article, p. 23.

defenders of the Statement and come out openly for changing it.

The Chinese method of argument departs from the normal practice of Communists, which is to present the concrete facts of the situation under discussion, to make an analysis of the social and political factors at work, and to use the experience generalized in Marxism-Leninism to work out a policy which will strengthen the mass struggle against the forces of reaction and advance those of the revolution.

THE CHINESE METHOD

The Chinese method is to base their argument on quotations, usually from Lenin, selected by themselves and presented without any reference to the context in which they were written.

In their argumentation a specific Chinese meaning is given to key words in the terminology used in our movement.

"Marxism-Leninism" means the views of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party.

"Marxist-Leninists" and "Marxist-Leninist parties" are those who agree with these views.

"Modern Revisionists" are those Communists who don't agree with the Chinese leaders.

The Chinese method calls to mind the words of the 1960 Statement that dogmatism and sectarianism "rob revolutionary parties of the ability to develop Marxism-Leninsm through scientific analysis and to apply it creatively according to the specific conditions."

Before dealing with the present attack on our Party, it is relevant to refer briefly to our past experience.

OUR EXPERIENCE

During the discussions which led up to the formation of our Party in 1920, a strong sectarian tendency expressed itself in the demand to boycott parliamentary elections. Lenin himself argued against this tendency in his famous work *Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder,* presented to the Second Congress of the Communist International. This trend was defeated by the majority at the foundation Congress of our Party — the Unity Convention held July 31st to August 1st, 1920: our Party united around a policy and rules which included participation in elections.

This pattern for the solution of differences — widespread discussion, decision by Congress, unity of the Party around the decision — was followed in subsequent controversies.

Our Party from its inception rejected the idea of factional struggle over differences of view, and provided channels for discussion and decision within the framework of Party unity.

Subsequent congresses developed our Party on the basis of

Marxism-Leninism and with democratic centralism as our organizational principle.

When, following the expulsion of Trotsky from the CPSU in 1927, a handful of Trotskyites tried to form factional groups in our Party, they were expelled. They then formed their own organization, which supported Trotsky's advocacy of the armed overthrow of the Soviet government.

TWENTIETH CONGRESS

In 1956 came the 20th Congress of the CPSU and later the Hungarian events. The exposure of the cult of Stalin and the violations of socialist legality and of democratic centralism which accompanied it in the CPSU and in other parties, gave rise to widespread discussion in the course of which an organized revisionist trend arose in our Party.

The essence of the revisionist position was: to extend the criticism of the violations of socialist democracy into a general rejection of the basic concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist democracy; to assert the right to form factions in place of the principle of democratic centralism; to subordinate the Communist Party to the Labor Party as the supposed mass political organization of the British working class and on this basis to oppose election contests by the Communist Party.

In 1956 the Executive Committee appointed two Commisions: one on the Party Program, the other on Inner Party Democracy.

The Commission on the Program discussed numerous proposals to revise the 1951 first election of *The British Road to Socialism* and produced a new draft for consideration by the 1957 Special National Congress. The draft was introduced to the Party and to the public by an article in the *Daily Worker* by John Gollan, and discussion upon it went on for three months in the columns of the paper. It was also dealt with by many comrades in the pre-Congress discussion in *World News*. Party Branches submitted 947 amendments to the draft; these were published in the usual printed booklet form, and were before Congress.

The Commission on Inner Party Democracy produced a majority and a minority report, both of which were circulated and discussed throughout the Party, and, together with numerous amendments, placed before the 1957 Congress.

OVERWHELMINGLY REJECTED

The revisionist position was overwhelmingly rejected by the 1957 Congress, which reaffirmed the Marxist-Leninist character of our Party. The Congress adopted a new text of the Party program clearly establishing our position in the struggle for peaceful coexistence, our support for the national-liberation movement, and

the advance of the working class and its allies in the mass struggle for political power and the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in Britain. Subsequent congresses endorsed the principles and line of the program. During the controversy in the international Communist movement, that is since 1960, not one Party Branch has suggested its revision.

The 1957 congress, also by an overwhelming majority, reaffirmed our adherence to democratic centralism and adopted a report on Inner Party Democracy which clarified its application.

This report became the basis for the drafting of the present text of our Rules, which after full discussion and consideration of numerous amendments, were adopted by the 1959 congress.

The congresses of 1959, 1961 and 1963 further developed our political line and the role of the Party, particularly in the mass struggle for peace and national liberation, higher wages, jobs, better living standards and social services, and in relation to the Labor movement.

These congresses repeatedly emphasized the political significance of Party building and of the extension of our electoral work, with the results that our Party membership increased by some 10,000 in six years and we are contesting elections much more widely.

The defeat of revisionism in 1956-57 therefore resulted in a political clarification and strengthening of our Party.

These experiences of our Party confirm the presentation in the 1960 Statement, and the correctness of its call for struggle against trends to depart from the general line of policy.

Speaking of the revisionist danger (at that time it said it was the main danger), the Statement declared:

"Revisionism, Right-wing opportunism, which mirrors bourgeois ideology in theory and practice, distorts Marxism-Leninism, robs it of its revolutionary spirit, and thereby paralyzes the revolutionary will of the working class. It disarms and demobilizes the workers and all working people, in their struggle against oppression by imperialists and exploiters, for peace, democracy and national liberation, for the triumph of socialism."

The Statement was equally forthright in condemning the ultra-Left danger, which it declared could become the main danger.

"Dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual parties, unless combated unrelentingly. They rob revolutionary parties of the ability to develop Marxism-Leninism through scientific analysis and apply it creatively according to the specific conditions. They isolate Communists from the broad masses of the working people, doom them to passive expectation or Leftist adventurist actions in the revolutionary struggle. They prevent the Communist parties from making a timely and correct estimate

of the changing situation and of new experience and using all opportunities to bring about the victory of the working class and all democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and the war danger. Thereby they prevent the peoples from achieving victory in their just struggle."

NEW ATTACK

Since the beginning of 1963 the sharpening of the public controversy in the international Communist movement has stimulated a new ultra-Left attack on our Party. This attack challenges our political line and the principle of democratic centralism by disruptive and factional activity, as the revisionists did previously.

This attack comes from two angles — the handful of those who carry their agreement with the Chinese line to the stage of following the call to split, and the Trotskyites.

Some of those who rejected the perspective opened up by the *British Road to Socialism* accepted the Chinese line as theoretical and political authority for extending their criticism of the idea of peaceful transition to socialism in Britain to a general charge that our Party policy and leadersrip were revisionist and betraying the working class. This view began to find expression during the 1963 discussions on the Chinese line and was defeated at the 1963 Party Congress, by 436 votes to 4, and in the branch discussion following the September E.C. statement, by 294 branches to 7. Some of the supporters of the Chinese line began factional activity during 1963.

During 1963 Michael McCreery organized meetings of a handful of members of the Party from various parts of the country.

DESTROY OUR PARTY

The McCreery committee against revisionism has since made clear its desire — a vain one! — to destroy our Party:

"We can only build a revolutionary, Marxist Party, by smashing the old Party, by appealing over the heads of the leadership of the CPGB to all honest militants in the working-class movement."*

The McCreery committee is in possession of resources enabling it to print and distribute expensive publications.

The content of its materials suggests that having obtained Albanian recognition, it hopes for Chinese recognition also. It would of course be a mistake to assume that this Committee is the only, or even the chief, grouping relied upon by those interested in a new political organization based on the Chinese line.

Anonymous supporters of the Chinese line also circulate Chi-

*From **Destroy the Old to Build the New.** Michael McCreery, 1963.

nese, and to a lesser extent Albanian, political material, including comments on our Party statements and articles. It is frequently sent by post to Party members who have not asked for it, and whose addresses must have been obtained by clandestine means.

The Trotskyites were quick to take advantage of the situation created by the actions of the Chinese and the character of their political line. The Sixth World Congress of the Trotskyist Fourth International in 1961 stated:

"The political positions of the Chinese CP are far from those of revolutionary Marxism but they demonstrate its huge possibilities and are opening a field of work such as Trotskyism never had in the past.

"In the construction of new revolutionary mass parties our allies can only be Left Communist currents; that is the . . . 'Chinese' currents in the CP's of the capitalist countries . . ."

The other wing of the Trotskyist movement represented by the Socialist Labor League and *Labor Review* says:

"The Chinese Communist Party makes an important contribution by opening the necessary discussion . . . It is not a question of an abstract argument about whose ideas come closest to the formulae of true Bolshevism. On that count the Chinese are correct on most points against Khrushchov and Togliatti."*

In fact Trotskyite organizations and papers had earlier put forward views similar to those of the Chinese leaders on some questions, particularly on the policy and role of the CPSU, peaceful coexistence and the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism in some countries.

The Trotskyites circulate their own periodicals and specialize in anonymous bulletins giving directives and arguments which they hope will be taken up. They practice a technique of entangling members of the Party and the YCL in their activities. They particularly seek to influence the youth and the students.

At a national conference of the Socialist Labour League held in London in March 1964 a meeting was held of a small group working inside the Party and YCL. This meeting issued a directive which says:

"Our National Conference shall, therefore, construct a faction inside the CP and YCL which will meet regularly on a national scale and operate and work under the jurisdiction of the National and Political Committee of the League."

The Trotskyites do not scruple to distort and falsify Lenin, for example, on the question of factions within the Party. They take isolated quotations from the period of preparation for the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, when factions and op-

*Labour Review, Vol. 7, No. 4.

position groupings were permitted. They completely suppress the fact that in his political report to the 10th Congress Lenin uncompromisingly condemned factionalism and that the Congress adopted a resolution, drafted by Lenin, which in the strongest possible terms condemned factional groupings and ordered their dissolution on pain of expulsion from the Party.

The resolution included the following passages:

"All class-conscious workers must clearly appreciate the harm and impermissibility of any factionalism whatsoever . . .

"In the practical struggle against factionalism, every organization of the Party must take strict measures to prevent any factional conduct whatsoever.

"The Congress, therefore, declares dissolved and orders the immediate dissolution of all groups without exception that have been formed on the basis of various platforms . . .

"Non-compliance with this order must involve unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party."

The supporters of the Chinese call to split, and the Trotskyites, whatever their political differences, are both committed to factional methods. Like all factions they feel the need to explain their defeat in Party discussion, by claiming that democracy is lacking in the Party, that members are not well informed, or not well enough versed in theory.

OUR BASIC THEORY

For our Party, Marxism-Leninism is our basic theory and guide to action, not one trend among others. We are not searching for a basic theory, we have Marxism-Leninism. History has proved it to be the only theory which has led the working class to the conquest of political power and the building of socialism, in a number of countries. Our Party Program is the product of the whole Party's work in developing our knowledge of Marxism-Leninism and applying it to British conditions.

Our Party's methods of democratic discussion and decision on all major policy matters are well known.

In preparation for the 28th National Congress, for example, the two major policy resolutions were published for full discussion and amendment. They were discussed at specially convened branch meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country. In addition a public pre-congress discussion took place in *Comment* in eight 4 pp. supplements in the two months before the Congress. Four hundred and thirteen amendments to the main political resolution and 200 to the trade union resolution were received, published, and circulated to all branches. The main amendments were selected for debate and where necessary were voted on. The final

amended resolutions were then put to the vote and became Party policy binding on all members.

No other political party in Britain has such a widespread public and democratic process in arriving at policy.

This is the only way for a Marxist party to function. The factionalists want to defy the democratic Congress decisions. They want anarchy.

The aim of the factions is clear. By "free discussion" and "continuous discussion" the faction means the right to raise its own ideas at any time, to ignore Party decisions, and to divert the Party members from political mass work. This is in fact a political fight to bring about the defeat of Party policy and to paralyze its activity. That is why the rules of the Party provide disciplinary sanctions against factional activity.

The whole question of factional activity was thoroughly dealt with in the decision of the 25th Party Congress on inner-party democracy.

"Some comrades argue that the right to reserve one's views and to express them to the higher bodies are not sufficient . . . Some comrades specifically claim the right to campaign in the Party and the press to get the decision changed and the right to form groups of likeminded comrades for this purpose. Some claim that such groupings should have the right to draw up their own political platform and to campaign for it and that either the Party should be obliged to publish that platform or they should have the independent right to publish it.

"These arguments amount to the proposal that factions should be permitted in our Party. A faction is a grouping of Party members outside the recognized organizations of the Party for the purpose of inner-party struggle.

"We completely reject such a proposal."*

Democratic centralism does not permit factions in the Party because they would destroy its unity and capactiy for political action. Factionalism in the international Communist movement was similarly condemned by the 1960 Statement which said:

"Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as a law of their activities strictly to observe Leninist standards of Party life in keeping with the principles of democratic centralism and to cherish Party unity like the apple of their eye."** and further:

"Resolute defense of the unity of the world Communist movement, of our principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary conditions for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for

---

*Inner-Party Democracy, Decision of the 25th Congress. p. 28.
**36 Million Communists Say . . . p. 33.

the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution and for the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism."***

Our Party has repulsed all previous attempts, whether from the right or the ultra-Left to disrupt our unity, discipline, and adherence to Marxism-Leninism and democratic centralism. We shall also repulse the present attack because our membership and our leadership are united behind the decisions of our Party Congresses.

***Ibid. p. 34.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Joint Council of the Irish Workers' Party (Republic of Ireland) and the Communist Party (N. Ireland), consisting of the Executive Committee of the two Parties, have recently discussed the latest developments in the international Communist movement.

In the pursuit of our joint struggle for national independence and the achievement of a united Irish Socialist republic, we unhesitatingly and unanimously declare that the struggle for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the achievement of general disarmament are the principal task of the international working class movement at the present time.

The Joint Council recognizes that, after the Second World War, there have been tremendous changes in the balance of world forces. Socialism is no longer confined, as it was in the prewar days, to the Soviet Union, to one country, encircled by imperialist powers. There is now a world system of socialism, embracing a third of the earth, in which the socialist commonwealth is achieving one success after another in the building of a new society, demonstrating in life and in fact the superiority of socialism over capitalism. Truly, the struggle of world socialism and world imperialism is the principal contest of our time.

The victory of socialism in all countries is inevitable. Final victory on a world scale, however, will only be achieved through the united efforts of the world socialist system, the international working-class movement and the peoples struggling for national liberation. The world socialist system's struggle against imperialism is the center of this united struggle. It is the focal point of the class struggle on a world scale.

In the experience of our own struggle we have seen that the nature of imperialism has not changed. We have also seen, despite the strength of imperialism and its unchanged nature, that the power of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states and that of the world forces for peace and progress can impose peace on the imperialists and can defend and advance the cause of national independence without recourse to nuclear war. This was shown during the Caribbean crisis. The heroic stand of the Cuban people, championed by the might of the Soviet Union, demonstrated the true character of the present epoch.

Cuba, a socialist island in the midst of imperialism, is a valuable

example to nations that are fighting for national and social liberation, to a small country, like ours, that has still to overcome the full effects of imperialist misrule.

The Cuban events showed that, beside the prevention of armed aggression against a small country, there also exists the basis for resolving all the issues in dispute between countries with different social systems through the medium of negotiations. Only the strength of the world socialist system has made this possible.

Such strength has forced the more realistic spokesmen of imperialism to understand that nuclear war would also destroy them. In effect, it would mean suicide for the imperialists and their system. It is true that there are wild warmongers, like Adenauer and Goldwater and the forces responsible for the assassination of President Kennedy, who would dismiss this and would not hesitate to plunge the world into a thermonuclear holocaust.

We cannot accept the standpoint of the Communist Party of China when it lightly dismisses nuclear war, and when it speaks of building "a thousand times more wonderful future" on the ruins that would follow such a war.

We reject this standpoint. Neither the Irish people, the workers of the world or the peoples of the socialist countries want or need such a nuclear war. It would not serve the cause of socialism. Instead, it would throw socialism, the working class and all humanity back a century. We are confident that socialism will triumph. It, and not nuclear war, is inevitable.

There are many roads to socialism. Regarding the position of our two parties on the question of peaceful transition, this has been clearly set out in our two Programs, *Ireland Her Own* (Irish Workers' Party) and *Ireland's Path to Socialism* (Communist Party, N. Ireland). We hold that conditions exist for a peaceful way to socialism in our country.

Socialism will be inevitably established in Ireland on the basis of the objective conditions and the understanding of the people for its need. Such prerequisites can never be imported or artificially stimulated by external pressures. They must develop on the basis of the internal conditions and struggle in Ireland. Socialism will be established by the Irish people, north and south, headed by the working class and its revolutionary vanguard.

The continuance of world peace, the easing of international tension, the economic and social progress of the socialist countries, the strengthened unity of the international working class and Communist movement—all these make for better conditions for the development of our people's struggle.

This is our standpoint. We reject the line which the Communist Party of China has advanced in opposition to the general line worked out in collective discussion and agreement at the 1957 and

1960 international conferences of the Communist and Workers' parties.

We condemn the manner in which the CPC has sought to sow confusion and create splits in the Communist and Workers' parties and the unprincipled character of their public statements. We condemn such absurd statements, that capitalism is being restored in the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Government has joined in a conspiracy with the imperialists.

We consider that the situation demands the convening of an international conference of the fraternal parties for the purpose of strengthening the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the decisions of the 1957 and 1960 international conferences.

Adopted at Joint Council meeting, held in Dublin, April 18-19, 1964.

TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE NETHERLANDS

RESOLUTION ON THE NEW ORIENTATION

The 21st Congress of the CPN acclaims and approves the new orientation set forth in the theses submitted for discussion and advanced in the speeches of Comrades Paul de Groot and Henk Hoekstra, and urges the Party to work hard and carry it into reality.

The Congress considers that the Party should be even more active in the defense of the interests of broad sections of the population, in working for the unity of Communists and Socialists, and in the struggle for higher wages, for peace and democracy. After the change in the trade union policy of the Party, which brought it signal successes in promoting unity and defending the interests of the working people, a change is needed in the communal policy as was emphasized by Comrades de Groot and Hoekstra. This will help greatly towards satisfying the demands of the people and rallying all the anti-monopoly forces.

The task is now, to unite all forces to oppose Marijnen's Rightist government and build a new majority in the country and in the parliament's lower chamber so as to replace it with a working-class government on a broad progressive basis.

The Congress urges all Party members, organizations and committees to display greater initiative and act more vigorously for unity, peace, democracy and the interests of the people.

This calls for active work in the Party organizations and for an even more serious approach to the problems agitating the people.

It is particularly important today to act promptly so as to make the prospects indicated by the Party a source of inspiration to all manual and brain workers.

Our propaganda and our newspaper *De Waarheid* must play an important part in this. It is necessary to modify the Party's propaganda work, especially by promoting local initiatives. The content of our newspaper should conform with the new tasks and with the possibility and necessity of winning many new readers among various sections of the population. For this, energy and perseverance are needed.

The new orientation provides ample opportunities for consolidating the Party and thus enabling it to fulfil its present great mission.

Therefore the Congress resolves to start a systematic Party-building campaign to recruit new members, set up new organizations and raise funds for extensive propaganda work.

RESOLUTION ON PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

Having heard its special commission, the Congress considers that an international conference of all the Communist parties should be held in the foreseeable future. The Congress expects this conference to lead:

—first, to greater unity of action;

—second, to the normalization of the discussion, which will enable it to promote unity.

The Congress considers it necessary for the international conference to be thoroughly prepared by all the Communist parties.

With this aim in view, the Congress proposes establishing an international drafting committee of competent members, regardless of what communist party they belong to, who should consult all the parties so as to enable each of them to contribute to the working out of the final decision.

The Congress believes that after such careful preparation the international conference should preferably be held, for instance, in Bucharest or Warsaw.

To make the conference a success, the equality of all the parties should be strictly observed, without any patronage or interference. The Congress is firmly convinced that the international conference will strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement and yield new successes in the struggle against imperialism for peace and socialism.

STATEMENT* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, PEOPLE'S PARTY OF IRAN

ON THE DIFFERENCES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST AND WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran, having considered the documents of the February 1964 plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and in view of the anti-Marxist disruptive activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China in the international Communist and working-class movement, deems it necessary to state its position on these questions.

The People's Party of Iran, which participated in the drafting of the documents adopted at the 1957 and 1960 meetings of the fraternal parties and is a signatory to them, holds that these documents clearly set forth the general line of the international Communist and working-class movement at the present stage. These documents were examined in detail and endorsed by plenary sessions of the Central Committee of the People's Party.

It is to be deplored that the leaders of the CPC, who signed and once stood by these documents, have now come out against them, revising them and substituting for them a new general line which was set forth in the Chinese leaders' 25-point letter of June 14, 1963.

In assailing the unity and solidarity of the international working-class movement, the leaders of the CPC do not limit themselves to disseminating anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist views. In the recent period they have embarked on extensive activities aimed at splitting the Communist and Workers' parties and the international mass organizations. Moreover, they consider their disruptive activity perfectly legitimate and even claim that it is in the interest of the international working-class movement.

The subversive activities of the CPC leaders are directed primarily against the CPSU and its Leninist leadership, the most consistent champions of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international working-class movement.

One of the Chinese leaders' principal aims is to drive a wedge between the national-liberation movement and the Communist and Workers' parties of Asia, Africa and Latin America, on the one hand, and the socialist camp and the proletariat of the capitalist countries, on the other. To this end they level the most outrageous

*Mardom, April 5, 1964.

accusations and slander at the leadership of the Communist and Workers' parties of both socialist and capitalist countries.

The CPC leaders have gone so far as to substitute for class analysis of things a nationalistic, geographic and race approach, resorting to a variety of methods to set the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against their class brothers in other continents. Their behavior at the last session of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Council in Algiers and the international conference of democratic lawyers in Budapest; for instance, fully revealed both their position and their methods.

Such activities on the part of the Chinese leaders are at crying variance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They are aimed at undermining the solidarity of the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement of the socialist countries and the newly-emerged independent states, and tend to disunite the anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces fighting against imperialism and for world peace. The CPC leaders speak endlessly about intensifying the struggle against imperialism, but by seeking to minimize the significance of the international working-class movement as compared with the national-liberation movement, and working to weaken the link between these movements they are objectively playing into the hands of imperialism.

The CPC leaders accuse the CPSU and the overwhelming majority of the Communist and Workers' parties of revisionism although themselves revising, out of nationalistic, great-power considerations, many of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. They assail the decisions of the 20th and the 22nd congresses of the CPSU as instances of "revisionism" and departure from Marxism-Leninism. But there is not a grain of truth in these accusations.

The main content of the documents of the 20th and the 22nd congresses of the CPSU, which were endorsed by all the fraternal parties, the CPC included, consists in the exposure of the Stalin personality cult and the restoration of Leninist standards in inner-Party life and the political, social and economic life of the Soviet Union as a whole, as well as in the sphere of relations between fraternal parties.

The 20th and the 22nd congresses of the CPSU put an end to the incubus of the Stalin cult which was incompatible with the most elementary principles of Marxism-Leninism, restored to Marxism-Leninism its creative character and vibrant vitality which, though inherent in it, were forgotten during the period of the Stalin cult, and re-established socialist legality. In a word, these congresses opened broad vistas before the international working-class movement in its fight against imperialism, for peace and socialism. The reason why the leaders of the CPC are opposed to

these bold steps deriving from the dedication to principle displayed by the leadership of the CPSU and its creative approach to developments, is that they themselves are proponents of the personality cult, which, as all can see, is being extensivley cultivated in China.

The Stalin cult greatly harmed the international working-class movement. The Communist and Workers' parties refuse to go along with the Chinese leaders in reviving any personality cult.

The People's Party of Iran fully supports the stand taken by the CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee. It considers this stand to be the only correct and effective one in the present conditions, a guarantee of success in the struggle against imperialism and for democracy and socialism. The People's Party, with its experience of revolutionary struggle waged over the years against imperialism and the present puppet regime in Iran, knows full well that the revolutionary movement in our country cannot win by resorting to "revolutionary" phrasemongering, leftist distortions in the ranks of the fighters for independence and freedom. We are deeply convinced that the line proposed by the leaders of the CPC and their activities to carry it out cause grievous harm to the national-liberation movement in general and in our country in particular, as well as to the entire international working-class movement. Hence we resolutely condemn this line and the practical actions of the CPC leaders.

The leaders of the CPC have made the Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU and its First Secretary, Comrade Khrushchov, the target of their attacks. The People's Party of Iran voices its full confidence in and respect for the CC, CPSU and its First Secretary, Comrade Khrushchov. The CC, CPSU, headed by Comrade Khrushchov, has performed a service of inestimable historical importance to the international working-class movement by waging an unflagging struggle against the Stalin cult, restoring the Leninist standards in the internal life of the CPSU and in the relations between fraternal parties, and opening new perspectives for the revolutionary struggle of the peoples for peace, democracy and socialism. Today the whole world rightfully associates the name of Comrade Khrushchov with the peoples' struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. This is proof that the peoples of the world correctly assess the efforts of the CC, CPSU, and of Comrade Khrushchov personally.

The People's Party of Iran, having considered the decision of the February 1964 plenary meeting of the CC, CPSU, believes that in the present circumstances it is necessary to convene a meeting of the fraternal parties to ensure the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement. The People's Party regards the unity of the international Communist and working-class

movement as an indispensable condition for final victory over imperialism and the reaction, and hence will exert every effort to safeguard this unity.

March 6, 1964.

STATEMENT ON ARAB UNITY

DOCUMENTS OF THE MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF SYRIA, LEBANON, IRAQ AND JORDAN.

It is the deep conviction of our Communist Parties that the Arab peoples' striving for unity is objectively conditioned. It has its historical roots and stems from the existence of a dismembered Arab nation faced by a common enemy, imperialism and reaction, and moved by a common desire to achieve freedom and progress and eliminate the dismemberment and its painful consequences.

We consider that the slogan of Arab unity proclaimed by broad sections of the people in the Arab countries has an emancipatory, anti-imperialist content, on the one hand, and a profoundly progressive and democratic character, on the other. Genuine Arab unity is inseparable from the struggle of our peoples against imperialism and its agents, against its bases and military pacts, against Zionism, as well as against feudalism and the reactionary pro-imperialist bourgeoisie whose interests are hostile to national liberation and democracy, for social progress and deep-going democratic and socialist change.

Arab unity is one of the great goals of the national-democratic revolution in the Arab world. Colonialism in its old and new forms remains the chief enemy of the Arab peoples and of their struggle for unity. The more successes are scored in the fight against imperialism and reaction, the more life in the countries is democratized, the more actively the masses participate in the solution of national and social problems, the deeper the social and economic reforms will be in the newly-free Arab states, and the broader the prospects that will arise for the realization of the great goal of unity.

Unity can only be achieved through the efforts of the progressive forces of the nation — the workers, peasants, intellectuals, progressive officers, students, petty bourgeois and progressives from among the national bourgeoisie.

The unity of two or more Arab countries must be forged on a basis furthering extensive democratic and social reforms and should promote social progress and socialism.

There is no doubt that implementation of democratic and progressive measures in some Arab countries, or the establishment

of a state of national democracy and the transition to the non-capitalist path of development can facilitate the achievement of unity.

The problem of unity is very serious. Rashness and haste are absolutely impermissible. Previous experience must be studied and the proper lessons must be drawn from it. Unity can only be voluntary and freely chosen.

The conditions necessary for success in establishing unity are:

—regard for the objective conditions and peculiarities of every Arab country;

—respect for democracy, which is the basis of the state system;

—provision of extensive democratic freedoms to the masses;

—pursuit of an anti-imperialist national policy, consolidation of Arab solidarity, assstance to the lberation movements of the Arab peoples still under the colonial yoke in Aden, Muscat, Oman, Hadhramout and other countries of the Persian Gulf and South Arabia, and also support of the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America;

—promotion of social progress;

—guaranteeing of the rights of the national minorities living together with the Arabs, specifically, the rights of the Kurd people;

—consolidation of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries;

—struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, for delivering mankind from the horrors of a devastating thermonuclear war.

Our meeting considers that the sweeping economic and social reforms being effected in Algeria are of a profoundly democratic and progressive nature. They are supported by all the peoples in view of the ever growing role the active initiative of the working masses plays in their implementation. Essential prerequisites for this are the freedoms enjoyed by the workers, peasants and various other sections of the population, who are sincerely fighting for socialism, as well as the unity and solidarity of all the patriotic forces of the people. President Ben Bella has declared that "socialism cannot be built under the slogan of anti-communism." On the domestic plane, the victorious national and popular revolution marches forward, rebuilding society on a new basis and creating favorable conditions for the country's development along socialist lines. In the foreign policy field, Algeria is fighting against imperialism, for peace, for cooperation and friendship with the Soviet people and the other socialist countries.

The measures recently carried out in the United Arab Republic —the election to the National Assembly, the calling off of the state of emergency, the release of political prisoners, Communists and democrats — are of a progressive nature, compared with the situation that existed before. Together with the already effected

important progressive economic and social reforms and with the foreign policy opposing the imperialists' plans and favoring world peace and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, these measures are called upon to consolidate the achievements the UAR already has to its credit, especially if they are carried through to the end and if they promote the consolidation of democracy and further social progress towards non-capitalist development.

Our meeting expresses its conviction that the progressive changes now taking place in some Arab countries are an illustration of the profound influence exercised by the ideas and positions of the socialist world system and the aid given by the USSR and other socialist countries on economic and social processes in the young independent countries, and on the character and trend of their development.

Our Parties consider that the supreme national interests of the Arab nation and of its emancipatory democratic movement demand the provision of all conditions for the cooperation of the various national forces within every Arab country, for closer unity and cooperation between all the patriotic and democratic trends and progressive movements in the Arab world, which have come out of the socialist rebuilding of society. It is necessary, therefore, that all the national forces of the Arab liberation movement, both at the governmental and other levels, banish mutual mistrust, suspicion and estrangement and display the initiative for rapprochement and the longed-for cooperation. We urge all patriots and honest nationalists to realize what intrigues and conspiracies the imperialists and their henchmen resort to in order to prevent this cooperation, and how they utilize for their ends the anti-democratic policy and ideology of anti-communism.

It is beyond question that the Communist parties and democratic forces in the Arab world have done much to explain the democratic concept of Arab unity and the correct way of building it. The facts have confirmed the correctness of this concept.

Our Communist Parties will do their utmost to contribute actively to the struggle of the broad masses of the Arab peoples for unity and for establishing an alliance of all progressive and patriotic forces opposing imperialism and reaction.

We express firm confidence that, despite the intrigues of the imperialists and their helpers, the Arab nation will realize its aspirations if it fights resolutely and relies on the support of the international forces of freedom and socialism and above all on the friendship and support of the great Soviet Union.

APROPOS THE REVISIONIST DISTORTIONS AND SPLITTING ACTIVITY OF THE CHINESE LEADERS

Arab Communists like Communists everywhere consider strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and guarding it against the threat of splits and deviations to be the internationalist duty of each Communist party. They attach paramount signicance to this problem.

Guided by this feeling of responsibility, we share the concern of the fraternal parties and, with them, express our indignation at, and denounce, the splitting activities carried out by the Chinese leaders in the international Communist movement.

In the initial period, i.e., after the Moscow meeting of 1960, the differences between the CPC leaders and the Communist and Workers parties were ideological and affected fundamental political and theoretical problems such as: the character of our time, the role of the socialist world system, the possibility of preventing world war, peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the need to combat the ideology and practice of the personality cult, the various forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and in newly-emergent nations, the ways of building socialism and communism.

Believing that these differences were ideological in character and striving to preserve the unity of the international Communist movement, the Communists of the Arab countries, together with the international Communist movement the vanguard of which is the CPSU, approached the views of the Chinese leaders with an open mind, conducting the polemics calmly and drawing up the facts of life and Marxist-Leninist ideology.

Heedless of the fact that in that period the Marxist-Leninist parties replied to the charges and actions of the Chinese leaders by persevering work to reinforce the unity of the international Communist movement, the Chinese leaders set about not to eliminate the differences but to aggravate them still further.

Replying to the criticism of their views, they chose to avoid fraternal, comradely discussion, one which would be worthy of Marxist-Leninists. The CPC leaders raised a loud campaign, precipitating charges on the fraternal parties, inasmuch as the criticism from the CPSU and the international Communist movement left no stone unturned of their assertions and falsehoods. They

have gone so far that they actually renounced the Declaration and the Statement jointly drawn up by the Communist and Workers' parties at the Moscow meetings in 1957 and 1960.

The Chinese leaders vainly vociferate about the national-liberation movement and its role, the wars of national liberation and their just character, preferring all possible charges against the Communist and Workers' parties on these issues. They proceed from a "theory" which leads to counter-posing the national-liberation movement to the socialist world system and the international working-class movement. This, to all intents and purposes, deals a blow to the national-liberation movement, for this isolates it from its most reliable bulwark — the world socialist camp. Today our Arab peoples know full well that the principal aim of the imperialists is also to drive a wedge between the Arab national-liberation movement and the socialist countries, primarily the USSR, to damage Arab-Soviet friendship.

So far more than 50 Afro-Asian countries have won political independence in the course of a long struggle which assumed diverse forms. Many of these countries have already launched far-reaching economic and social reforms sapping the economic positions of the imperialists. Their victories were secured with the support and assistance of the socialist countries, and above all the Soviet Union. The existence of the socialist system, its steadily growing role and resolute struggle against imperialism, as well as the various forms of aid it has rendered and is rendering the oppressed nations, have created exceedingly favorable international conditions for their struggle and served to open for them the possibility to score grand victories.

Today the oppressed nations are in a position not only to win political sovereignty but also to safeguard it, achieve economic independence, resolutely rebuff imperialist aggression, and take the road of progress and well-being. In all this they are supported by their first and strongest ally — the socialist system and, primarily, the Soviet Union. This is fully borne out by the experience of the Arab national-liberation movement and the struggle of our peoples. This experience gives the lie to the "theory" of the Chinese leaders concerning the role played by the socialist system vis-a-vis the national-liberation movement. All Arab Communists are coming to realize, from their own experience, the significance of the solidarity of the Communist parties and the working-class movement at all stages of the national struggle in their countries.

The Arab national-liberation movement has won outstanding victories since the Second World War, i.e., after the emergence of the socialist world system. The formation of the latter, the material and moral support of the socialist camp, the vanguard

of which is the Soviet Union, have contributed to the liberation of most Arab countries, of which some won political sovereignty whilst others have already entered upon the road of strengthening their economic independence. At present broad perspectives have opened for them to carry out fundamental social reforms and advance along the non-capitalist path. All this, naturally, could not have been achieved if not for the socialist world system which plays a paramount role in the world arena. Not a single honest Arab can forget that the failure of the agggression against Egypt in 1956, the frustration of the attempts to invade Syria in 1956, the frustration of the attempts to invade Syria in 1957 and Iraq after the revolution of July 14, 1958, as well as the fact that in 1958 the U.S. imperialists were forced to withdraw their troops from the Lebanon, and the British from Jordan, were due above all to the resolute stand of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, to their solidarity with the struggle of these countries against the aggressors.

Our peoples and all sincere Arab patriots are proud of the aid given them by the Soviet Union. The USSR has supported the UAR, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, Tunisia, Lebanon, Aden, Oman and the countries of the Arabian Peninsula in their struggle against imperialism. The Soviet Union has rendered and is still rendering selfless aid to the newly-free Arab countries in advancing their economy and raising the living standards of their peoples. The Aswan High Dam, the economic and technological agreements the Soviet Union concluded with Syria and Iraq, the long-term credits extended to Algeria and the aid to Yemen — such are the facts of the great support for the independence of these countries, for their social and economic advance. The Arab peoples therefore cannot but wrathfully denounce any attempts to sow doubts and mistrust for Soviet aid and the socialist camp.

Our peoples also condemn the "theory" of the Chinese leaders concerning the so-called intermediate, or neutral, zone, by which the latter understand West Germany, Britain, France, etc. This "theory," clearly, is designed above all to weaken the vigilance of the peoples with regard to West German, British and French colonialism in all its forms. What sort of neutrality do the Chinese leaders have in mind when they offer this "theory" to the Arab peoples? Perhaps, they have in mind the "neutrality" of West German imperialism which finances Israel, supplies it with arms and, using its capital, is trying to worm its way into all Arab countries? Or maybe, they see the "neutrality" of British imperialism in the bombing of towns and villages of the free Yemeni Arab Republic and Oman, in building military bases in Aden, in the protectorates and in Libya, in the predatory plunder of the Arab oil wealth? Perhaps, by France's "neutrality" they

understand the setting up of military bases in North Africa? Or, last but not least, perhaps they have forgotten about the one-and-a-half million Algerian Arabs who were killed by the French colonialists with the support of the U.S. imperialists?

Our Arab peoples, who are fighting against imperialism, its bases and economic infiltration, regard this "theory" of the Chinese leaders as a mean, though vain, attempt to deliver a blow to this struggle against the colonialists, old and new alike.

Clearly, the struggle of the Arab peoples is directed primarily against U.S. imperialism which, with its capital, monopolies, oil companies, military bases, aggressive pacts, naval fleets and endless conspiracies, creates the greatest danger to the independence of our peoples. Precisely for this reason, the latter are fighting against this predatory imperialism, which is constantly changing the methods and forms of its penetration.

This, of course, does not mean that they shut their eyes to the activity of other imperialists who, notwithstanding the differences between them and the U.S. imperialists, as often as not come to terms with the latter in order to weaken the struggle of the Arab peoples and halt their advance.

The peace-loving Arab peoples maintain that the attempts of the Chinese leaders to bolster up the cold war and their foreign policy permeated with the spirit of adventurism and hostility to the cause of peace, peaceful coexistence and general and complete disarmament, objectively serve the imperialists and are spearheaded in the first place against the national-liberation movement.

The conditions of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two world systems create the possibility for the peoples of the world, including our Arab peoples, to avoid the horrors of a destructive thermonuclear war. Broad vistas are opening before them in the struggle to dismantle the war bases. Moreover, they can win fresh victories in the struggle against imperialism and for social progress.

In our time peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the two different social systems are decisive for the development of national-liberation movements. Each victory won by the socialist world system over imperialism is a victory for our Arab peoples, for the cause of their advance towards socialism.

The Chinese leaders are working feverishly to disrupt the unity of the Communist parties of the Arab countries. For the sake of this criminal aim, they aid and abet dubious elements and elements expelled from the parties. The CPC leaders cooperate with them, as in the case of the expellees from the Communist parties of Australia, India, Belgium, Brazil and other countries. In carrying out these unsavory actions, they resort to bribery, buy columns for their articles in the ultra-reactionary and pro-imperialist

organs of the press. Palming off these articles as "theoretical," they pursue the aim of disorganizing and befuddling not only Communists but other democratic and progressive elements as well.

The Chinese leaders' attempts to split the national-liberation movements have led them to utilizing the dirtiest methods of intrigue and slander against the Soviet Union among the various national and democratic forces and in international forums. They are sliding more and more to the road of cooperation with the reactionaries and stooges of imperialism, like the fascist Right wing of the Baath Party or the hangman Ali Saleh Saadi, who were brought to power by the U.S. and British oil companies and who engineered a bloodshed — unmatched in the modern history of the Arab world — against the Communists and other patriots and democrats of Iraq. They were not ashamed to call the fascist Baath government in Iraq a revolutionary regime and offer it economic aid. They supplied arms to the criminal Baathist rulers whose hands are stained with the blood of thousands of Communists, democrats and patriots — sons and daughters of the Iraqi people. Moreover, Peking's cooperation with the Saadi government had gone to such lengths that the Chinese leaders blessed and supported its criminal campaign of extermination against the fraternal Kurdish people.

In its Declaration of 1957 and Statement of 1960 the international Communist movement arrived at the conclusion that our time is a time of the transition from capitalism to socialism, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale. The superiority of the forces of peace, national liberation and socialism is becoming ever more marked. The socialist world system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society. The socialist camp, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples — these great revolutionary forces of our time — are merging into one powerful current that undermines the positions of imperialism and the forces of war and moves the wheel of history forward. Proceeding from this objective assessment of the character of our time and from the fact that the growing might of the socialist system is the center of contemporary development, the international Communist movement drew the conclusion that world peace.

The Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings emphasize that the fight for peace and to avert global thermonuclear catastrophe is the prime task of the Communist and Workers' parties, that the policy of peaceful coexistence is the general line of the relations between the socialist and capitalist countries.

With overt cynicism the Chinese leaders have renounced these conclusions which they themselves supported when they signed

the Declaration and the Statement. Claiming that another world war is inevitable, they demonstrate their lack of faith in the powerful international forces of socialism and peace. While hypocritically displaying concern for peace, they in reality pursue a policy of aggravating international tension and intensifying the nuclear arms race. Their reckless stand at the time of the Caribbean crisis and their attacks on the Moscow partial test-ban treaty are nothing else but practical embodiment of their dangerous line of international policy which leads to weakening the fight for peace and renders service to the criminal aggressive schemes of the warmongers. The CPC leaders raise a hue and cry in their violent attacks against the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence — a policy which is being steadily pursued by the Soviet Union, which has been decisive in lessening the tension, and which is instrumental in creating a favorable climate for solving outstanding international issues through negotiation and for upsetting the designs of the rabid instigators of war.

The 1960 Statement stresses that disarmament has become the order of the day and that implementation of the program for general and complete disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union would secure universal peace. The Chinese leaders, however, no longer concealing their renunciation of these conclusions, declare that the program for disarmament is utopian and can be it is possible to prevent the threat of another war and preserve implemented only after the victory of socialism on a world scale.

The international Communist movement maintains that in a number of countries socialist revolution can be effected peacefully, depending on the specific conditions in these countries and in view of the new changes in the international arena. This scientific conclusion, made on the basis of the experience of the Communist movement and of the changes that have taken place in our time, is formulated in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings. However, today the Chinese leaders cast aspersions on this conclusion about the peaceful way of transition to socialism and attack those Marxist-Leninist parties which included this idea in their programs and are working to implement it in practice.

Refusing to analyze concretely each specific situation and defying the conclusions approved by the international Communist movement, the Chinese leaders deny any possibility of the peaceful way of revolution and consider the armed way to be the only alternative. They insist that this way should be unconditionally accepted as a ready-made recipe which can be used everywhere and at all time in carrying out both socialist and national-liberation revolutions. They smear the Marxist-Leninist parties which refuse to accept this recipe. Thus the Chinese leaders not only reveal their lack of knowledge of the changes which have taken

place in the world but are also doing all they can to impose their will on the Marxist-Leninist parties, trying to issue orders, forgetting all about their shrill cries about "equality" of the parties.

It is common knowledge that Czechoslovakia passed over to socialism in a peaceful way. Guinea, Ghana and Mali shook off colonial domination in the course of a long and difficult mass struggle, without having to wage armed struggle. Each Marxist-Leninist party itself should determine the forms of the struggle and elaborate its policy, depending on the specific conditions in the country. It is therefore quite natural that the Communist and Workers' parties reject the fossilized and high-handed line of the Chinese leaders and their dangerous sectarian recipes.

The Chinese leaders act as zealous advocates of the Stalin personality cult and justify in one way or another the violations of legality committed at the period. For this reason they seek to discredit the 20th Congress of the CPSU which ushered in a new era in the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and the modern Communist movement, as well as its 22nd Congress — a congress of the builders of communism.

The Chinese leaders' apology for the Stalin personality cult means that they regard the cult as part of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the socialist system. Their attitude is a result of the fact that a personality cult reigns supreme inside the Communist Party of China. A resolute and principled struggle against the personality cult has been and remains the duty of each Communist party, for this is the struggle for the purity of theory, for the triumph of the Leninist principles of organization of both the Party and the socialist state, for the development of creative initiatives of the working people.

The Chinese leaders impudently deny the universally recognized vanguard role of the CPSU — the tried and tested contingent of the world Communist movement, which is a source of inspiration for Communists everywhere, a model of fraternal aid and the standard-bearer of proletarian internationalism. By so doing the Chinese leaders deny the historical experience of the Party of the great Lenin, which is of exceptional significance not only for all the Communist and Workers' parties but also for all progressive and revolutionary foces which stand for rebuilding society along socialist lines.

The international Communist movement emphasized in its policy documents, signed also by the Chinese leaders, that the main contradiction of our time is the contradiction between socialism and capitalism and that today it is impossible to consider any revolutionary movement or any important issue without the thorough knowledge of the operation of this contradiction and its impact on world development. The Chinese leaders, obscuring this objec-

tive fact, have invented a "theory" that Asia, Africa and Latin America are the principal storm-center of world revolution against imperialism. Not only do they counterpose the national-liberation movements to the socialist world system but, paying lip-service to the former, deliberately exaggerate their role. In this way they deny the leading role of the world proletariat and its main creation — the socialist system — in the single revolutionary process of our time. To adopt this attitude would mean passing over the banner of leadership to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois forces which so far prevail in the leadership of the national-liberation movements.

In an attempt to justify their feverish and reckless splitting activities, the Chinese leaders manufacture "theories" which substantiate split as inevitable. Putting forward the slogan of "unerring minority and erring majority," they demonstrate their arrogance towards the world Communist movement, their refusal to adhere to the jointly elaborated general line. Under the slogan "split has become inevitable" the Chinese leaders strive to establish a splitter center in the movement and justify their factionalist and subversive actions inside the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Instead of working to strengthen the unity of the socialist system, the Chinese leaders are going all out to weaken this unity. Instead of acclaiming the magnificent economic achievements of the USSR and the persistent efforts made by the CPSU to raise the living standards of the working people, the Chinese leaders slander these successes, referring to them as "embourgeoisement." They deliberately ignore the impact of these achievements upon the working people all over the world and their exceptional role in winning over the working masses for socialist ideas. In recent years they have curtailed economic, scientific and cultural relations as well as trade with the USSR and other socialist countries and have transferred ideological differences to inter-state relations.

Instead of concentrating their efforts on strengthening the unity of the Communist movement and the socialist camp, the Chinese leaders are disrupting this unity. As the Trotskyites did in the past, the CPC leaders, contrary to their "Left" phrases, are diverting the attention from the common enemy — imperialism — and dismembering the forces opposed to it. Instead of abiding by the principles of proletarian internationalism, the Chinese leaders spread nationalist prejudices, racial and regional tendencies, and divide the peoples according to the racial principle. They are working to split the democratic movements and organizations throughout the world.

Pursuing their reckless policy of splittism and nationalism, the

Chinese leaders serve the aims and schemes of the imperialists.

All theories and positions of the Chinese leaders, especially their feverish activities aimed at aggravating international tension, dividing the Communist movement and undermining each Marxist-Leninist party, fully bear out the conclusion that latter-day Trotskyism, dogmatism and adventurism have now become the main danger in the international Communist movement.

All this testifies beyond all doubt that the Chinese leaders have extended their differences with the international Communist movement from the ideological sphere into the field of concrete actions in order to undermine the Communist and national-liberation movements and weaken the struggle against imperialism, for peace, social progress and socialism.

We Arab Communists see how deep is the bog into which the Chinese leaders have slipped and we realize the responsibility we have to shoulder in the struggle to preserve and consolidate the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. We declare our complete support for the decisions of the CC, CPSU, and Comrade Suslov's report on the splitting activity of the CPC leaders. We also declare our full solidarity with the CPSU and all other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties in their denunciation of the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders. We deem it necessary that a conference of all the Communist parties be convenced to discuss the situation which has developed in the international Communist movement, take effective steps to strengthen its unity and defeat the splitting tendencies.

We have full confidence in the victory of the international Communist movement in its struggle against all the revisionist distortions and splitting actions of the Peking leaders .

April 1964.

LEFT REVISIONISM—MAIN DANGER FOR MARXIST-LENINIST UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Oscar Kreidt

GENERAL SECRETARY, PARAGUAYAN COMMUNIST PARTY

WE MUST TAKE A DEFINITE STAND

Comrade Suslov's report subjects the question of the Chinese Communist Patry's differences with the general line of the world Communist movement to a new and more profound examination.

Throughout the past year and in the early part of this year, the Chinese leaders rejected the fraternal proposals made on repeated occasions by the Soviet comrades, and replied to these proposals by intensifying their aggressive sallies. The Chinese leaders continued to deepen and extend the area of disagreement, and on February 4 the journal *Hungchi,* theoretical organ of the CPC, proclaimed the "split" between the Communist parties to be a "law of dialectical development" of the Communist movement.

More than that, these fallacious theories of the Peking leaders are being repeated word for word and widely popularized also by the leaders of some Communist parties in countries situated in the more or less immediate vicinity of China. For example, the official organ of the Korean Party of Labor declares that "the creation of new Communist parties" is "quite justified." This is downright incitement to split the Communist parties and to set up parallel pseudo-Communist parties in all countries of the world. The same idea is propounded in the February issue of the English edition of *People's Korea.*

These facts indicate that disruptive activity is no longer something that is carried on clandestinely and disclaimed. On the contrary, it has been elevated to a principle and a political line publicly formulated and substantiated. Splitting activity has been placed on a theoretical foundation and, with the formation of a limited group of a few parties which serve the CPC leaders as a basis and an instrument for the diversive activities on all continents, has acquired an international character.

From this standpoint one may say that a new situation has arisen. And this situation must be theoretically explained. When

a split occurs, Lenin said, it is essential clearly to ascertain its class roots and class significance.

Comrade Suslov analyzes the class roots of the erroneous position adopted by the CC of the CPC and thereby provides the theoretical explanation of the differences that have arisen in the world Communist movement. By endorsing and publishing this document, the CC of the CPSU has followed the counsel and example of Lenin.

The concrete and exhaustive analysis contained in Comrade Suslov's report leads to the conclusion that the theoretical and practical position of the CC of the CPC is a petty-bourgeois, nationalistic and neo-Trotskyite deviation camouflaged by "Leftist" phraseology.

An examination of the class roots of this ideological struggle is of cardinal importance for the Marxist-Leninist education of our Party membership and the masses. It will enable us to refute imperialist propaganda and its attempts, firstly, to reduce everything to a matter of rivalry between the Russians and the Chinese, and secondly, to make it appear as if the Chinese have rebelled against the "domination" of the Russians. When the members of the anti-Party group who were expelled from our Party say that there is no need for the Paraguayan Communist Party to interfere in the conflict between the Communist parties of the Soviet Union and China, they are in effect supporting the above-mentioned propaganda line.

At a time when Marxism-Leninism is combating a hostile ideological trend, any intermediary position is an objective impossibility; deliberately to avoid taking sides is evidence of a lack of principle.

The bourgeois press eagerly welcomes positions that it classifies as "ideological neutralism," "non-alignment," "abstention," or "non-involvement" regarding them as further indications of disagreement between the revolutionary parties of the working class and the socialist states.

And if until recently such indecisive positions might be attributed to insufficient knowledge of the actual gravity of the disagreement and the disruptive aims of the Chinese leaders, today in the light of the facts and of Comrade Suslov's report it is no longer possible to plead these "extenuating circumstances." The time has come to make a clear and sober appraisal of the facts on the basis of a critical analysis and guided by class criteria and independent thinking.

THE SOCIALIST SYSTEM — PRINCIPAL FORCE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

Comrade Suslov lays the main emphasis on the question of the

role played by the socialist system in the worldwide struggle against imperialism.

In its letter of June 14, 1963, as we know, the CC of the CPC formulated the revisionist thesis that the main contradiction of our time is not the struggle of the socialist system against imperialism, but the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the colonial and dependent peoples against imperialist domination.

Prompted by the Chinese leaders, the organ of the fraternal Korean Party of Labor published a theoretical article expounding these ideas in great detail. In this article the international role of the socialist world system is *totally* rejected and the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in Asia, Africa and Latin America are deliberately idealized. It asserts that these revolutions "will bury imperialism" by their own forces, and goes so far as to declare that they constitute a "full and absolute guarantee" of the "ultimate triumph of socialism."

Comrade Suslov is not exaggerating when he draws attention to the fact that, by denying the growing influence and the increasingly decisive role played by the socialist system in the world, the Peking theoreticians are denying the leading role of the working class in the world revolution.

This is a perversion of Marxism, for Marx and Engels held that the working class is the grave-digger of capitalism. The principal force of the working class today is the socialist system. Its chief ally is the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the peoples fighting for national independence and progress. The invention of new theories diametrically opposed to these elementary principles is revisionism of the first water.

Nor is this purely a matter of doctrine. In pursuance of their revisionist line the Chinese leaders are bent on dissociating themselves from the socialist system. They belittle its role and seek the support of the progressive bourgeois governments in Asia and Africa with a view to counterposing them to the socialist states of Europe and the socialist system as such. Incidentally, the disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders springs directly from their negative attitude to the revolutionary role of the socialist system.

The disruptive activity carried on by the Chinese leaders in Asia, Africa and Latin America is aimed at undermining the faith of the peoples in the socialist system. The purpose is to deprive the people of the vitally essential international assistance rendered them mainly by the Soviet Union and the more developed socialist countries. A policy which, on the pretext of building a united front of the Asian, African and Latin-American countries in the struggle against imperialism, in reality seeks to *destroy* the unity between these states and the socialist system, is hypocritical to say the least.

The Chinese leaders allege that China shares "common interests" with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America making it imperative for them to unite. The union they are advocating would exclude the socialist countries of Europe, among them the USSR, which is also an Asian country and the most progressive of all the countries of Asia.

It would seem that with regard to the Asian, African and Latin-American countries the Chinese leaders have *special interests not shared by the socialist system as such.* What are these interests? The Chinese leaders are deliberately silent on this score. But it is clear to all and sundry that it is these special interests that have prompted the Chinese leaders to oppose the participation of the USSR in Afro-Asian conferences; such a policy cannot accord with the interests of the common struggle against imperialism, the interests of the world revolution.

The motive force of the policy of fission pursued by the CPC leadership is nationalism, egoistic ambition, the striving for great-power hegemony, and other such ideas that have taken possession of the mind of Mao Tse-tung, and of all those inside and outside of China who are creating a Mao cult and are all but deifying him.

By asserting that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are "the main force" of the world revolution the Peking theoreticians are seeking to flatter them, but they clearly underestimate their abilities. The Latin-American peoples have seen for themselves what is the main force that has for years prevented the wild men of the Pentagon from carrying out their plans to invade Cuba. The role played by the Soviet Union in this respect shows that, contrary to the assertions of the Peking demagogues, *the socialist system, its growing economic and military might is the principal guarantee of the victorious advance of the world revolution.*

This thesis, whatever the Chinese theorists might say, by no means denies that the decisive force of revolution always and everywhere is the people. Only men bereft of their reason could question this elementary truth.

The revisionist theory that socialism in our time plays a secondary role is a theoretical concept that forms an important and integral part of the ideology of Mao Tse-tung and his disciples.

They underestimate the possibilities of socialism, its might and its significance as a creative force. This implies a general underestimation of the international revolutionary movement and overestimation of the forces of imperialism. The CPC leaders do not understand the fundamental changes that have taken place in the balance of forces between socialism and imperialism. They do not believe that as a result of socialist construction and the economic competition between the socialist and capitalist systems a new and radical change will take place in the balance of forces,

and imperialism will be substantially weakened. This will facilitate still more the victorious advance of the anti-imperialist revolution of the exploited nations.

Lack of faith in the success of socialist construction, overestimation of the forces of imperialism is the source of all the errors committed by the Chinese leaders. It is the source of their pessimism with regard to the possibility of preventing war; of their pessimistic view that peaceful coexistence is of advantage only for imperialism; of their conviction that revolutions of oppressed nations must be artificially "prodded" from without; of their desperate impatience and their constant striving to substitute spectacular ultra-revolutionary slogans for positive actions.

The Chinese leaders, having lost faith in the role of the socialist system and the international working class, exaggerate the potentialities of the revolutionary bourgeois-democratic movement in the Asian, African and Latin American countries. The universal significance of these movements is noted in the 1960 Statement. They help in large measure to prepare the ground for the worldwide victory of socialism. But it is wrong to assert as do the authors of the above-mentioned theoretical article published in the organ of the Korean Party of Labor that throughout Latin America, Asia and Africa "the conditions are ripe and the masses ready to fight (with arms in hand)."

The new "theory" that the revolutionary situation in the epoch of imperialism is not determined by the concrete conditions in each country, but should be assessed from the standpoint of the general situation, and that it exists on all continents, is utterly groundless. This type of theory leads straight to petty-bourgeois adventurism and putschism. It is a revisionist theory pure and simple. In his fight against "Left" communism, Lenin, as we know, urged that stereotyped methods of struggle be abandoned and that every concrete and specifically national means of overthrowing the bourgeoisie be thoroughly explored.

In some Latin-American countries a revolutionary situation in the broad sense of which Lenin wrote in 1915 does exist. But in most countries the elements of a future revolutionary situation are only beginning to emerge. The conditions differ greatly in each country. Such delicate questions cannot be decided by a single genius and moreover one who is extremely remote from the people, from the masses.

In conclusion it is necessary to stress that the theoretical and practical errors of the Chinese leaders, their pessimistic view with regard to the role of the socialist system and also their "Leftism" in appraising the anti-imperialist bourgeois-democratic revolutions are organically interlinked and add up to a definite system of ideas. Analysis of this fallacious ideology confirm that it is rooted in an

attitude that minimizes the strength and the role of the socialist system, and denies the leading role of the international working class. Hence the conclusion made in Comrade Suslov's report that we are dealing here with an anti-Marxist deviation of a clearly defined petty-bourgeois nature camouflaged by ultra-revolutionary phraseology is perfectly justified.

ROOTS OF OPPORTUNISM AND ITS TRUE FACE

Comrade Suslov in his report raises the legitimate question as how it came to pass that the central committee of a large, venerable and experienced Marxist-Leninist party could have slipped into a "Left" deviation. An examination of the policy of the CPC shows that this deviation is an expression of "petty-bourgeois pressure on the Communist Party of China" and is based on the fact that social strata whose roots can be traced to small-scale agricultural production are still the predominant force in the country.

Certain specific features in the history of the Chinese revolution may provide some clue to the strange process of degeneration that has taken place in the Communist Party of China.

To begin with it should be remembered that the Chinese revolution developed out of a bourgeois-democratic national-liberation revolution which experienced an exceptionally long period of development.

A more careful study of Peking's thesis concerning the subordinate role of the socialist system in relation to the anti-imperialist petty-bourgeois revolution will show that this is but one aspect of a definite ideological and political orientation. The struggle against imperialism, in both its direct and indirect form, is given priority over the specific tasks of socialist construction, i.e., the tasks arising from economic struggle against imperialism on which, in the final analysis, the worldwide victory of socialism will depend.

Their distorted understanding of the task of a socialist government indicates that the Communist Party of China, its leadership included, has not yet overcome the ideology of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution, whose principal aim was national liberation through direct armed struggle against imperialism. Owing to this lag in its ideological development, the CPC has not yet been able fully to grasp the ideology of the socialist stage of the revolution, whose principal aim is of a different and a higher order, namely: economic upbuilding of socialism within the framework of the socialist world system in keeping with the ultimate goals aspired to by the international working class.

Another feature of the historical course of the Chinese revolution is that the revolutionary proletarian movement in the big urban centers was crushed, with the result that the revolution acquired the form of a peasant uprising led by the Communists. It was

inevitable, therefore, that the influence of the working-class movement proved weaker in China than in the revolution in Russia and in the other, now socialist, countries of Europe. The overwhelming majority of leading functionaries of the CPC, including those who now form its Central Committee, sprang from the petty-bourgeois sections of society.

Lenin warned that in countries with a considerable preponderance of small producers the latter are *bound* to penetrate into the party causing Right and "Left" opportunistic vacillations. He pointed out that this can also happen after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established. But at the same time, Lenin demonstrated both theoretically and practically that petty-bourgeois pressure can be eliminated by *constant and resolute defense of the fundamental principles of Marxism.*

This is precisely what Mao Tse-tung has failed to do. Instead of making a thorough study of the world experience of Leninism and applying it creatively to the specific conditions of his own country, Mao Tse-tung chose to invent a Chinese road to communism, *revising* the Leninist road of socialist construction. He idealized the semi-military peasant commune and the development of small-scale rural industry, two typical features of "populist" thinking, which has its source in the mentality of the poor peasant.

At the same time Mao Tse-tung began to revive the old nationalist and racist prejudices obtaining in the period of the wars against imperialism. He advanced the slogan of the "Big Leap" by means of which the other socialist countries were to be outstripped. He preached and still preaches pan-Asianism and Afro-Asianism under Chinese aegis. He stirs up chauvinism over small border incidents. Needlessly and without possessing the necessary means, he has involved the country in the costly atomic arms drive, his passionate zeal in this respect being akin to that of the French and West German militarists.

But the worst thing is that Mao Tse-tung, by supporting the nationalistic and racist prejudices dating back to the period of the anti-imperialist stage of the revolution, is imbuing his people with hatred for the Soviet Union. The slogan of struggle for an "independent national economy," which was the slogan of the anti-imperialist period, is now directed against the socialist system. It is designed to justify resistance to the establishment of a united socialist system, and the sabotage of coordinated development of the national economies of the socialist countries.

The revisionist line which Mao sought to impose on the economy ended in failure. Realizing that the building of socialism was a long process, being obliged to make certain retrenchments and encountering colossal economic difficulties, the Chinese leaders began to lose their faith in socialism as an immediate prospect.

That is why they embarked on the hopeless task of prodding the world anti-imperialist revolution by means of catch phrases in the manner of the Trotskyites.

These are the socio-economic conditions which caused the CC of the CPC, blinded by the personality cult, to slide down onto positions which Comrade Suslov's report describes as an ideological and political deviation of a petty-bourgeois order in many respects intertwining with Trotskyism.

The class nature this "Leftist" deviation imparts to it has a definite, but carefully disguised *opportunistic* content. The Peking theoreticians do not believe that the socialist system and the international revolutionary movement can bring about a situation in the world which will make armed imperialist aggression a practical impossibility, even if the danger of it will not entirely disappear.

Mao Tse-tung has gradually built up a whole system of revisionist ideas. This general revision is camouflaged by such slogans as "Sinification of Marxism-Leninism," "Sinification of dialectical materialism" and "the ideology or philosophy of Mao Tse-tung." Such theoretical perversions speculate on the national feelings of the Chinese people. In practice they amount to a call to convert *class* ideology, working-class ideology into *nationalist* ideology. The worst of it is that Mao Tse-tung is trying to spread his system of revisionist ideas all over the world. He wants to dictate his "sinified" version of Marxism-Leninsm to all peoples. And those who refuse to accept this "product" are declared beyond the pale and branded as "contemporary revisionists."

Revisionism of the Chinese type is marked by two interconnected features:

1) according to Lenin's definition it is "Left revisionism," and
2) being revisionism "from the Left," it can easily assume the disguise of a passionate fighter against revisionism as a whole.

Despite the strenuous efforts of "Left" revisionism to pose as the champion in the struggle against Right revisionism, it cannot conceal its remarkable resemblance to the latter.

The basic feature of the two brands of revisionism is the old familiar "national communism" that has always been so dear to the hearts of the men in Washington and other imperialist capitals.

Inspired from one and the same source, both the "Left" and Right opportunists have revived the Marxist theory of the nation turning it into an absolute category. In the name of "national independence" both the one and the other are opposed to the coordination of the economies of the socialist countries. Instead, they seek agreement with certain colonialist powers and solicit credits. To this end diverse theories are invented to embellish the colonialists. For instance, the "Left" revisionists whitewash the

colonialists of France, Britain and Japan, and include them in the great worldwide anti-imperialist front in the guise of an "intermediary zone" along with the Latin-American, Asian and African peoples who are fighting for their national independence and progress.

General de Gaulle is one of those realistic imperialist statesmen who know what these thories signify and what they stand to gain from them.

Some time ago the Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic told a group of British journalists that by the end of this year China would have paid all her debts to the USSR. This was an intimation that China was ready to receive credits from the capitalist countries.

Such is the true face of these ultra-revolutionaries, the cynical physiognomy of opportunism, which hides behind a dazzling red mask in order to mislead the peoples who are shedding their blood in the fight for their freedom.

WHAT DOES SPLITTING ACTIVITY LEAD TO?

Comrade Suslov's report sheds new light on the factional activities of the Chinese leaders. The stubborn efforts of Mao Tse-tung to split Marxist-Leninist unity is an expression of his own ideological break with Marxism-Leninism.

The nature of factionalist activity reflects the *opportunist* complexion of this deviation.

Comrade Suslov's report shows that this activity encourages the creation of parallel "Communist parties" consisting of "opportunist and wavering elements" in league with "traitors and adventurers of every kind," with men expelled for various reasons from the parties and whose main task is to combat the genuine Communist parties, frequently by using arguments drawn from the aresenal of anti-communism, in other words, the ideology and propaganda of imperialism and the bourgeoisie.

This points to a "total lack of principle on the part of the Chinese leaders," as Comrade Suslov observes. It explains why in Peru former accomplices of General Odria's dictatorship now belong to this disruptive trend. In Ecuador it includes elements enjoying police protection at a time when the Communist Party is hounded. In our country frankly opportunist groups call themselves a "Leninist Communist Party," a title similar to that appropriated by analogous groups elsewhere. The activity of these elements, like that of the Trotskyite groups, is exclusively *counter-revolutionary* in character.

The splitting activity is proof that Mao Tse-tung and his admirers scorn the interests of the world revolutionary movement.

It is the sort of activity that threatens the security of certain

socialist states. Speculating on China's hostility toward the USSR, Nixon recently declared that favorable opportunities have now been created for armed aggression against North Vietnam.

The Korean leaders who are taking part in the splitting activities, are, by so doing, actually undermining the security of their own country.

To argue in favor of revolution and at the same time to act in such a way as to divide the revolutionary forces means to injure the cause of revolution. To weaken the unity of the socialist system means to encourage the most aggressive forces of imperialism.

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

We cannot and we must not underestimate the gravity of the difficulties that have emerged in the Communist movement.

Our Party concurs with the following conclusions contained in Comrade Suslov's report adopted by the CC of the CPSU:

1. The anti-Leninist tendency in the activity of the Chinese leaders has become the main danger for the international Communist movement. In view of this, the corresponding point of the 1960 Statement should be changed.

This does not mean, of course, that the struggle against Right revisionism can be relaxed. Some adroit theoreticians are trying to use the struggle against the "Left" deviation to raise the Kautsky slogan of the "democratic road" to socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such an attitude runs counter to the 1960 Statement.

2. The fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and their elaboration in the 1960 Statement must be more firmly and vigorously defended, and those adhering to wavering and conciliatory positions accordingly criticized.

3. We must be prepared for a long and serious struggle.

4. A new meeting of Communist parties should be convened for the purpose of "preserving and cementing the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Communist ranks."

Every precaution should be taken in advance to avoid a split at the meeting. However, the meeting should not be postponed indefinitely on the grounds that "prolonged preparation" is necessary. Any such postponement will only give the splitters time to step up their activities.

It is necessary to draw a sharp line between the positions and at the same time to seek ways of reaching concrete agreement on united action between the three basic trends in the Communist movement, the genuine Marxist-Leninist general line, "Left" revisionism and Right revisionism.

Even if the Chinese leaders continue to persist in their subver-

sive activities, the meeting will not fail. The Marxist-Leninist forces will emerge from the meeting more united, more confident and better equipped to carry on the ideological battle for a single line capable of leading to the worldwide triumph of socialism.

DEFEAT OF PUTSCHISTS WILL PAVE WAY FOR THE BRAZILIAN REVOLUTION

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE BRAZILIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

The military coup of April 1 raped constitutional legality and established a dictatorship of reactionaries, agents of imperialism and latifundism.

With the backing of the reactionary majority in the National Congress, a group of generals deposed the President and established a reign of violence and terror. Acting allegedly in the name of a "democratic revolution," the coup leaders tore up the Constitution and enacted fascist decrees. As a result of the annulment of the mandates of dozens of MP's, the powers of the Congress were forcibly curtailed, and it became an obedient tool of the putschists. The people's will was criminally trampled underfoot by the deposition and arrest of Miguel Arrais, Seixas Doria and other governors and the imprisonment of deputies, prefects and municipal councillors throughout the country.

The coup is directed against the workers, peasants, students and patriotically-minded servicemen, whose organizations the putschists have either banned or taken under the control. Progressive clergymen have not escaped repressions, either. Hundreds of public figures have been deprived of their political rights in an attempt to stifle opposition to the dictatorship. The sanctity of the home is being violated, thousands of citizens of most diverse political views are being unlawfully arrested, and people are hunted like animals in an unprecedented orgy of repressions. Books are being confiscated and destroyed as in the bleakest times of fascism.

The coup was inspired and financed by the North American imperialists. All the reactionary forces united to accomplish it, from Right extremists like Lacerda, Ademar de Barros and the officers who had taken part in the 1954 and 1961 coups, to the reactionaries of the center, the Social-Democratic leaders and Magalhaes Pinto.

The reactionary minority is resorting to violence in its attempts to suppress the struggle of the working people and the masses and prevent reforms that would undermine the rule of the imperialists and landlords and affect the privileges of powerful economic groups. It is seeking to destroy the national gains of the Brazilian

people, make Brazil alter her independent foreign policy and turn her into an obedient tool of the U.S. State Department. A grave threat has thus arisen to the national interests and sovereignty of the people.

A serious blow has been dealt to the national and popular forces. But the victory of imperialism and reaction is not firmly grounded and cannot survive for long.

Unable to paralyze the democratic movement, the dictatorship is inflicting deep wounds to the interests of the nation and has already now roused vigorous and resolute resistance among the entire Brazilian people. Although accomplished under the threadbare banner of anti-Communism, the coup affects the interests of all patriots and democrats, whatever their political and ideological views. Striving to destroy the freedom, national sovereignty and rights of the working people, the putschists are antagonizing all Brazilians, who refuse to accept slavery. The reactionary dictatorship is sure to be confronted by formidable forces.

Far from resolving the acute contradictions shaking the country, the coup is only adding to the suffering of our people. Preservation of the privileges of foreign monopolies and domestic latifundists will only facilitate plunder and worsen the plight of the Brazilians. Moreover, those who joined forces to perform the coup are not a monolithic block. Contradictions exist between them which undermine their unity.

The supreme duty of all Brazilians in this hour is to defend the democratic freedoms from encroachments by the reactionaries. Let us unite to ensure the freedom of the press and speech, the right to assemble and organize! Let us uphold the organizations of the people, the trade unions of industrial and agricultural workers, the organizations of pupils and students, by protesting in every way against their prohibition and demanding the holding of assemblies, an end to the interference in their affairs, and free elections! Let us demand the immediate release of political prisoners and organize campaigns of solidarity with people languishing in prisons or subjected to persecutions, and with their families!

Let us fight for the immediate demands of the working people, national sovereignty and the basic reforms needed for the country's progress. Today we must intensify the struggle of the entire people against the high cost of living, the struggle of the workers for higher wages and for trade union freedoms, the struggle of the peasants and farm laborers for agrarian reform and against exploitation by the latifundists, the struggle of the students and intellectuals for culture and freedom of thought, and the struggle of civil servants against persecution by the dictatorship. Let us oppose the new and shameless concessions made by the traiterous camarilla to the trusts, and the foreign policy that harms the interests

of the nation! Let us demand continued relations with Cuba and all the socialist countries!

All patriots and democrats, all political trends which reject the dictatorship! Let us unite in a powerful mass movement capable of defeating the putschists and installing a nationalist and democratic government representing the forces fighting for freedom, independence and progress of our country.

Working people and Brazilians!

In this dramatic hour, the Communists are calm. It is not the first time that the reactionary groups in the service of North American imperialism are trying forcibly to impose their rule on us. Similar attempts were made in 1945, 1954 and 1961, but to no avail. This time the number of victims is great and the violence f the reactionaries exceeds all bounds, but the Brazilian people will overthrow the power of the putschist camarilla and march forward along the revolutionary road.

Communists!

You shoulder a tremendous responsibility today. In this crucial moment in the life of our country still greater importance attaches to the role of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class. The duty of every Communist is to remain at his combat post among the masses, in factories and fields, in schools and army barracks, in residential communities and in the streets. We must organize the people and raise them to the struggle against the dictatorship, employing all means, from simple expressions of protest to meetings and street demonstrations which are to become a means of self-defense. Let us head the workers in their strikes, the peasants in their struggle against landlordism, and the entire Brazilian people in their struggle for democracy.

The defeat of the putschists will pave the way for the victory of the revolution in Brazil, for the final liberation of our country from the rule of imperialists, landlords and reactionaries.

Unity, organization and mass struggle is what we need to defeat the reactionary dictatorship!

On behalf of the Brazilian Communists,

Luis Carlos Prestes.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR by G. Deborin $2.00

A new thoroughly documented book, based on Soviet archives.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75

393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75

404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50

735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

16

Included in this issue

INTERVIEW WITH BACHIR HAJJ ALI,
prominent Algerian Marxist

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION BETWEEN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Antal Apr

AGAINST SPLITTING MANEUVERS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

supplement to

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 16

contents

DOCUMENTS OF PEOPLE'S VANGUARD PARTY OF COSTA RICA 5

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF URUGUAY 15

INTERVIEW WITH BASHIR HAJJ ALI
UNITA interviews prominent Algerian Marxist 18

FOR A GENUINELY DEMOCRATIC ELECTORAL LAW
Statement of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Austria 23

AGAINST SPLITTING MANEUVERS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT 25

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION BETWEEN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES
Antal Apro, Member of Political Bureau, Central Committee, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party 29

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF LESOTHO, ON UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT 45

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
August 18, 1964

DOCUMENTS OF PEOPLE'S VANGUARD PARTY OF COSTA RICA

ENLARGED FOURTH MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE MAY 9-10, 1964

This material was submitted to the CC meeting for drafting a new statement on the differences in the world Communist movement.*

SOME ASPECTS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Political Commission found it necessary to include the question of the ideological struggle in the world Communist movement in the agenda of the present meeting, whose chief purpose is to discuss political problems connected with the elections. Although we have repeatedly stated our opinion on this question, we have to do so again because events continue to develop and the struggle is growing sharper. Far from abandoning their original stand, the CPC leaders are intensifying their violent campaign and digging up ever new differences. Worse still, they have barefacedly gone over to open splitting activities.

It has to be pointed out, in addition, that the CPC leaders have rejected all efforts the other fraternal parties and above all the CPSU have made to discontinue the open polemic and ensure a calm discussion of the disputed issues. The CPC leaders go even further. They step up the campaign of lies and slander against the entire world Communist movement, first and foremost against the Communist parties of the USSR and European socialist countries and some of the biggest Communist parties of the capitalist states.

In the heat of the polemic the CPC leadership has cast aside the Leninist principles guiding relations between parties and placed its own narrow interests above the interests of the international working-class movement. In these conditions we repeat what we said at our October meeting in 1963: "The policy and actions of the Chinese leaders represent today the main danger to the unity of the international Communist movement." This conclusion gives a direction to our participation in the ideological struggle.

---

*Correo Semanal, a weekly bulletin, No. 69, May 11, 1964.

SOURCES OF THE CPC LEADERS' ATTITUDE AND ACTIVITIES

The Chinese positions have their class origin in petty-bourgeois pressure. There was a time when the Chinese leaders themselves saw this danger. "Our Party," Mao Tse-tung, for example, said, "is not only surrounded by this broad social stratum from without, but people with a petty-bourgeois background form a huge majority within it as well. . . . Petty-bourgeois ideology of all shades frequently finds expression in our Party." He also said that in the CPC petty-bourgeois ideology finds expression in dashing now to the left, now to the right, in a weakness for Leftist revolutionary verbiage and slogans, in sectarian adventurism.

There is not the slightest doubt that today petty-bourgeois pressure has taken the upper hand both in the internal and foreign policies of the CPC. Realities of this kind should not prompt us to make fallacious generalizations. The experience of other countries shows that if a party remains vigilant and if, moreover, it is a hardened Marxist-Leninist party, it can consistently uphold a truly revolutionary line.

The ideological positions of the Chinese leaders are nothing new to the revolutionary working-class movement. Lenin pointed out in *"Left-Wing Communism", an Infantile Disorder*: "Bolshevism grew up, took shape, and became steeled in long years of struggle against petty-bourgeois revolutionism, which smacks of, or borrows something from, anarchism, and which falls short in everything essential of the conditions and requirements of a consistently proletarian class struggle."

The present position of the Chinese leaders is the most graphic manifestation of what Lenin called petty-bourgeois revolutionism. They pose as fighters against revisionism and brand as revisionists all those who disagree with them. They use "ultra-Left" phraseology to disguise their adventurist stand. The confusion this phraseology may cause is especially dangerous in countries where the industrial proletariat is numerically small or non-existent, where the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology is strong and the revolutionary cadres are not theoretically mature yet. This makes it incumbent on the leaders and rank and file of our Party to be vigilant and fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin pointed out in a number of works that the small proletarian, the small proprietor easily falls into "ultra-revolutionism" and tends to go to extremes, but is incapable of displaying reserve, organization, discipline and firmness. Lenin also taught us that, their clamorous revolutionary talk notwithstanding, the positions of Left-wing Communists stem from stark pessimism and utter despair. He pointed out that such positions served objectively as the weapon of imperialist provocation.

The coincidence of the positions of the CPC leaders and the Trotskyites has been noted in many party documents. The Chinese leaders' stand can be characterized as neo-Trotskyism. Trotskyism, a manifest petty-bourgeois deviation, raises the false banner of a more "Left", more revolutionary trend. Factionalism is the soul of Trotskyism.

Do not the present concepts of the Chinese theorists remind us of many notions of the petty-bourgeois trends long ago defeated by Leninism? Only a petty-bourgeois "ultra-revolutionary" can regard the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems as a "renunciation" of the struggle against imperialism, a "rejection" of the revolution. He alone applauds the thesis on the revolutionary war being the last and decisive means of resolving the antagonism between the two social systems. A petty-bourgeois "ultra-revolutionary" alone can demand revolution "now and everywhere," without regard for the concrete conditions and the correlation of forces. He alone can oppose the peaceful road of revolution, for violence irrespective of the circumstances is his only criterion of "revolutionism."

It is this road that has led the Chinese leaders into the bog of Trotskyism and factionalism. Their stand on the question of war and peace is nothing but a rehash of Trotsky's "neither peace nor war" thesis.

The active opposition of the leaders of the CPC Central Committee to socialism's economic competition with capitalism is a repetition of Trotsky's old line of renouncing peaceful economic construction and going over to the tactics of revolutionary war, of "prodding" the world revolution by force of aims. That was the meaning of Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution."

The Chinese leaders' attempts to represent the principle of incentives and raising the living standard of the masses as petty-bourgeois degeneration and their exaggeration of the role of force, of coercion in the revolution and in the building of socialism bespeak their Trotskyite attitude.

Their thesis that the regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the "storm-centers of world revolution" is a repetition of the thesis of the Fourth (Trotskyite) International that as a result of the successive defeats of major revolutionary waves of 1919-23 and 1943-48 the focus of the world revolution has temporarily shifted to the colonial world.

In the writings of modern Trotskyites one can find other "ultra-revolutionary" statements which are reproduced practically word for word in the Chinese press and palmed off as "revolutionary principles." Peaceful coexistence the Trotskyite "wild men" proclaim, is not only impossible but also harmful to the working class of all countries because it tends to strengthen the positions of

capitalism and weaken the positions of socialism. Only he who is prepared fearlessly to face the consequences of the nuclear war being prepared by capitalism, they claim, can be considered a true revolutionary, and so on and so forth.

It is not surprising, after this, that in addressing the CPC leaders the chieftains of modern Trotskyism say (as was said in July 1963 by Posadas, one of the heads of Trotskyism in Latin America): "Comrades Chinese, you have no right to maintain that all the questions you are putting forward as revolutionary conclusions are the result solely of your own theoretical and political works. They are the conclusions of the Fourth International."

Small wonder that the Trotskyites openly link up their hopes for a revival of their long-withered movement with the present political line of the Chinese leadership. "The political stand taken by the Communist Party of China," states the so-called *Manifesto* of the Sixth Congress of the Trotskyite International, "indicates tremendous possibilities, which open a field of activity such as Trotskyism never had before."

At a meeting in the summer of 1963 the Executive Committee of this "International" adopted a special resolution approving "the historical mission of joining the Chinese and working for a united front between the Fourth International and the Chinese comrades." Struggle against the CPSU and against the Indian, French, U.S., Italian and other Communist parties should be the basis of this front.

Such is the position to which the Chinese leaders have slipped, a position of identity of views on basic issues with the Trotskyites, the bitter foes of Marxism-Leninism.

Petty-bourgeois impatience has become manifest also in questions of socialist construction in China. The Chinese leaders have departed from the general direction of Lenin's plan for building socialism and replaced it with the so-called policy of three red banners: of the general line, the big leap and the people's communes. In accordance with this scheme, which had no scientific basis whatsoever, they intended to leap over several stages and take their place at the head of the socialist countries. They set impracticable tasks and suffered great failures. It was decided to increase gross industrial output 6.5 times (with an average annual growth rate of 45 per cent) and the total agricultural output 2.5 times (with an average annual rate of 20 per cent) in five years. The attempt to realize these unscientific plans resulted in a many years' slump in China's economic development. These grave failures added to the petty-bourgeois impatience and pessimism of the CPC leadership.

The present positions of the Chinese leaders stem from the increasingly more open nationalist and chauvinist tendencies that

are particularly evident in their foreign policy. History knows of many cases when vociferous "revolutionism" went hand in hand with the most blantant nationalism. Lenin pointed out time and again that the social conditions giving rise to the petty proprietor impart special stability to one of "the most deep-seated of petty-bourgeois prejudices, namely: prejudices of national egoism, of national narrow-mindedness."

This is manifested in their attitude to frontier issues, real or artificially created by them, to the atomic test-ban treaty, and so on.

The most negative aspect of the nationalist policy of the CPC is the deliberate unilateral separation of China from the community of the socialist countries, which has resulted in the deterioration of the material conditions of the Chinese people and gravely damaged the entire revolutionary movement.

All the phenomena we have pointed out above are closely connected with the Mao Tse-tung personality cult. Chinese propaganda has elevated Mao Tse-tung to the rank of a demi-god; his ideas are declared to be the Marxism of our time. As a result, all the negative phenomena that existed in the USSR at the time of the Stalin cult have begun to be observed in the life of China and the CPC and in their relations with other countries and parties.

In keeping with their hegemonistic plans the Chinese are striving to obtain nuclear weapons. They were deeply mortified by the USSR's refusal. In our opinion, this is one of the main causes of their present stand. But the USSR has repeatedly and clearly explained why it did not give the Chinese samples of nuclear weapons. The inevitable reaction to the transfer of nuclear weapons to the CPR, the Soviet comrades stressed, would be the nuclear arming of powers of the imperialist camp, West Germany and Japan in the first place. Having a higher level of economic, scientific and technological development, they could undoubtedy produce more bombs than China and build up their nuclear potential faster. It should also be borne in mind that revanchist aspirations are particularly strong in these countries. It was these countries that in the past were the main hotbeds of war danger and militarism.

The atomic weapon of the USSR is a reliable guarantee of the defense not only of the Soviet Union itself but also of the entire socialist camp, including China. The CPS leaders know this perfectly well. Nevertheless, they want to acquire the nuclear weapon at all costs. Very indicative in this respect is the interview given to Japanese journalists in October 1963 by Chen Yi, Deputy Premier of the CPC State Council and members of the Politbureau of the CPC Central Committee. Saying that China would develop her own nuclear weapon whatever the price, he declared, according to the Japanese press, that possibly it would take China several years

and perhaps even longer than that to begin the mass production of the bomb. But China, he said, would manufacture the most modern weapon even if it would cost them their last shirt. Several days afterwards a Chinese government spokesman stated in *Jenminjihpao* that China would adhere to this line "even if the Chinese people will not be able to create the atom bomb in a hundred years."

Clearly, such a position of the Chinese in no way promotes the cause of peace or the struggle of the peoples for liberation.

SPLITTING THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT HAS BECOME THE CHIEF TASK OF THE CPC LEADERSHIP

Along with the polemic on ideological issues the CPC leaders launched a violent campaign against the unity of the Communist parties, working for a further split in the world Communist movement.

They declared this intention for all to hear. In an article published on February 4 last they advanced a strange thesis which serves as a theoretical substantiation of their factionalist aspirations. The formula is this: unity—struggle, or even a split—a new unity on a new basis.

What would be the result of such a split, and whom would it benefit? It would inevitably undermine the unity of the main forces of the anti-imperialist front—the socialist camp, the international working-class movement, the national-liberation movement and the world-wide democratic movement of the masses. That would play into the hands only of the aggressive forces of imperialism and facilitate their attack on the positions of the world liberation movement. Obviously, those who seek a split are assuming an incomparably great responsibility to history.

It seems that the Chinese leaders are trying to achieve what has proved to be a day-dream to the world reactionary forces. In the pursuit of their splitting aims the Chinese make use of all kinds of scum and traitors to the working-class movement and even opportunist elements who until recently remained inactive.

According to information available to us, they have set up anti-party groups, directed and financed by them, in the Communist parties of Belgium, Brazil, Australia, Ceylon, Britain, Chile, Austria, the United States. These groups include elements with a shady adventurist record.

The Peking leaders are anxious to secure the cooperation of elements expelled from Marxist-Leninist parties. As we have pointed out above, they are out to set up a bloc of "parties" headed by Peking. What are the aims of this bloc? It is clear to all that it is not being formed to fight for the realization of the tasks of the working-class movement, against world imperialism, for the very

idea of the bloc contains the seeds of a split and, consquently, of a weakening of the working class. This bloc is being set up to fight against the Marxist-Leninist parties, against the international Communist movement, for the benefit of the special aims of the leadership of the CPC Central Committe.

They also threaten to split international democratic organizations. Certain Chinese theses have endangered the very existence of some of these organizations.

These splitting activities, proved by facts, lead us to the conclusion that the CPC leaders have become the main danger to the unity of the world Communist movement.

Our Party remains rallied behind its Central Committee, but we should retain vigilance so as to eliminate any danger of a split that may suddenly arise. It is a matter of record that Rojas and Rodriguez, expelled from the Party, had talks with some comrades on whom disciplinary punishments had been inflicted, and proposed to them "to found a new party." We do not think that such aspirations can materialize. But all that obliges us to be on the alert.

The position of the CPC leaders was thoroughly discussed at a number of meetings of our CC. At this meeting we should like to lay emphasis on the origins of this position and on the splitting activities.

When the draft resolution is discussed we can go back to other questions. But we want to add something else.

The position of the CC, CPC leaders is stated in the so-called 25-point letter. Its essence boils down to the following: denial of the increasingly decisive influence of the socialist system on world development; underestimation of the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries; the setting off of the national-liberation movement against the socialist world system and the international working-class movement; preservation of the cold war in the world; encouragement of sectarianism and putschism in questions of revolution; advocacy and preservation of the methods and practices of the personality cult condemned by the Communist movement, and justification of factionalist struggle in this movement.

NEW STATEMENT ON THE DIFFERENCES IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Fourth Meeting of the CC of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica declares:

1) The world Communist movement continues to develop. The socialist countries headed by the USSR are scoring ever new successes. Their economic plans are being fulfilled and overfulfilled. The grand program for building the material and technological basis of communism in twenty years, adopted by the 22nd Con-

gress of the CPSU, is being carried into reality. This is the most important and decisive historical event of our epoch.

The Communist parties and the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries have also achieved major successes (the last elections in France, Italy, Greece and other West European countries and the rise of the strike movement in these countries and also in Spain, Belgium, and so on).

The national-liberation movement in the colonies, semi-colonies and dependent and underdeveloped countries has reached the highest level in history, while colonialism is faced with complete bankruptcy.

The imperialist camp, which has suffered major defeats at the hands of the national-liberation movement, is bogged down in contradictions. Its biggest military organization, NATO, is bedeviled by a crisis. A crisis has also affected the European Common Market and practically all relations between the North Atlantic allies..

In Latin America, after President Kennedy's death and the obvious fiasco of the demagogic "Alliance for Progress" plan, U.S. imperialism is reverting to old methods, which have fallen through already and are doomed to a still greater failure in present-day conditions. The demagogy proclaimed after Punta del Este is being replaced with a policy of strength, open and brazen interference, support for military coups and regimes, and threats and blackmail.

2) Nevertheless, the national-liberation revolution continues to develop in the Latin American countries. In some regions, where the masses have succeeded in upholding the democratic forms of government, it develops peacefully. In others, where this has proved impossible, the revolution is also developing, but in other ways. But everywhere, our country included, the revolution is developing in this or that way only by relying on the masses. For only thus can the national-liberation revolution be victorious. Attempts to accomplish it by groups isolated from the masses, no matter how resolute and heroic their efforts may be, are doomed to failure.

Petty-bourgeois impatience is alien to Marxism-Leninism. That was why Marx condemned Blanquism and Bakuninism and Lenin resolutely opposed Trotskyism. All those representatives of petty-bourgeois mentality sought to skip stages, artificially accelerate the revolutionary process, make revolution to order, export revolution and wage the "revolutionary war."

Our Party has always come out against petty-bourgeois adventurism, against any policy disregarding the interests of the masses, any attempt to make revolution a cause of one group or even of a vanguard party isolated from the people. We have denounced and will denounce any adventurism, any extremist trend as harmful to the revolution. We also reject sterile phrasemongering and pseudo-revolutionary verbiage.

Of late groups subscribing to such views have been trying to engineer a split in the Communist and Workers' parties with support from outside—from the CPC leaders.

3) The efforts made by the CPSU and other fraternal parties to prevent the open polemic in the world Communist movement, find ways and means of preserving unity or at least mitigate the ideological struggle have been unsuccessful so far. The Chinese leaders are deepening the differences in every way and intriguing to cause a split. They do not scruple to employ the vilest means to create difficulties for the Communist parties which disagree with their dogmatic, sectarian thesis reeking of petty-bourgeois adventurism and becoming more and more identical with the old propositions of Trotsky and his followers.

Not content with the harm they are doing to the unity of the world Communist movement, they are working for a split also between the socialist states. In fact, they have already broken away from the socialist camp.

The Chinese leaders have embarked on factional activities. As we stated at the previous CC meeting, sectarianism, dogmatism, bourgeois nationalism and modernized Trotskyism are becoming the main danger in the world Communist movement.

4) We do not consider that restoration of the unity of the movement can best be promoted by fence-sitting or "neutrality" in the debate on important ideological issues. On the contrary, we firmly believe that it is an internationalist duty of every party to take an open, militant stand against the splitters, to expose them and foil their machinations.

Lenin was merciless towards those who tried to undermine party unity, which he urged to cherish as the apple of the eye. He tirelessly fought, on the national as well as international plane against all deviations, right and left. We oppose revisionism and all opportunist deviations. But the threat now hanging over our movement emanates primarily, not from Right revisionism and opportunism, but from sectarianism, extreme Leftism, dogmatism, great-power chauvinism and Trotskyism—trends which are headed by the leaders of the CPC and by which they are guided in their activities.

We are not pessimistic about the prospect which, despite the splitting work of the Chinese leaders, is opening up before the world Communist movement. We consider that phenomena similar to the one we now are combating arose at all stages of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, but were always overcome by the working class and its parties. Ideological struggle, struggle against deviations caused by the ideological influence of other social classes is inherent in any revolutionary process. It is conditioned by its very dialectical nature. Therefore our meeting expresses firm conviction that the world Communist movement will

surmount the present difficulties, close its ranks under the banner of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and score fresh successes in the struggle for the great cause of the working class, for peace and national liberation, for the triumph of socialism and communism.

5) The People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica favors the earliest convocation of a new international conference of all the Communist parties and objects to the Chinese leaders' attempts to postpone it. Our Party maintains that to postpone the conference means to give the Chinese leaders time to step up their splitting activities; it means to aggravate the situation by making it possible to advance new motives for disagreements, and lead to an intensification of the struggle in the world Communist movement.

Hard as our Party strives to restore the unity of the Communists of the whole world, it realizes that this cannot be done overnight. But it sees it as its duty to contribute in every way to cementing the ranks of our movement.

We declare once again our affection towards and solidarity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the world Communist movement, the party which is setting us examples of loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. There are many socialist states and Communists parties which we hold in deep steem and from whose experience we learn. But we consider it essential for determining our international stand to declare our unreserved solidarity with the Party of Lenin, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This is due to the special position the Soviet Union and its Communist Party occupy by virtue of the historical role they have played as the pioneers of the modern revolutionary movement, of their being the main force of the socialist camp and the most experienced contingent of the working class, as was stressed in the 1960 Statement of the 81 parties. The reason why the USSR, the CPSU and personally Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, are the main target of the attacks of the Chinese splitters and their followers is that the Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence so needed by all the peoples of the world is based on the unshakable loyalty of the CPSU Central Committee headed by Comrade Khrushchov to the invincible principles of Marxism-Leninism.

STATEMENT* OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF URUGUAY

At a meeting held on May 8 and 9, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay discussed questions of unity of the international Communist movement arising from the Chinese splitting activity on the ideological and organizational plane. As our Party has already stated, the CPC leaders have counterposed their policies and activity to the general line of the Communist movement laid down in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, and, to disprove this line, have advanced their nationalist concepts screened behind "ultra-Left" phraseology.

The Central Committee censures the Chinese leaders who are revising Marxism-Leninism on all key questions of the theory and practice of the revolutionary struggle of the working class. They, for one, distort the concepts determining the content of our time as the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale; the propositions on unity in the struggle for socialism, democracy, national liberation and peace, with the determining role played by the socialist world system and the main force of our time—the world proletariat; on economic competition in conditions of peaceful coexistence as the principal form of the class struggle between capitalism and socialism; on the character of the State and the Party; the role of material and moral incentives in building socialism and communism; the tactics of the working-class movement based on utilizing all forms of economic, political and ideological struggle; the ideological and organizational principles of the Party of the new type, specifically, the unity and discipline of the Communists both internally and internationally. On all these points the Chinese leaders violate and rudely distort the foundations of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

At the same time they dogmatically cling to hard-and-fast formulas which disregard the profound changes that have taken place in the world. They reject the creative contribution made to Marxism-Leninism by the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, the contribution that was collectively discussed and unanimously endorsed by the 1957 and 1960 meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties: the possibility of averting war in our time; the possibility of peaceful development of the revolution in certain conditions; the paths of transition from socialism to communism; the character and role of the Party and the State in that period;

---

*El Popular, May 12, 1964.

the definition of our epoch, the role of the socialist system, the national-liberation movement, the struggle for peace and disarmament, the democratic anti-monopoly struggle, etc.; the struggle against the personality cult, and other important problems.

The Chinese leaders openly proclaim the fatal inevitability of a split in the Communist movement. In an attempt to split the parties, they support any group of renegades, thereby violating the basic principles of unity of the Communist movement on the national and international scale. In conformity with their intransigent nationalism they launch anti-Soviet sallies, try to drive a wedge between the Afro-Asian countries and the USSR, and spread racialist concepts belittling the role played by the socialist world system and the peoples of Western Europe and America. The CPC leaders support ruling capitalist groups that claim to be the "third force" and whose positions in Latin-American and other countries have been undermined considerably owing to the growing prestige of the USSR and other socialist countries and the victory of the Cuban revolution on our continent.

The Central Committee indignantly rejects the violent attacks of the Chinese leaders against the CPSU, its Leninist Central Committe and Comrade Khrushchov, whose activity has elevated to an unprecedentedly high level the prestige of the CPSU, the recognized vanguard of the international Communist movement.

The Central Committee openly rejects the views of the leaders of the Communist Party of China, and does so after pursuing for quite a long time a policy that corresponded to the reasonable and flexible efforts to strengthen unity made by the CPSU and the majority of the fraternal parties, which for several years have unremittingly sought ways of avoiding public polemics and paving the way to a fraternal dialogue and the overcoming of the differences on a foundation of principle. We reaffirm that our goal has been and will always be the search for complete unity on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The stubborn opposition of the CPC leaders to any comradely discussion customary among Communists, their unceasing attacks against the unity of the fraternal parties have necessitated posing the question the way it is done in Comrade Suslov's report of February 14, 1964: only ideological struggle will make it possible to avoid still greater difficulties and create a climate conducive to overcoming the present crisis. Any appeasement and concealment of the pernicious differences would inspire anti-Party and anti-Soviet activity and sow confusion in the working-class and mass movement, facilitating the openly disruptive schemes of the CPC leadership.

On all these questions the Central Committee firmly adheres to the positions of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. It is

guided by the documents of our 16th, 17th and 18th Congresses. The Central Committee deems it necessary to launch a vigorous ideological struggle in defense of the purity of creative Marxism-Leninism, against opportunism both Right and "Left", to uphold the unity of the Communist and working-class movement against actions, the methods and concepts of which are reminiscent of the old concepts of Trotskyism. Defense of unity and struggle against the splitting activity of the CPC leaders, who are intriguing against the Communist Parties and all the forces of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism, acquires special importance in conditions that are favourable for final victory of the cause of the international working class and the peoples.

The need to strengthen the Communist movement calls for a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties, for the Chinese leaders, who are going all out to postpone it for a long time, have no other aim but to continue their open factional activity. The Central Committee considers, therefore, that the international meeting should be convened at the earliest possible date to defend the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The march of events confirms the correctness of the line laid down in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement. The cause of peace and socialism is winning position after position. In view of this the Central Committee expresses confidence that, the present grave difficulties notwithstanding, the Communist movement will find ways and means of overcoming them and bringing nearer the triumph of the invincible teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

INTERVIEW WITH BASHIR HAJJ ALI

UNITA INTERVIEWS* PROMINENT ALGERIAN MARXIST.

Question: Why was last April's FLN Congress keynoted by ideas of scientific socialism?

Answer: There are many reasons, both internal and external. The first is that the broadest masses of peasants, workers and toilers generally had taken part in the war. They knew that they were fighting not only for independence but also for a better life. The Algerian revolution differs in its mass popular character from what is taking place in Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt.

On the other hand, French colonization has proletarianized the peasantry by depriving them of the best lands. Peasants were either driven to less fertile lands or employed as agricultural laborers or else they were compelled to go to town and form the base of a potential labor force and, consequently, of the proletariat, although unemployed. In addition, the French had done their utmost to prevent the growth of a merchant bourgeoisie in Algeria. As a result, the main role in the war of liberation was bound to be played by the proletariat in the broadest sense of the world, mostly by agricultural workers. That was why our first modern nationalist movement, the North African Star, originated in Paris in 1925 among Algerian proletarian emigrés. The first actions on Algerian soil, undertaken chiefly by agricultural workers and urban proletarians, were influenced by the October Revolution.

All that facilitated the spread of socialist ideas. Immediately after independence (1962) broad masses initiated "self-administration." They took hold of estates abandoned by the French, jointly tilled their lands and prevented them from getting into the hands of the Algerian bourgeoisie or landowners. This assisted the country's development in the direction of socialism. It is Ben Bella's historic merit that he understood the essence and purport of that movement and legalized it in decrees enacted in March 1963.

The leadership of the revolutionary movement headed by Ben Bella immediately realized that Algeria's backwardness would not be done away with on the capitalist road, that in the present international and internal conditions socialist construction could be launched in Algeria even while imperialism still held strong economic positions.

---

*Unita, June 30, 1964.

Question: Why is Cuba's experience so often referred to in Algeria?

Answer: The example of Cuba, which is builidng socialism 90 miles off the shores of the United States, was very important to the Algerians. But Algerian experience transcends the bounds of Cuban experience. Cuba is building socialism after abolishing all North American economic exploitation on her territory, whereas Algeria is advancing to socialism at a time when French interests still predominate in key economic branches — oil and gas. There still are 20,000 Frenchmen working in Algeria, including 8,000 in administration (4,000 in the central apparatus) and not all of them favor socialism.

However, Algeria's socialist orientation was most strongly influenced by the example of the socialist countries, by their prestige and their aid to the Algerian people, which was important not only because of its magnitude, but also thanks to its consistency and educational role. This is confirmed by the agreements President Ben Bella signed quite recently in Moscow. This element is, of course, common for all other underdeveloped and newly-free countries. But in Algeria, by virtue of the conditions necessitating the advance to socialism and of the present correlation of internal forces, this element helps to ensure the decisive influence of the proletariat and its ideology, for the industrial working class is not sufficiently developed yet.

Question: What do you think of the program adopted by the FLN Congress?

Answer: This program is the result of a scientific analysis of the position of the country. It guarantees continuity of a socialist policy and progress of socialism. It contains some general propositions characteristic of any country's advance to socialism. For instance,

1) it reaffirms or envisages socialization of all basic means of production;

2) it points out the motive forces of the Algerian revolution: the urban and rural proletariat, the peasant social strata, and revolutionary-minded intellectuals. I also believe that the petty bourgeois as a whole can not only be neutralized but also won over to the side of socialist Algeria;

3) these social motive forces of the revolution are uniting and will go on rallying ever closer in a vanguard party, around the state which represents them. The task of the state is to run the country. Moreover, it has to frustrate counter-revolutionary attempts to sabotage progress of socialism in Algeria.

Question: What are the characteristic features of the Algerian revolution?

Answer: We have spoken of self-administration already. There is Yugoslav experience in this field. But in Yugoslavia self-administration was introduced in a conscious way, specifically to combat the threat of red-tape. In Algeria, as we see, self-administration appeared as a result of the spontaneous movement of the masses to preserve the estates left entirely unmanaged after the departure of the French. Self-administration should not be understood as a counterweight to nationalization. The latter has many positive aspects, especially when prompt action is needed. But not infrequently nationalized enterprises can subsequently be turned over to the self-administered sector, which, incidentally, is most extensively supported by the state sector.

We have pointed out that imperialism still holds important positions in a number of decisive sectors of production and trade. Socialist development naturally leads to Algeria's gradual liberation from this dependence.

Another specific feature of the Algerian revolution is that, as distinct from countries where the formation of a vanguard party preceded the revolution, in our country such a party was built in the course of the revolution launched by the proletariat of town and country. The April Congress of the FLN actually formalized this party, completing a relatively long period of revolutionary activity.

Question: What are the ideological aspects of the Algerian revolution?

Answer: I know that this question is of special interest to other countries.

It is a distinguishing feature of our revolution that the socialist road was chosen without the adoption of Marxist philosophical principles as a whole. This does not prevent the advance to socialism, because—and this is the main thing—economic, social and political conditions for the building of socialism are being created: the ruling class has been replaced and the socio-economic structure is being changed. This does not at all mean that we should underrate the ideological aspects of the revolution. Being Marxists, we should analyze them correctly.

Question: What is the Algerian Marxists' attitude to Islam?

Answer: The following factors should be taken into consideration:

1. During the French occupation Islam, together with the socialist ideas that appeared roughly in 1920, contributed to the development of the national revolution and largely helped the moulding of national self-consciousness.

2. Today the masses of believers see in socialism a means of realizing Islam's progressive moral ideals. By doing away with

exploitation of man by man, socialism will materialize man's age-old dream and provide these ideas with a real basis, which they have up till now lacked.

3. Islam is not a "church" with an exclusive hierarchy connected with capitalist interests. Therefore it can be brought into conformity with social and political changes, with the movement of the masses. Anti-clerical traditions are non-existent in our country, where religion and social life are closely intertwined. Marxists have never reduced their theory to being an instrument of anti-clericalism. The Koran and the Prophet's Hadis (oral interpretation of the Koran) contain behests conforming with the essence of the socialist revolution. Suffice it to quote this one: "The land to those who make it bear fruit."

Question: Are there states where attempts are made to use Islam for conservative purposes?

Answer: Yes, there are. For instance, in Jordan and Saudi Arabia Islam is used to protect class interests. But in Algeria, where there is a revolutionary government, a state which more and more serves the masses, Islam plays a fully progressive role. Therefore, we do not see any contradiction in the fact that our Constitution makes Islam an official religion and at the same time points to socialism as the objective of the revolution. Overcoming philosophical differences, this dual selection will strengthen the link between socialism and the progressive ideas of Islam, in the struggle against domestic reactionaries, who are vainly trying to turn Islam into an instrument for preserving the old social order.

It is not enough, however, to say that national distinctions alone should be taken into consideration. The socialist idea of our revolution, which we are elaborating, should include the real national psychological factors, everything that is progressive in them, so that they should serve as a moral stimulus of advance to socialism. We restore to the word *jihad* (sacred war) its original meaning of physical and intellectual endeavor in the struggle against backwardness. We restore the dynamic meaning of the word *ittihad* (joint creative effort) so as to counterpose it in people's mentality to the sterile *taklid* (tacit agreement, imitation), a synonym of dogmatism.

The words of Prophet Mohammed adjuring people to work in this world to earn eternal life, the belief in man, in his capabilities are also a weapon in the struggle against passivity and estrangement. All this is helped by the works of Islam's rationalist thinkers Averroes, Avicenna and ibn-Khaldun. Our people's adherence to Islam will facilitate the transition to socialism. Could a Marxist be embarrassed if people said seeing the achievements of socialism: "Here is Islam in all its glory?" I think it would be

a major victory for Marxism to see Communists working among believers in the name of socialism and of the spiritual values to which our working people are sincerely attached.

That is why we say that the Algerian masses are marching to socialism with the Koran in one hand and "Capital" in the other.

Any other, ostensibly "Left" or "advanced" attitude would be not only fallacious but also harmful, for it would disunite people and set the non-believing and believing supporters of socialism against each other. The success of our experience, which is specific because born of life itself, will help to pave the way to socialism not only for the Algerians, but for all Arab peoples. Truly we can say, as was stated at the Congress of the National Liberation Front, that Algeria will be the centre of revolutionary radiance in Africa, in the Maghreb and all over the Arab world.

FOR A GENUINELY DEMOCRATIC ELECTORAL LAW

STATEMENT* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRIA

The Communist Party of Austria has long been campaigning for democratic electoral legislation giving equal weight to every vote.

The electoral law now in effect, pushed through by the two big parties to obtain special privileges for themselves, puts any small or new party at a disadvantage and restricts the sphere of its work, binding up members of Parliament with one of the two big parties even when they disagree with the latter on major policy issues. This law is largely responsible for the insignificant participation of the masses in political struggle and for the enormous scope of political corruption.

An electoral law is democratic only when it guarantees all rights of small or new parties. That is why the unlawful privileges of the two big parties should be abolished.

These privileges are more beneficial to the Austrian People's Party (APP) than to the Austrian Socialist Party (ASP). For instance, on two occasions the ASP polled more votes than the APP but obtained less seats. As a result, the conviction is growing in the ASP, too, that the law has to be modified. Faced with the mounting popular discontent with the present state of things, even the APP cannot afford to ignore the need for a change.

DOWN WITH PRIVILEGES AND RESERVATIONS!

Both ruling parties seek to retain as many unlawful privileges as possible. Making proposals for amending the law, they proceed from purely arithmetical considerations and oppose a simple and genuinely democratic solution that would give equal rights and opportunities to all: one mandate per definite number of votes (approximately 20-25,000).

In its initial proposal the ASP leadership insisted on the five per cent paragraph.** It wants privileges that would unlawfully give it seats which would otherwise, in accordance with election returns, belong to the Communists. It has openly declared that

---

*Volksstimme, June 5, 1964.

**Meaning that no parliament seats will go to a party polling less than five per cent of all votes.

the aim is to keep the Communists out of Parliament. At the same time it panders to the Austrian Liberation Party (ALP)*, whose character and aims are clear to all. If adopted in the form proposed by the ASP, the new law can increase the number of ALP seats by 50 per cent.

WHY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST COMMUNISTS

What right do they have to discriminate against the Communist Party, one of the three parties that founded the republic? As distinct from the present ALP leaders, who in 1945 and later adhered to entirely different positions, the CPA has always been in the forefront of the struggle for Austrian independence and neutrality, which was opposed in Parliament by the "Union of Independents." The attempts to bar the Communists from Parliament with the help of an undemocratic electoral law are designed to help break the resistance to Austria's entry into the European Economic Community and weaken the forces championing independence and neutrality, the interests of the working people and consolidation of democracy.

At present the ASP leadership has withdrawn its bill and tabled a new one, even more undemocratic on basic points. Anxious to retain the seats which, had the will of 135,000 voters been heeded, would have belonged to the Communist Party, it is allying itself with out-and-out enemies of Austrian independence and neutrality, democracy and the interests of the working people.

AGAINST FALSIFICATION OF THE ELECTORAL LAW

The CPA resolutely opposes the new falsification of the electoral law and the policy of alliance with the ALP, which can place Austria in jeopardy again.

An electoral law based on an ASP-ALP alliance tends to increase the influence of the ALP in Austria and cannot guarantee genuine democratic rights of the voters. That is why we are resolutely against it. When the plebiscite on it is held we shall urge all Socialists and anti-fascists to defeat the pan-German nationalists, these gravediggers of Austria and successors to Hitler fascism, as well as their direct and indirect accomplices. Only in this way is it possible to prevent the dangerous ASP-ALP alliance today and the APP-ALP bourgeois bloc in the future.

---

*Founded in April 1956 on the basis of the "Union of Independents," this party is headed by former Nazis.

AGAINST SPLITTING MANEUVERS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

The activity of the leaders of the Communist Party of China spearheaded against the international Communist movement and its vanguard — the CPSU — has gone beyond the limits of political and ideological debate, developing into an anti-Soviet campaign which for the vicious character of its attacks, is comparable only with what the Trotskyites did in their time. The principal arguments of the former and the latter are essentially the same. The Trotskyites accused the Soviet Union and the Comintern of "betraying" the cause of world revolution, "restoring" capitalism, and of "conciliation" with the imperialist powers. Today the Chinese leaders use the same language. Following in the footsteps of the Trotskyites, they are issuing calls for the "overthrow" of the Soviet leaders.

At the same time they concentrate fire on the unity of the international Communist movement as a whole and of each Communist party loyal to the decisions of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960, in particular.

In Belgium, Sweden, Brazil, Peru, Chile, Australia, the United States and Ceylon insignificant groups style themselves as "the new Communist parties"; supporting the Chinese standpoint, they engage in a violent struggle against the Communist parties and the Soviet Union. This cannot but delight the reactionaries in these countries, since the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders facilitates their plans of dividing and weakening the vanguards of the revolutionary forces.

Similar things happen in the international democratic organizations. Chinese delegates to the conference of the Afro-Asian countries in Algiers refused to reckon with its character and aims and sought to turn that gathering into a forum for anti-Soviet sallies. The Chinese representatives in the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the youth organizations and the world peace movement ignore the large scale of these movements and use them as a platform for attacks against the country and party of Lenin, thereby imperilling not only the unity but the very existence of these movements.

---

*Mundo Obrero, central organ of the Communist Party of Spain. Second half of April 1964.

Taken as a whole, the economic and political actions of the Chinese leaders show that, contrary to their professions, it is not imperialism but rather the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement which is the "main enemy" for them. Their large-scale propaganda campaign through journals, books, bulletins and the radio pursues one principal goal: smear the CPSU and its leaders and wreck the unity of our movement.

Even the Communist parties working in the conditions of fascism and brutal repressions are not spared the disruptive attacks of the Chinese leaders. One of the parties they now charge with revisionism is the Iraqi Communist Party. In acquainting oneself with these attacks against a party, hundreds of leaders of which were shot only recently, one cannot help recalling that at the time when General Aref was committing these crimes Mao Tse-tung sent a message of greetings to him.

The Chinese leaders carry out their splitting activity also against our Party. Not long ago a mimeographed document was circulated, carrying a report about the so-called "extraordinary conference" of the self-styled "Communist Party of Spain," at which a person referred to as X (not for considerations of secrecy since X freely travels all over Europe with a Franco passport) decided to "denounce" our policy, "displace" our Central Committee and "revise" the Rules and Program adopted by the Sixth Congress of our Party.

At the same time leaflets were circulated, announcing the formation of a faked "revolutionary opposition to the CPS." Today the so-called "Communist Party of Spain" and the "revolutionary opposition" are reported to have merged. On the whole, they hardly number a dozen persons, some of whom have never been members of our Party. Having large funds at their disposal, they are "making noise" to give the impression that they are a legion.

The same printshop in Paris, which publishes the posh pro-Chinese magazine *Revolution*, also produces the newspaper *El Proletario* edited by a gentleman who has never been a Communist but who, using Chinese money, is working to form another "party" in order to unite with the splitters (the latter will then number not twelve but thirteen). Sheets are also appearing, signed by "Marxist-Leninist groups" in emigration whom nobody knows. However, political emigres in Paris, Belgium or Switzerland know full well that two hands are enough to count on fingers all those persons who take part in this "unrestricted" activity, that some of these persons have never been members of the Party, the origin of others is generally unknown, while still others are members of political groups alien to our Party.

The special department of the Ministry of Information and Tourism openly encourages this propaganda directed against the

Communist Party. It assisted the publication of a faked issue of *Mundo Obrero* which we exposed in due time. They decided not to produce a second issue because, with the existence of *El Proletario* and the so-called *Mundo Obrero Revolutionario,* there is no longer any need for the Francoists to waste money for such purposes.

Spanish television gives wide publicity to these publications accompanying its broadcasts with profuse commentaries and photos supplied by the groups of adventurers. The April 11 issue of *El Espagnol,* official organ of the Ministry, carried a bombastic article entitled "Crisis in the Communist Party."

We have learnt that the Ministry of Information and Tourism has a special department charged with campaigning against the Communist Party. The department enjoys "skilled" assistance of the renegade Enrique Castro Delgado and the not less notoriously known Francisco Felix Mantiel, who was expelled from our ranks in 1947 for homosexualism and for other reasons. After the victory of the revolution this man had to flee from Cuba, for he had acted as a paid informer for the Batista police there.

This department supplies anti-communist articles for *El Espagnol.* It was here that the issue of *Mundo Obrero* was faked. It also assists the Chinese splitting activity, hoping to use it in order to deal a blow to the unity of our Party and sow confusion among its ranks.

Some time ago the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain addressed a letter to the Communist Party of China, informing if of the doings of Franco propaganda and alerting it to the fact that the maneuvers conducted by separate adventurist elements play only into the hands of Franco and the enemies of communism.

The Communist Party of China has not only declined to reply to our letter but, as we see, has even increased financial support for anti-Party rags.

How can activity of this kind directed against our Party, which is fighting in the difficult conditions of illegality, be qualified? It can only be assessed as a desire to stab us in the back.

Fortunately, even those members of our Party who at one time were impressed by the "Leftist" phrasemongering of Chinese propaganda and who might have supported it if it were confined to the ideological sphere, were shocked by the attempts to split the fraternal parties. They replied by closing their ranks and coming out in defense of the most precious weapon that a revolutionary party possesses: its unity and solidarity.

Solidly united, the Spanish Communists will rebuff all disruptive moves against our Party, its policy and its Central Committee.

The money spent to destroy our unity, no matter who spends it, will surely go down the drain.

The Communist Party of Spain has always sought to conduct the polemic with the Chinese leaders on a theoretical plane. It has sought not to allow this polemic to lose the character of comradely ideological and political discussion. Our Party has been particularly careful in this respect, avoiding strong language, categorical condemnations and maledictions. Even at the last meeting of the Central Committee we exerted no small efforts to keep the polemic within this framework, and drew the attention of the Chinese comrades to the danger arising from their further sliding down the path of a split.

But the warnings of ours and other Communist parties were left unheeded. The efforts of the CPSU in this direction were qualified by the Chinese leaders as "weakness" and "fear" in the face of their highfalutin' "Leftist" attacks. They gave the same qualification to the patient attitude on the part of Comrade Khrushchov.

We've had enough of it! Experience has shown that in order to overcome the differences and restore the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement it is essential that the Chinese leaders should not only understand the absurdity of their theses on war and other fundamental issues of our time but should also realize that the Communist parties are determined to cut short the disruptive actions from which only imperialism and reaction benefit.

In this situation, an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties, which would require an answer from the Chinese leaders, becomes an absolute necessity. So far the convocation of such a meeting has been postponed in the hope that rapprochement will follow and the danger of a split will disappear. But rapprochement has not taken place and the danger of a split does exist. There can be no further procrastination!

It is not the question of excommunicating the Communist Party of China from the great international family of Communists; nobody wants to do this. What we want is to make its leaders realize that we have one common enemy — imperialism and reaction — and one common goal — winning a victory for the forces of revolution and socialism throughout the world and safeguarding world peace. We can polemize, debate and compare views and experiences in the international Communist and working-class movement, whenever the need arises. However, we have something sacred, something that nobody can encroach upon — unity.

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION BETWEEN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES*

Antal Apro

MEMBER OF POLITICAL BUREAU, CENTRAL COMMITTEE
HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY

I. CMEA 15 YEARS OLD

Fifteen years ago a new form of economic cooperation between socialist countries came into being with the inauguration, in 1949, of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. The founding members were Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union, who were later joined by Albania, the German Democratic Republic and the Mongolian Peoples' Republic.

Today when the number of socialist countries has risen to 14, when the socialist world system occupies 27 per cent of the world's dry land and accounts for 26 per cent of the world's population and 37 per cent of world industrial production, economic cooperation between socialist countries and building a strong economic union assume exceptional importance. It should be borne in mind, however, that creating a higher, more developed form of economic cooperation is a long process.

★ ★ ★

Since 1949, in the process of tackling problems and accumulating experience, the work of the CMEA and the economic cooperation of the socialist countries have changed considerably and further developed.

At the initial stage, in 1949-54, the chief task of the Council was to increase trade between member-countries. Throughout that period its member-countries endeavored to coordinate their economic development by means of extending commercial contacts. Then there arose the need to coordinate planned targets for individual branches, and finally it became necessary to coordinate the national economic plans and organize new forms of economic cooperation.

Of special significance in that respect were, in our opinion, the *Basic Principles of International Socialist Division of Labour,*

*Abridged translation from the magazine **Tarsadalmi szemle**, No. 3-4, 1964.

adopted by the 1962 Moscow conference of Party leaders. These principles, which to a certain extent had already guided us in our work, clearly defined the trends of our further economic cooperation. We are aware, however, that it will take quite a long time fully to carry these principles into reality.

These jointly agreed principles not only operate within the CMEA as a whole, but also constitute the basis for the development of bilateral and multilateral contacts.

Stated briefly, these principles are as follows:

1. Each socialist country plans its economic development proceeding from its specific conditions and from the political and economic tasks jointly determined by the Communist and Workers' parties concerned, with due regard for the requirements and possibilities of all the socialist countries.

2. Multilateral coordination of economic plans is the principal means of promoting international socialist division of labor. Comprehensive coordination of long-term plans and investments alone ensures close international cooperation and specialization in key branches of the national economy.

3. Rational division of labor in the main industries, such as fuel and power, iron and steel, chemical, engineering and consumer goods production.

4. The socialist world system of economy has favorable conditions not only for consistent and planned development of division of labor, but also building in every country a rational complex of interrelated and complementary economic branches.

5. Applied in practice, these principles make possible gradual elimination of the historical differences in the economic levels of the socialist countries and better utilization of the advantages of international socialist division of labor.

6. Continued growth of trade due to division of labor.

7. Establishment of direct production contacts, the drawing together of various branches of industry, transport and science.

The "Basic Principles" reflect *general laws* governing the development of the socialist world system. These principles stem from the character of relations between the socialist states, from the level of development of the productive forces and economic cooperation attained by them. They also take into account the concrete economic and political tasks facing the individual countries and the socialist world system as a whole.

It should be clear to all that the practical implementation of the principles of international economic cooperation calls for thorough research and organizational work. Coordination between countries at different levels of development, bringing their economic levels in conformity with the level of the entire CMEA system is extremely difficult. In addition, there exist discrepancies in the

economic and political concepts of certain countries, which still make themselves felt.

Disagreements, too, may arise between CMEA countries in the course of concrete consideration of specific economic problems affecting countries with different levels of development. The main problem is that national interests and economic estimates of one or another country do not coincide automatically with the interests of the other states. Moreover, by virtue of the differences in the levels inherited from capitalism, the contradiction between national interests and the interests of the community appears to be almost natural. These non-antagonistic contradictions can be resolved only in conditions of socialism, by taking account of the interests of the entire community, in the process of comradely mutual assistance, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism, when contradictions are resolved by dove-tailing the interests of any one country with the interests and potentialities of the community as a whole.

The attitude of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party to the problems of promoting international economic contacts and accelerating development is clear and definite. We come out, as before, for a common road, for close bilateral and multilateral economic cooperation of the socialist countries.

Our Party and government have always attached great importance to the active participation of the Hungarian People's Republic in the economic cooperation of the socialist countries. This stand conforms with the policy of our Party, with its internationalist position, with the vital interests of our people.

II. CURRENT PROBLEMS OF CMEA ACTIVITIES

I shall deal only with the main problems, on which our countries concentrate and which are of particular importance for Hungary's economy.

The first problem is supply of raw materials, fuel and electric power. It is the basis of all industrial and agricultural development and a major concern of the Council.

Estimates show that even taking long-range prospects into account, all our countries possess sufficient stocks of mineral resources such as natural gas, coal, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, as well as raw materials for the chemical industry. For instance, the stocks of oil and gas fully ensure the development of the oil and gas industries of the CMEA countries. Pooling their efforts, they can meet their requirements in this respect.

Large stocks of combustible and coking coal are possessed by the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia. There are also considerable stocks of lignite in the GDR. The Soviet Union has the world's biggest iron ore deposits.

According to estimates, in the next 20 years the CMEA countries can increase electric power consumption by 160 per cent. In the future the fuel budget will change considerably in favor of hydrocarbons (oil and gas), although coal will continue to play the predominant role in the coming decades as well.

A few words about the fuel problem in our country today and in the future.

The demand for fuel and power grows parallel with the development of our economy. In 1960 Hungary consumed twice as much fuel as in 1938. In 1970 the demand for fuel is expected to be four times and in 1980, six times greater than in 1938.

It is pointed out in the recommendations of the 16th session of the CMEA that within the framework of international socialist division of labor the countries should strive to meet their power requirements through the utmost utilization of their own resources.

According to our new long-range power balance, drawn up in conformity with the CMEA recommendations, in 1980 our country is to provide 70 per cent more electricity than in 1960. However, since in the same period our power requirements will have grown by 157 per cent, about half of them will have to be met through import.

As far as our power and fuel supply is concerned, we rely chiefly on the Soviet Union, in particular on the Friendship oil pipeline currently being built by five countries.

Another important menas of meeting our future power shortage is the direct import of electricity. By 1980 we plan to increase it 14.5 times. In this respect not only we but other socialist countries as well are greatly helped by the Peace international transmission line which ensures uninterrupted supply of electricity to seven states.

Speaking of the problem of meeting our power needs, mention should be made of two fields demanding big investment: construction of hydro- and atomic power stations. In these fields international socialist division of labor is particularly essential.

The biggest planned project is the Hungarian-Czechoslovak system of hydropower stations on the Danube. At a maximum capacity of about 900 megawatts it will be generating up to 3,700 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, which is equivalent to mining or importing 5 million tons of lignite. Total capital expenditures on the system are tentatively set at 12,400 million forints. Both the building and maintenance costs and the electric power output will be shared equally. The system is to be built between 1966 and 1975. The first units of the Nagymaros power plant are to go into operation three years after the start of construction work.

Problems of the peaceful uses of atomic energy are dealt with by a special permanent commission of the CMEA Executive, whose numerous duties include organization of atomic power station construction, research production of isotopes and instruments, and specialization in this field.

The CMEA countries, Hungary included, should concentrate today on large-scale coordinated research, the training of specialists and the study of possibilities to design more economical atomic power stations with greater capacity.

Of special importance to our country is cooperation in the non-ferrous metals production. Non-ferrous metals play an exceptionally important role in ensuring the technological advance of practically all branches of our economy. In the past ten years their production in the CMEA countries has been developing much faster than in the capitalist system as a whole. Between 1958 and 1963 the output of copper almost trebled while the output of lead increased 2.7-fold and of aluminium, 1.6-fold.

What are the prospects for the cooperation of the CMEA countries in the production of non-ferrous metals? The mineral raw materials needed for their manufacture are distributed very unevenly. For instance, with the mineral wealth of the Soviet Union excluded, 95 per cent of bauxites are concentrated in Hungary and 85 per cent of copper ore, in Poland, and most of the deposits of tin and zinc ore, in Bulgaria and Poland. The latter two account for 76 per cent of the stocks of lead and 82 per cent, of zinc.

In view of the uneven distribution of raw material resources and because of the need for big capital expenditures for the development of the non-ferrous metals industry, the problem of non-ferrous metals supply can only be solved through close cooperation. In order to expedite the satisfaction of their requirements, CMEA countries have already pooled their efforts in some fields. For instance, the aluminium industries of the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Poland use Hungarian bauxites and Soviet and Hungarian alumina. The rapid economic advance of the CMEA countries calls for working out new solutions to meet the demand for aluminium in accordance with long-range plans.

Hungary can increase the extraction of bauxites, but her power output is insufficient to multiply several times the manufacture of aluminium. Of exceptional importance in this respect is the Hungarian-Soviet agreement of November 15, 1962, according to which in 1967-80 Hungary will be supplying the Soviet Union with 330,000 tons of alumina annually. Cheap Soviet hydropower will convert it into 165,000 tons of aluminium, which will then be shipped to Hungary in ingots.

Hungarian alumina will be delivered to Soviet refineries by barges emptied after having brought large amounts of Soviet goods upstream of the Danube. Transportation costs, therefore, will be insignificant. This form of import of electricity is beneficial both to Hungary and the Soviet Union.

International specialization and coordination of production is another important sphere to which we pay attention both within the CMEA framework and in our bilateral economic contracts.

In the CMEA countries heavy industry — the backbone of socialist industrialization — has been developing faster than industry as a whole. Especially rapid advance, in the engineering industry in particular, has been made in economically less developed socialist countries. For instance, between 1950 and 1962 engineering industry output grew in Poland 10 times, in Rumania 9.3 times, in Bulgaria 9.7 times, and in Hungary 4.4 times.

International specialization in machine-building is necessitated by the inability of the smaller countries to produce economically and at a high technical level the wide range of machines needed for their economic development. This is particularly true of our country, where the domestic market is limited and raw materials are in short supply. Hungary produces 55 to 60 per cent of the world nomenclature of machines, which is a great deal.

In recent years the CMEA bodies have elaborated a number of recommendations on international division of labor in machine-building. They concern, specifically, the manufacture of ore mining and processing machines, forge and press equipment, railway cars, equipment for the oil industry, metal-cutting lathes, agricultural machines, equipment for ships, transformers, spinning machines and weaving looms. Rumania, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and other CMEA countries take part in the specialized production of these machines.

A machine manufacturer, Hungary is interested, in accordance with the already established specialization, in the production of 215 lines. Proceeding from our tasks in developing the engineering industry and from the recommendations on specialization, we have discontinued the manufacture of some items, such as railway freight cars, some types of agricultural machines, electric trucks, etc.

We are not yet satisfied with the results of our specialization in engineering. We are far from using all our possibilities, a state of things which was justly criticized at the Moscow top-level meeting in 1962. Numerous facts prove this. For instance, all socialist countries manufacture motorcycles, but in insufficiently large series. The same situation obtains in the production of electrical house appliances and some other items. In our country many machine-tools are also turned out in small series, to say

nothing of special lathes. It is hardly economical when Hungary manufactures as few as 2,350 buses, 4,600 trucks and 3,100 tractors a year.

The most typical shortcomings in specialized machine-building are the following: manufacture of far too few machines is distributed among the countries; in machine-tool production, which is of special interest to Hungary, specialized manufacture does not reach even 10 per cent of the total output.

The same applies to most branches of the engineering industry.

Another drawback is seen in the fact that between 1955 and 1962 engineering output in the CMEA system grew by 252 per cent, while exchange of machines between member-countries increased by only 233 per cent. By way of comparison, between 1957 and 1961 the Common Market countries increased engineering output by 136 per cent and exchange of machines, by 190 per cent.

The decisions on specialization are not always carried out. Due to various reasons, such as lack of investments or a lag in the development of new models, countries sometimes do not live up to their commitments.

These shortcomings derive from the fact that so far the division of labor has been isolated from the coordination of national economic plans. It is now clear that from year to year CMEA countries plan for the export of machines to exceed their import and, because of lack of coordination, produce many new items separately. This trend seriously hampers rational division of labor in machine-building. At the same time, our countries have serious shortcomings in the manufacture of machines demanding large labor, material or capital expenditures. As a result, we are often compelled to turn to the West for machines which otherwise (given more rational division of labor) we could produce ourselves.

Let us now consider the problems of specialization in the chemical industry, which has been developing rapidly in recent years. Launching production of new kinds of output in a particular country requires extensive research and considerable expenditures. Along with this, in most cases the country's need for a new product is not big enough to make its manufacture economical. Hence the need for broader and more detailed specialization than in other branches.

Since its establishment the CMEA Permanent Commission for Chemistry has discussed questions of specialization in the manufacture of 700 to 800 chemical products. In accordance with an agreed program, it has been found expedient to develop in all countries the production of mineral fertilizers and sulphuric acid needed for this, increase the output of basic materials, such as caustic soda, chlorine and naphthalene, and launch mass produc-

tion of plastics, artificial fibre and synthetic rubber, while manufacture of other chemicals and synthetics, such as medicines, fine chemicals, dyestuffs, pesticides and detergents, in amounts sufficient to meet the need of all, is to be undertaken by one or two countries. Hungary is particularly interested in international specialization in the production of the largest possible number of chemicals. We want to assume obligations suiting the conditions of our country. Specifically, we plan a considerable increase in the production of medicines so as to cater both to our own needs and those of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Production could thus be organized on the optimal scale and be more economical. Between 1958 and 1962 our export of medicines to the Soviet Union, for instance, grew fourfold. There was a similar increase in the export of medicines to other countries.

The 9th session of the CMEA Executive adopted a decision on coordinating recommendations in the course of bilateral talks. In accordance with this the Bulgarian People's Republic, for instance, has undertaken to supply Hungary in 1966-70 with all the phenol needed by her in exchange for Hungarian benzol. Czechoslovakia and Hungary can pool their efforts in the production of an important basic material for the manufacture of pesticides.

Hungary has received important assistance from the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries in building a number of big chemical plants. In the second five-year plan period we have already purchased from the fraternal countries, primarily from the Soviet Union, plant and equipment for 20 enterprises.

The coordination of plans on a bilateral and multilateral basis is an important aspect of international economic cooperation. At present plans are being drawn up for 1966-70 period. The last session of the CMEA Executive in Bucharest decided to complete bilateral consultations this year and by July 1 present to the CMEA planning bureau basic provisions of the new five-year plan.

Also in keeping with CMEA decisions, consultations have started on the 20-year plan. Until now they were essentially of an informative nature, with the national planning agencies familiarizing themselves with the projected rate and structure of development planned in the other countries. These consultations were very useful, for they made it possible to specify the role to be played by the national economies in international division of labor and the main problems to be solved by joint effort. The consultations on the 20-year plan constituted the point of departure for elaborating plans till 1970.

Of great importance are the understanding and agreements with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria on specialization in the production and on reciprocal deliveries of plastics, artificial fibre, pesticides and fine chemicals. We can also expect now to

increase the export of our machines and determine the most important fields of specialization in the engineering industry. Concrete results have been achieved in specialization in the manufacture of machine tools, equipment for the food industry, and consumer goods.

Hungary, it will be recalled, does not posses raw materials for the iron and steel industry. Our plants operate on Soviet iron ore and on coke and coking coal supplied by other fraternal countries. In keeping with the recommendations adopted through consultations, it has been decided not to build up a new iron and steel base in our country.

Coordination of the most important investments has begun, too. From the start we agreed on some 270 projects being built in our countries in 1964-65. The initial coordination of plans, however, did not bring important results, for in effect it concerned investments into projects already under construction. We proposed, therefore, that we should begin already now to coordinate investments for 1966-70. If we succeed, considerable funds will certainly be saved.

Definite progress has been made in the construction of jointly-owned enterprises and in the making of joint investments, which is one of the most important aspects of our cooperation. Among the measures already taken in common mention should be made of the following:

a) Construction and operation of the Friendship oil pipeline and laying the Peace electric power transmission line.

b) Joint capital investments for increasing the output of mineral raw materials. Examples of bilaterial cooperation in the field can be cited. Czechoslovakia is helping the GDR to increase potassium salt extraction, and the USSR to expand the mining of iron ore and the manufacture of aluminium. A phosphorite mine is being built in Kingisepp (USSR) with the participation of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The credits the USSR received for the project will be repaid by deliveries of crude phosphate.

The Danube socialist countries cooperate on an increasing scale in utilizing the hydro-power resources of the river. Not long ago Bulgaria and Rumania agreed on designing joint power stations, while Rumania and Yugoslavia intend to build a big power station at the Iron Gate.

c) Valuable experience has been accumulated in running jointly such institutions as the Nuclear Research Institute in Dubna. Inaugurated in March 1956, the institute has enabled scientists of the socialist countries to conduct research with the help of equipment which their countries, with the exception of the Soviet Union, could not afford individually. Its aim is to ensure that the social-

ist community as a whole benefit by international scientific cooperation. So far 39 Hungarian researchers have studied and worked in the institute.

d) A new step towards more rational utilization of our possibilities has been made with the formation of a common fleet of railway goods cars.

e) On January 1, 1964, the International Bank for Economic Cooperation was instituted, following the introduction of multilateral clearing among CMEA countries. Its rules enable national banks to perform, directly or through the Bank, financial transactions in gold and freely convertible capitalist currency with the banks of other countries and with international finance establishments. The initial fixed capital of the Bank was 300 million convertible rubles. Hungary's share is 21 million rubles.

f) Finally, mention should also be made of the CMEA Institute for Standards, which is faced with a variety of tasks. On the one hand, it has to carry on research and experimentation to solve scientific, technological and economic problems arising from standardization; on the other, it designs new common standards with a view to speeding up the introduction of modern techniques.

The CMEA countries, Hungary included, are working hard to raise the scientific and technological level of their economy. Decisive in this respect has always been scientific and technological assistance, without which not a single People's Democracy would have been able to improve its technical level. The Soviet Union remains in the lead in this respect.

The scope of cooperation in this field is illustrated by the following facts. In the past three years the Soviet Union passed over to the other socialist countries more than 28,000 complete sets of technical specifications and received in exchange 7,000 sets. Some 18,000 specialists were invited to the Soviet Union, and about 2,000 Soviet experts were sent to other countries to exchange experience. Close to 300 Soviet research and planning organizations and about 400 of their counterparts in the CMEA countries cooperate in solving roughly 3,500 scientific problems.

The effectiveness of mutual scientific and technological aid can be gauged from the fact that the enterprises built in our country in accordance with Soviet specifications and with direct Soviet aid account for 40 per cent of all pig iron, 20 per cent of steel, 34 per cent of rolled metal and 50 per cent of roller bearings manufactured in Hungary.

The CMEA Permanent Commission for the Coordination of Scientific and Technological Research has set, as the initial step, the task of conducting research into the following fields: application of plastics in the national economy; chemicalization of agriculture; development of research equipment; elaboration of the

theory of automatic control; photosynthesis; integrated mechanization of cargo handling and transportation, etc.

Cooperation in agriculture has become particularly urgent in recent years. It is universally recognized that rapid increase in agricultural production is essential for further raising the living standards of our peoples.

The 1962 and 1963 agricultural years were unfavorable in many socialist countries. The 1963 plan for grain output was not fulfilled in most of them. Along with exceptionally inclement weather conditions, this was also due to the relatively low level of efficiency and material and technical supply. Grain output in the European CMEA countries was in 1963 roughly at the level of the previous four years but lower than in 1959 and 1960. That compelled some countries, Hungary among them, to increase grain imports.

There were also difficulties with fodder. We are especially undersupplied with protein-containing fodder, with the resulting continuous decrease in the output of livestock products. In 1963 the head of cattle in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Hungary and Czechoslovakia was less than in the previous year.

With the exception of the GDR, Mongolia and the Soviet Union, meat production in 1963 was lower than in 1962.

An analysis of agricultural production suggests the question: what, besides unfavorable weather, can explain the fact that our agricultural output does not grow to the extent we want it to and that our average level of production in many respects lags behind that of the capitalist countries? The root of the trouble lies in inadequate material and technological supply. Although farm mechanization grows from year to year, the shortage of prime movers remains. Mechanization of maize, potato and sugar-beet harvesting is introduced at a slow pace.

Agriculture is still inadequately supplied with mineral fertilizers. In 1963, for example, there were 45 kg of effective fertilizer per hectare of arable land in Bulgaria, 59 kg in Hungary, 223 kg in the GDR, 58 kg in Poland, 22 kg in Rumania, 16 kg in the Soviet Union, and 127 kg in Czechoslovakia. In this respect, too, we are way behind the capitalist countries with a developed agriculture.

The decline in agricultural production is also due to the reduction of the sown area. In the past four years the area under cultivation in the European CMEA countries decreased by more than 800,000 hectares. In order to stop the process, the governments of many countries, Hungary included, have taken steps to protect sown areas.

Proceeding from an analysis of the situation that has developed in recent years, in 1963 in particular, the fraternal parties and the governments of our countries are undertaking new efforts to

accelerate the development of agriculture and make more investments in it. The 1964 plans of the CMEA countries provide for higher grain output and broader utilization of mineral fertilizers, machines and high-quality seeds. Some countries are also increasing considerably their investments in agriculture.

Our cooperation in agriculture has been developing successfully in the field of plant-growing and, particularly, in specialized seed-farming.

Appreciable changes in the structure of food consumption are observed the world over. There is a marked increase in the consumption of animal protein as well as vegetables and fruit. Owing to the rise of the standard of living, this trend is manifest in our countries as well. In keeping with the decisions of the 13th session of the Council, CMEA bodies conducted a preliminary study of the problems of vegetable, fruit and grape growing and recommended to the exporters of these products, notably Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary, to examine possibilities of increasing production so as more fully to satisfy the requirements of the importer countries. Thanks to this and other factors, in 1962 compared with prewar, production of vegetables grew almost fourfold in Bulgaria, more than trebled in Rumania and more than doubled in Hungary.

Cooperation grows also in animal husbandry, especially in improving cattle breeds and the standards of veterinary service, and in studying and popularizing more rational methods of feeding.

The CMEA also considers problems of farm mechanization. Hungary covers most of her needs for machines and mineral fertilizer by importing them from fraternal countries. In 1963, for instance, we received about 7,500 tractors (75 per cent) from CMEA countries. In 1961 and 1963 from 75 to 80 per cent of all harvester combines were delivered by the USSR. The GDR fully supplies us with potassium fertilizer, while almost all of our phosphorus fertilizer we get from the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that in the future we shall achieve still greater success in our cooperation.

In assessing the results of cooperation in agriculture we should stress that, although all problems are clear in principle, we are far from utilizing all the possibilities in practice.

III. BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL CONTACTS

Eager to fulfil the historcal tasks facing them, the CMEA countries are steadily broadening economic cooperation. In the past, trade was the most important form of cooperation. Today, the CMEA countries are linked together not only by trade relations, but also by ever closer economic, scientific and technological cooperation, cooperation of planning bodies, and steadily expanding

production contacts, which makes cooperation more and more multilateral.

Further development of cooperation has been put on the order of the day by life itself. In connection with this, disputes and differences of opinion have arisen between countries, for not all of them, for instance, recognize the importance of their participation in new international projects. Striving to accelerate our advance, the Hungarian people work actively to consolidate international cooperation.

We do not deny that we have difficulties, but these are difficulties of growth. It is inside the Common Market where real contradictions can be found. From day to day leading capitalist newspapers report on the "collapse of the EEC agrarian policy," on skirmishes in the "coal and steel war" and the "apple and chicken war". All this, even without a detailed analysis, clearly shows the real state of affairs and the internal contradictions of the integration of the capitalist West European countries.

One should be careful not to over-rate the economic successes of the Common Market countries in certain fields. It would be equally wrong, however, to underestimate the economic achievements of the Western capitalist countries, for we can learn much from them, especially as regards promotion of technological progress, organization of labor, and knowledge of the market situation.

Over recent years economic contracts between CMEA countries have developed in two closely interconnected forms — cooperation within the framework of the CMEA, in its branch bodies, which is the main form, and cooperation of two or several countries on the basis of CMEA principles in special economic fields or those of particular interest to the countries concerned. Both forms supplement each other and in no way contradict or differ essentially from one another.

Bilateral cooperation enables us to find and make better use of the possibilities latent in the structure of the national economy, the level of economic development, the geographical position, etc. Moreover, the bilateral or triangular form often makes it easier simultaneously to coordinate the needs and possibilities and to find mutually beneficial solutions.

Multilateral contacts will in the future naturally develop into the main form of CMEA cooperation.

In our opinion, further development of international division of labor, which accelerates our economic advance, calls for the establishment of direct production contacts and building joint enterprises in key branches on the basis of principles and tasks jointly approved by our parties. With this aim in view it is

necessary to find new organizational forms such as jointly-run industrial associations, international administrations, committees or common enterprises and agencies.

Promotion of bilateral and multilateral contacts is by far not a new task. Hungary has for several years engaged through inter-government economic commissions, in bilateral economic co-operation with many socialist countries. We have cooperated through such commissions with Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and the GDR. These commissions guide themselves by the principles and recommendations of the CMEA.

During the latest talks in Moscow conducted by the Hungarian Party and government delegation headed by Comrade Kadar an agreement was concluded on the establishment of a Soviet-Hungarian Inter-Government Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation. At its first session, held in Budapest on February 3-5, 1964, the sides agreed on the order of work of the commission and discussed prospects for broader cooperation. We attach great importance to this commission, for continued growth of variegated economic contacts with the Soviet Union is essential to our country. The task of the commission will be to discuss from time to time, in conformity with the basic principles of the CMEA, concrete measures in the field of specialization in industry and promotion of trade and scientific and technological cooperation.

Along with developing economic contacts with the USSR, we, naturally, strive for closer cooperation with the other socialist countries as well. Concrete decisions adopted at bilateral top-level meetings have given rise to new organizational forms of cooperation. For instance, a Hungarian-Czechoslovak Commission for Economic Cooperation was formed at a meeting in Prague last February. An agreement is being prepared with Czechoslovakia and Poland on setting up a joint body for co-operation in iron and steel production, which can be made more economical in view of the similar patterns of the iron and steel industry of the three countries, the traditions of cooperation between them, and their geographical proximity. In the future the task of the joint programming bureau of these countries will also include coordination of plans for the development of their iron and steel industries. Such close cooperation of the three countries should promote cooperation in this field with the other member-countries of the Council.

IV. OUR TASKS

We stand for further development of economic cooperation, for the pooling of our efforts, for international unity. The Eighth

Congress of our Party stressed in its resolution that the road to strengthening the socialist camp lies through fuller utilization of the economic resources of each country and through coordinated development. The more varied and effective our economic cooperation, the sooner we shall build socialism and communism, and the sooner the socialist world system will win in the economic competition with capitalism.

We should go on actively developing and perfecting all forms of international cooperation, searching for new solutions and establishing inter-state production contacts.

Along with displaying initiative we should be patient and provident and consider carefully the interests and needs of the socialist community as a whole and of each socialist country in particular. It is possible to eliminate the differences in the economic levels of the socialist countries and win in the peaceful competition with capitalism only after a certain period of time and through all-round concentrated efforts. We should not think in terms of this day only and expect immediate results. We should learn how to dovetail current and long-range targets. Much is being done in the field of cooperation, and it is essential that we determine the order of tackling problems and concentrate our efforts accordingly.

We should overcome the surviving backward views, conservatism and nationalistic trends, which hamper our cooperation. There are people who verbally stand for internationalism but are reluctant to implement it in practice. It should be remembered that close economic cooperation with socialist countries is identical with serving the common interests, with practical realization of internationalism.

Speaking of our present concrete tasks, we should say that our economic executives and specialists should contribute in every way to the success of joint international enterprises that have been or are being built. Difficulties do arise at the beginning, but that is natural even for every new national organization. However, the advantages of concerted action soon become evident, for the pooling of efforts always brings about signal achievements.

Today it is decisive to carry out the economic commitments that have been taken, turn out high-quality specialized products, raise their competitive value on the world market by applying advanced production processes, increase labor productivity, promote technological progress and, which is closely connected with this, lower production costs. We cannot sell obsolete, costly goods.

Much is yet to be done by the economists and all specialists dealing with problems of international economic cooperation.

The most important questions of our cooperation have been formulated in the Basic Principles of International Socialist Division of Labor, but many theoretical and practical problems will have to be further specified. Answers will have to be given to such problems as economic estimates of joint investments, the wide range of questions pertaining to fixing uniform prices, the factors arising in the course of international specialization in production, or many interconnected peculiarities of the multilateral clearing system. Our economists will also have to give a more detailed economic substantiation to such vital problems as evening up economic levels or overall development of individual economic sectors.

★ ★ ★

The ideas of socialism are winning ever greater popularity the world over. There is no force today capable of arresting the victorious march of the socialist countries, their economic progress. Objective conditions favor our advance and new victories in all fields.

The socialist system enjoys tremendous advantages. If they are properly utilized, we shall be able, acting in common, to overtake and, in the next decade, outstrip the leading capitalist countries in many aspects of economic life. If every socialist country abides by the principles of proletarian internationalism in economic cooperation and bends every effort to strengthen our international solidarity and build up our common might, the peoples of the socialist countries will in the near future score new victories in the glorious struggle for socialism and communism.

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF LESOTHO ON UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lesotho having studied the materials of the February meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and, in particular, the report by Comrade M. A. Suslov, unanimously approved the resolution and decisions adopted by the CC, CPSU which correspond in every material matter with the standpoint of the Communist Party of Lesotho.

For some years now there has been an abnormal situation in the international Communist movement. This has been caused by the differences between the Chinese Communist Party and the rest of the international Communist movement.

In 1957 a great international gathering of Communists took place in Moscow. This was on the occassion of the 40th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. A Declaration was unanimously adopted at that gathering. The Declaration set forth the views of the international Communist movement on all major developments in the world from the point of view of creative Marxism-Leninism.

The issues dealt with in the Declaration concerned the conditions existing in our epoch, that is, what the main trends and content of the present epoch are; the role of the world socialist system; the ways of building socialism; on the possibility of averting world war; on peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems; on the need to combat the personality cult ideology and practices; on the forms of transition to socialism in the developed capitalist countries and in the newly-free countries; the problems of how to carry out revolution in our time.

There was agreement in 1957.

In April 1960 on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the birth of Lenin the Chinese Communist Party published an anthology of three articles entitled *Long Live Leninism*. These articles challenged the conclusions jointly worked out by the international Communist movement on several vital matters of principle including (a) the definition of the epoch and (b) the question of world war and the possibility of averting it.

It was clear that for such an important party as the Chinese Party to come out with views contrary to those of the rest of the international Communist movement would lead to serious consequences. As a result meetings were held in August, 1960 at Bucharest and in Moscow in November 1960. In the November meeting 81 Communist and Workers' Parties held consultations for three weeks. At the end of the conference unanimity was reached and incorporated in the 1960 Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. All the parties signed the Statement which is an outstanding contribution to the science of Marxism-Leninism. The Statement is well worth studying today in the light of what happened subsequently.

Despite the agreement the Chinese Comrades continued to propagate views contrary to the general line agreed upon. At first they endeavored to conceal this by giving out that their erroneous views were in fact in accordance with the conclusions of the 1960 Statement. Eventually they proposed their own general line consisting of 25 points. This general line of the Chinese comrades differs on many basic questions with the views of the international Communist movement.

The Chinese Party did not just differ ideologically. The Chinese Party and state launched a political struggle on all parties which did not agree with them. They forgot all the rules about non-interference in the internal affairs of other parties. In the 1960 meeting the Chinese comrades had vigorously fought against the inclusion in the statement of any reference to factionalism in the international Communist movement. This was based on the formalistic argument that the principle of democratic centralism could not be applied to the international Communist movement as there was no central organ to impose discipline.

Now the Chinese Communist Party is financing and supporting factions in individual countries where there is a central organ and where democratic centralism fully applies. In fact we now hear from the Chinese theoreticians that there can be such a thing as a "Communist . . . outside a Communist Party." Groups of Communists and in other cases renegades are encouraged to come out against Central Committees with which the Chinese party has fraternal relations. This is described as fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. Needless to say this is unheard of in the history of the Communist movement.

The major parties and in particular the Communist Party of the Soviet Union tried everything to avoid further development of the differences. Comrade N. S. Khrushchov on many occassions called for an end to polemics and pointed out how struggles of this kind developed a momentum of their own. The

CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties realized that it was an extremely serious matter which affected the fortunes of the international Communist movement for such a great party as the Chinese to carry on these harmful activities.

This responsible attitude on the part of Comrade Khrushchov, the CPSU and other parties was used to blackmail the international Communist movement. If the differences had been kept within the ranks of the Communist movement itself the harm could have been contained. But the Chinese comrades carried the dispute into non-Communist organizations. Internal Communist matters were discussed with outsiders. Questions of Marxist-Leninist theory were submitted for arbitration to non-Communists and even to anti-Communists!! Such people were appealed to in deciding which view of Marxism-Leninism was correct. This was rather like asking atheists to adjudicate in a dispute between Christians. This is not to suggest that the issues the Communists were debating were of no interest to others. On the contrary they were of vital interest to all mankind. But the method of conducting the polemics was objectionable. Because of this the work of mass organizations such as the Afro-Asian Solidarity Movement, the WFDY, the WFTU, the world peace movement and others have been disrupted.

As a result of all this it has now become necessary for the international Communist movement to give detailed replies to the Chinese comrades in order to defend the principles of Marxism-Leninism. A firm ideological rebuff must be given to the attempt of the Chinese comrades to split the movement in order for them to control a section of it.

It would be too long to deal in this statement with all the issues in detail. But some of them are of immediate importance for Basutoland.

For example in defining the present epoch the 1960 81-Party Statement says this:

"Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world scale."

This definition covers all the main social trends of our epoch. According to it the main trend, the man content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which has produced the great world socialist system of one thousand million people — a third of mankind.

The Chinese theoreticians are not happy with this definition and in various ways seek to revise or modify it. They say that the national-liberation revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America is now becoming the most important force that is dealing a *direct* blow at imperialism. As regards the world socialist system and the international working class, or those sections of it in the imperialist countries, they assign to it the role not of leader of the struggle against imperialism and capitalism but of "supporter" of the struggles waged by the nationally oppressed peoples.

It is typical that in discussing the national-liberation revolutions, the Chinese writers do not stress the need for a close delineation of classes for which they were once famous. The question of hegemony of the revolution by the working class and its vanguard as a condition of complete victory is not stressed. If they did stress these aspects they would at once perceive that the national-liberation movements, however splendid the blows they struck against imperialism, could not be regarded as the main focus of the contradictions in our time.

Imperialism is an outgrowth of the capitalist system. The struggles for national liberation weaken imperialism considerably. But the essential problems of our time demand not only that imperialism be fought but that the system that gave rise to imperialism, namely, capitalism must be brought to an end and a new, just, social system created in its place—socialism. In the national-liberation revolutions the qualitive change only takes place if the working class has hegemony of the movement as happened in the Chinese revolution. The countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America may represent the weak links in the chain of imperialism but they are not the focus of the contradictions in the present-day world. Here we have an example of how the Chinese comrades have made one aspect of the main contradiction take the place of this contradiction.

Our country Basutoland lies in the zone that the Chinese comrades have described as the focus of the contradictions in our time. It is a small country surrounded on all sides by the Republic of South Africa with its notorious policy of racialism and apartheid. The country is under the rule of the British imperialists. The main economic activity of our people is to work on the farms, mines and industries of the Republic of South Africa. Our workers migrate to work in South Africa on contract and return home on completion of their contracts. As far as land relations are concerned they are pro-feudal. The land by law belongs to the Basotho nation and is held in trust for the nation by the ruler Moshoeshoe II. There is no individual ownership. The interest of the British imperialists who have vast interests in

the Republic of South Africa has been to ensure the efficient flow of labor to that country. Inside Basutoland itself no serious economic development took place. There is not a single factory in Basutoland. Agriculture is at a subsistence level. The governmental system is simple and the apparatus of coercion is insignificant. We have no national bourgeoisie.

In these conditions the Communist Party of Lesotho (Basutoland) believes it is possible to unite the workers, peasants and intelligentsia under the leadership of the working-class party into a revolutionary force capable of carrying out revolutionary changes by peaceful means. Provided there is a guarantee against imperialist counter-revolution the internal enemies of revolution have not got the means to suppress the revolutionary people. And what would the process of development be after the working-class took power in such a country as ours? Taking over a country with communal tribal land relations inhabited by workers with experience of working in the mines, industries and farms of the neigboring South African Republic, the first task would be to lay the foundations for a modern economy and to introduce agrarian reform. Such an economy to begin with could hardly be called a socialist economy nor would it be capitalist. It would be more correct to refer to it as a non-capitalist economy. The state form would be a state of national democracy —an independent national democracy. Then we would move to socialism and finally communism.

It is clear that for a country such as ours the international environment in which our revolution takes place would be of vital importance. An environment of decreasing international tension in which there is active peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems would be extremely favorable. Hence our Party consistently supports all peace initiatives by the Soviet Union and other socialist states. We have never regarded peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems as "prohibiting" the Basotho from carrying out their socialist revolution. In fact it is our opinion that with our extremely favorable internal position our victory is assured, provided only that the international position makes it difficult for the imperialist to export counter-revolution to our country.

Our economic development could only take place with the support of the World Socialist System. In fact without the perspectives opened up by the formation of the World Socialist System the prospects of the Lesotho revolution would be dim indeed. Our victory as a small but proud nation with a long tradition of struggle is very intimately bound up with international developments, in particular with the fact that the

socialist system is exerting a growing influence on the course of world development.

The strategic and tactical directives given to the international working class by the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 comprehensively meet the needs of the Communist Party of Lesotho. A departure from these documents would be a departure from revolutionary truth.

The question that arises is what is to be done in the light of these differences? A country or state cannot be "disciplined." A country cannot be excommunicated from socialism. The mode of production of a country or state does not automatically change because its leaders follow an incorrect political line. This is a problem that first arose with the emergence of the World Socialist System after the Second World War. First we had the attack on Marxism-Leninism from a Right-wing position by a socialist country—Yugoslavia. Now we have an attack from ultra-Left, dogmatic position from another socialist country — China. The handling of the Yugoslav problem by Stalin was not altogether satisfactory. That method which the Chinese comrades extol of excommunication from socialism will not work. It was easier to deal with deviations by parties without state power. Now we are faced with deviations from Marxism-Leninism by parties wielding state power.

It is significant that both the Right-wing and Left-wing deviations made the Soviet Union the central target of attack. This is by no means accidental. The Soviet Union is the tried and tested vanguard of the international Communist movement. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the custodian of the integrity of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This is a task imposed on the Soviet party by history. Under the leadership of N. S. Khrushchov the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is actively defending Marxism-Leninism, and carrying out its duties to the international working class. The unprecedented welcome which the African people have given to N. S. Khrushchov and the Soviet guests in Egypt is testimony to the feelings our people have for Soviet policy on national liberation, peace and freedom in Africa.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has suggested the holding of meetings of various parties to prepare for the international gathering of Communist and Workers' parties in the autumn of this year. We fully support the suggestions. The object of these meetings is to define issues clearly; to separate the chaff from the wheat; to define the scope of the dispute and to what extent the movement should go in protecting its unity and cohesion. But clearly something must be done to minimize the effect of the Chinese deviations at least until objective

social conditions in China itself remove the causes. The social system in China is the permanent, the ultimate factor which will defeat all subjective and nationalist mistakes.

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Lesotho (Basutoland)

May 15, 1964.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR by G. Deborin $2.00

A new thoroughly documented book, based on Soviet archives.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75

393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75

404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50

735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY
Included in this issue

INFORMATION

bulletin

17

LETTER OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION TO CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA (June 15, 1964)

ENSURE THE PEACEFUL ROAD
Luis Corvalan (Chile)

FOR ANTI-MONOPOLY GOVERNMENT
Gaston Moulin (Belgium)

supplement to
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

information bulletin - 17

contents

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
June 15, 1964 letter from the Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union **5**

FOR AN ANTI-MONOPOLY GOVERNMENT FOR AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE WORKING CLASS AND THE MIDDLE CLASSES OF TOWN AND COUNTRY
Report by Gaston Moulin, Member of Political Bureau, Central Committee, Communist Party of Belgium **20**

INTERVIEW WITH MAX REIMANN
MUNDO NUOVO interviews First Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Germany **30**

FOR STRENGTHENING NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE, FOR GENUINE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, AND AN END TO THE DICTATORSHIP AND THE ABNORMAL SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY
Statement by Central Committee, Iraqi Communist Party (abridged) **33**

RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS
National Conference, Communist Party of Indonesia **44**

ENSURE THE PEACEFUL ROAD
Luis Corvalan
General Secretary, Communist Party of Chile **46**

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
August 25, 1964

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

JUNE 15, 1964 LETTER FROM CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Dear comrades, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has received your letter of May 7, which contains an answer to ours of March 7 last. In your letter you not only reject all the proposals of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties aimed at overcoming the difficulties in the Communist movement, but virtually refuse to meet with representatives of parties, to hold talks and discuss with them common problems of concern to the Communists of the whole world. Never before has the CC, CPC so openly expressed its disregard of the opinion of the fraternal parties, and its refusal to lend an ear to them and take part in a joint search for ways of overcoming the differences. The entire content of your letter, as well as its rude tone, shows that for all the numerous CC, CPC declarations to the effect that it is anxious to prevent a split and uphold unity, you do not want the differences to be overcome, and in practice oppose the unity of the world Communist movement. You even make no attempt to conceal that your aim is to have your hands free in order to carry on factional, splitting activities. This is the only way the Marxist-Leninist parties that are concerned about the difficulties which have arisen within the movement can interpret your letter.

In sending you its letter of March 7, the CC, CPSU believed that the situation in the world Communist movement called for a collective examination of the difficulties, a collective formulation of the right ways of overcoming them, and for unity of all the fraternal parties. With these aims in view, we proposed calling a CPSU-CPC meeting and a preparatory conference of delegates from 26 parties as speedily as possible, and holding a world meeting already this year, by agreement among the fraternal parties. We felt that open polemics must be discontinued and all manner of subversive, splitting activities within the socialist commonwealth and the Communist movement—practices which have already done considerable harm to our cause—renounced if those measures were to succeed. We reckoned with the will of most of the fraternal parties, which strongly urge that CPSU and CPC delegates meet and that an international Communist forum

be held to discuss jointly the problems that have arisen in a comradely atmosphere, within the fraternal family of Communists, and remove the divergencies caused by the CPC leaders' splitting activities.

The proposals put forward in the CC CPSU letter of March 7 were actively supported by the world Communist movement. To date the overwhelming majority of the fraternal parties have declared for convening a meeting without delay. Some parties, while favoring a conference in principle, make certain reservations as to the exact date when it should be called, bearing in mind your opposition to a meeting. But as far as we know no leadership of any party, except that of the CPC and the Albanian Party of Labor, rejects the necessity for collective measures to overcome the difficulties in the Communist movement and promote its unity.

The CC, CPC letter of May 7 proposes postponing the conference for "four or five years or more" and, moreover, declares that "it would even be better not to convene it than to convne it." Once again you put off for a long time the bilateral meeting which the CC, CPC proposed a short time ago holding in October 1964, and make such reservations to your consent to it as give cause for doubt whether the Chinese side is interested in it at all.

We state, therefore, that the CC, CPC is going back on its own proposals. The CPC leaders for a long time posed as initiators of an early conference, making it appear as if the CPSU was against it. When, in the winter of 1962, the Communist parties of Indonesia, Vietnam and New Zealand proposed a conference, you supported their proposal. You wrote on April 7, 1962, that a conference would be of "topical, positive significance in overcoming the differences existing between fraternal parties today." At the end of 1962 that attitude of the CC, CPC was publicly reaffirmed in the speeches made by your delegations at the congresses of the fraternal parties of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Afterwards you declared for a conference in your letters to the CC, CPSU of March 9, 1963, and June 14, 1963. Lastly, your letter of February 29, 1964, said in black and white: "The Communist Party of China invariably favors a conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of all countries, and actively supports it."

However, as soon as the CC, CPSU and other fraternal parties raised the question of a conference concretely you made a volte-face. Anyone will be struck by the extremely contradictory and illogical position of the CC, CPC. Until recently you enthusiastically supported the idea of a conference, and were even proud of having been the first to support the proposal for convening it

because you considered it useful. Today the CPC leaders say something quite different. From what they say, a conference would be untimely and likely to cause all kinds of trouble to the Communist movement. That wavering seems to be due solely to the fact that you have never before thought seriously of a conference—any more than you do now—because you could not count on support for your ideological and political platform on the part of a world Communist forum. It is legitimate to assume that the CC, CPC is little concerned about the problem of preserving and strengthening the unity of the Communist movement and that it is turning the question of a conference into an object for an unseemly political game to cause more difficulties.

Although you in every way flaunt your indifference to the opinion of other parties and declare that you are unafraid of a "resolute rebuff" from them, in fact you are afraid to attend a world Communist conference because you are anxious to evade a fair and straightforward discussion, and a comparison of your erroneous platform and the line of the world Communist movement.

Your objections to a conference are utterly indefensible. You contend that a world conference, like a CPC-CPSU meeting, would merely "end in a quarrel and in all parties going away without achieving any results," and that "there will be an open split and everyone will go his own way."

Only those who themselves are determined to bring about a split can pose the question in this way, predict that the conference will lead to a split. Indeed, if at a conference the line pursued is one of aggravating differences and if its purpose is seen as one of condemning someone, attaching offensive labels and making irresponsible charges, the result may be further dissociation rather than greater unity.

But the CPSU and those fraternal parties which at every stage of the differences have consistently favored a new international meeting emphatically reject such a line, the very idea of such an approach to a conference. As far as we are concerned, the question of a conference is inseparable from the problem of maintaining and promoting the unity of our movement. We believe that in view of the differences which the Communist movement has come up against, it is necessary, first and foremost, to concentrate on bringing out what the fraternal parties have in common and what unites them, on seeking ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen. Fraternal parties have no better method for overcoming differences and formulating common positions than a collective exchange of views at an international forum that would enable each party to fully retain

its sovereignty and yet take an active part in formulating the common line of the world Communist movement.

The differences and disputes which have broken out in the Communist movement and are causing it considerable damage affect the interests of all parties without exception. That is why each party is entitled and obliged to contribute to the discussion and solution of urgent problems and to the common cause of promoting unity. A conference would give each party an opportunity to hear all opinions and state its point of view frankly and seriously, so that it could subsequently be taken into consideration when a common line and common decisions were formulated.

As regards the CPSU, in proposing a conference, its aims—in full accordance with the principles established within the Communist movement after the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960—to pursue at it a line making for unity, the normalization of the situation in our movement, and a serious discussion of disputed issues, such as will make for greater unity on the basis of principle, and not for an aggravation of differences. It is our deep conviction that there are no insurmountable obstacles to this. All that is necessary is for every participant in an international meeting to show at least a minimum of goodwill, to be willing to listen carefully to the opinions of others and to understand them, and seek for ways to unity and not to dissociation. If the representatives of every party show an interest in overcoming the difficulties, and if the CPC delegation attends the proposed conference with a desire to seek mutual understanding with the other participants, and with a constructive program, which the CPSU and other parties think necessary, then the conference may become a turn towards the strengthening of unity.

The CC, CPSU is perfectly aware that the divergencies between the CC, CPC and other fraternal parties are very serious and have gone far. In the course of the public debate there has been an accretion of many irrelevant and artificial obstacles to mutual understanding, between the parties. A number of fundamental differences over highly important problems of today and of the policies of world communism have emerged and become acute. It is possible, therefore, that whatever the efforts which the Marxist-Leninist parties may make, the conference may not succeed in arriving at a common view on all matters at once. The CC, CPSU is convinced, however, that even such an outcome of the conference will not amount to a split, which the CPC leaders persistently predict. Even in a case like that, we think it possible to reach at the conference an agreement that the

Communist parties commit themselves to take account of the opinions of all the conference delegates, all the Marxist-Leninist parties, to cooperate conscientiously in areas where their positions and interests are identical and refrain from any further action aggravating the difficulties and gratifying none but the class enemy. One may well ask: given this approach, why should a conference lead to a split or so much as worsen the situation in the Communist movement?

We consider that the procedure for the conference suggested by us fully accords with the standards and principles of relations between Communist parties and is practicable. It is a question of really showing elementary concern for unity, tolerance and good faith, which the Communist movement has a right to expect from any one of its contingents. There can be no doubt at all as to the success of a conference provided every fraternal party and its leaders are aware of their historical responsibility for the destinies of our movement and realize the gravity of the present situation and the possible consequences of a split.

In upholding the idea of a new international meeting, the CC, CPSU maintains that it is indispensable not only for overcoming the differences, important as this task may be in itself. Communists should not for one moment forget their responsibility in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and national independence, for a successful advance along the road of socialism and communism.

About four years have passed since the last world conference. In this period, many important changes have taken place in the world which require study, generalization and conclusions. The socialist world system has made notable progress in the past years. Its economic power has increased, and so has its political and ideological impact on world development. Most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society. Their further advance to socialism and communism makes it increasingly imperative to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance, exchanges of experience, and coordination of political and economic activities.

Two opposed world policies are in evidence today, more clearly than ever before. One is directed towards preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence; it is pursued by the socialist countries and is supported by the majority of mankind. The other is aimed at increasing international tension and the war menace; it is pursued by the imperialist reactionaries led by the wild men of the USA and other imperialist powers. The past years have shown how very correct were the Communist parties:

conclusions regarding the possibility of averting war and isolating and defeating the forces opposed to peace.

The recent period has seen even more obvious signs of an aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, of the growth of the social and political antagonisms rending the capitalist system both within bourgeois society and internationally. There is now much that is new in the forms of organization and the methods used by the working class of the capitalist countries in fighting for its immediate and ultimate goals. The disintegration of imperialism's colonial system has entered its closing stage. The newly-free nations' irresistible gravitation towards socialism, their striving towards the non-capitalist road of development has become particularly evident in recent years.

The revolutionary movement, the champions of peace and socialism, now have new great opportunities, and we Communists should think of the best ways of using these opportunities in the interests of the working class and all nations.

We are firmly convinced that a conference would be just the place to make a collective analysis of new economic and socio-political developments and processes, coordinate appraisals and positions, and enrich and specify the common political line accordingly. We state with satisfaction that the general line of the world Communist movement, as defined in the 1957 and 1960 documents, has been proved by reality to be perfectly correct and has brought the fraternal parties further achievements. On the other hand, there is now a pressing need to meet in order to sum up the progress made, exchange experience, review the problems confronting world communism and, in keeping with the changes that have occurred in the international situation, supplement and elaborate the ideas of the Declaration and Statement, and creatively examine and solve new problems.

In the light of all these tasks, the CC, CPC proposal for putting off a new world conference for a long time is particularly unacceptable. Everything goes to show that the conference is necessary and the question of convening it should not be shelved.

The most important thing, however, as the CC, CPSU sees it, is for every Marxist-Leninist party to contribute already today, irrespective of when the new world meeting will be held, to the cause which the meeting is to serve—strengthening unity among the Communists of the world, and redoubling efforts towards common goals. At the moment it is important for every fraternal party to fight for these goals still more actively. Every fraternal party is faced with tasks brooking no delay; it must make a thorough study of the situation that has developed in the Communist movement, participate constructively in the discussion of

difficulties and in the search for ways of overcoming them and subordinate its everyday activities to the interests of the international unity of our ranks. This is the practical method for proving one's loyalty to the principles and experiences of proletarian internationalism and to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. It is also the surest way to convene and successfully carry through a world Communist forum. We are emphatically against making the question of the date of a conference a pretext for further argument and a stumbling-block to the solution of the main tasks confronting the Communist movement. However, we are emphatically against postponing a conference for "four or five years or more," which is what the CC, CPC proposes.

Such is our position on the main issue raised in the latest letters which the CC, CPSU and the CC, CPC have exchanged concerning the aims and prospects of a new world meeting.

The CC, CPC letter of May 7 deals with a number of other problems, both concerning a world meeting and having no direct bearing on it. Among them is, for example, the question of the procedure of convening the conference.

The CC, CPC asserts that in present-day conditions no one has a right to call a world conference since there is no permanent body like the Comintern. From the point of view of the democratic principles on which the Communist movement is based, it must be recognized that any party or group of parties is free to take such an initiative. In that event it is the duty of the other contingents of the Communist movement to carefully examine and support that initiative, provided it benefits our common cause. As for the CPSU, it will be recalled that the fraternal parties have placed on it a special responsibility with regard to the convening of world meetings. The decision adpoted by the 1957 meeting reads: "Entrust the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with the function of convening meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties in consultation with the fraternal parties." This decision was passed unanimously, with the CPC delegation participating. What is more, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, who spoke at the afternoon sitting of November 14, 1957, said that "it is necessary to recognize the CPSU as the party which should take the initiative in calling meetings."

We are citing these facts to establish the truth and prevent the question of the initiative in calling a meeting from being made a new point at issue and a pretext for delaying a world forum of fraternal parties, which has become urgent.

The CC, CPC, raising one obstacle after another to a meeting, writes that there is a need of "great preparatory work." Our Party has always considered that the conference has to be prepared for

carefully if it is to succeed. It is with this aim in view that we have repeatedly proposed stopping the public polemic and renouncing methods of factional activity within the world Communist movement.

Everything suggests that the CC, CPC, in speaking of "preparatory work," means something that is the exact opposite of it, namely, the intensification of factional, disruptive activities, and the utmost exacerbation of the polemic. Frankly speaking, that is, in effect, the real reason why the Chinese leaders want to put off the meeting. At a time when the struggle is becoming more and more acute, they count, as everything seems to indicate, on forming a bloc of parties and groups subservient to Peking. Another fact indicating this is that you are now openly trying to secure an invitation to the meeting for the supporters you have recruited in various countries.

Since the CC, CPC is turning the question of the composition of the meeting into another point of difference, we consider it necessary to state our attitude to it. We are of the opinion that all those parties which took part in the meetings of 1957 and 1960 and signed their documents are entitled to attend, all the more so because the differences in the Communist movement concern the interpretation of the Declaration and the Statement. Obviously, only a forum of the parties which formulated and signed those documents are in a position to interpret them correctly. Only the conference itself has a right to decide whether any new participants should be invited. In the years that have passed since the last world meeting there have arisen in several countries (including some African countries) parties which agree with and implement the general line of the Communist movement expressed in the Declaration and Statement and are the recognized spokesmen of the working-class movement of their countries. Naturally, these parties are entitled to expect an invitation to attend the new international meeting.

But when the CC, CPC poses the question of inviting new participants to the meeting, it is thinking not of these parties but of the anti-party factional groups which it has brought into being and which it designates by the high-sounding name of "parties." However, these groups to begin with do not represent the working-class movement of their countries but have been artificially set up from without. It is no chance coincidence that the anti-party groups in Australia, Brazil, Belgium, Ceylon and some other countries sprang up just when the CC, CPC launched its factional activities within the world Communist movement. Secondly, these groups do not adhere, either in theory or in practice, to the general line of the world Communist movement

defined in the Declaration and Statement. On the contrary, the views they advocate betray them completely as opponents of this line. Thirdly, they are made up of anti-party opposition elements expelled from Marxist-Leninist parties and fighting against lawfully elected central committees, against tested leaders of these parties who enjoy prestige. It is indicative of the political character and composition of these groups that they have been joined by Trotskyists, anarchists and all manner of renegades and apostates. It should be said that this type of adherent to the Chinese leadership's line is no credit to it. No matter how hard you try to represent these impostors as "true revolutionaries," they are outside the Communist movement, and nothing can give them a place in its ranks.

The CC, CPSU cannot overlook the attempts made in the letter of the CC, CPC of May 7 to defame the tested Marxist-Leninist parties of Australia, Brazil and India. We emphatically reject the unworthy methods by which the leaders of one party, the Communist Party of China, lay claim to a special position in the Communist movement, to the right to pass judgment on entire parties and their leaders and arbitrarily decide issues that are only for the working class of the given country to decide.

If you persist in this sort of "preparatory work" for the meeting, i.e., strive to extend factional activity, you will only confirm the opinion that the CPC leadership is driving headlong towards a split.

The striving of the CC, CPC to aggravate the open polemics in the Communist movement has long become obvious. The propaganda campaign started by it has gone beyond the framework of any ideological polemics and developed into an open political struggle against Marxist-Leninist parties. It has nothing in common with elucidation of the truth, with the working out of pressing problems of the theory and policy of our movement. The content, methods and tone of your statements show that you are deliberately trying to widen the area of disagreement, distort the real stand of the Marxist-Leninist parties, slander their leadership and turn the masses against it. It is patently clear to everybody that this is not polemics any longer but a fomenting of differences and enmity. This sort of thing undermines friendship among the peoples of the socialist countries, sows confusion and distrust in the ranks of the revolutionary working-class and national-liberation movement and compromises world socialism. The CPC leaders thereby bring grist to the mill of the aggressive circles of imperialism, who, as everybory knows, are eagerly helping to circulate Chinese propaganda materials.

We approach the preparations for the meeting differently. The

CC, CPSU has always held that in the course of the preparations there should be a creative discussion of important problems of the Communist movement on the basis of comradely exchanges of opinion, as provided for by the 1960 Statement. We regard a discussion of urgent problems of Marxism-Leninism, of problems of the strategy and tactics of our movement, as normal and useful. Such discussions help to advance Marxist thinking, to bring the activity of the Communist parties closer to the requirements of reality and to work out a common policy in the course of preparations for meetings and conferences. However, the CC, CPC's propaganda campaign, which is hostile to the Communist movement, in no way serves this purpose.

You threaten that you intend answering "the more than two thousand anti-Chinese articles and materials" allegedly published in the Soviet press as well as "the numerous decisions, statements and articles of several tens of fraternal parties." In other words, you plan to carry on the public polemic endlessly. That, evidently, is your objective. You started the polemic, forced the fraternal parties to give a rebuff to your erroneous views and now, under the guise of "answers," you intend to extend the political struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties still further.

The CC, CPC's proposal, contained in its letter of May 7, for concluding an agreement between the two parties to publish materials of the other side in their press completely exposes your design, which is to fan the polemics to even greater proportions.

We should like to note that while there was hope that the discussion would not go beyond a principled debate of theoretical and political issues we reprinted some of the Chinese materials in our press. But when it became clear that it was not a principled discussion but hostile propaganda we had to change our approach to this question. No Communist Party has ever undertaken to reprint, circulate and propagate slanderous materials that are alien to socialism. No matter from whom such materials come, they help only the reactionary circles of imperialism in their struggle against world socialism.

The reprinting of articles in which our country is accused of "plotting with U.S. imperialism," "betraying the revolution" and "restoring" capitalist practices would have served no purpose other than to undermine our people's feeling of friendship and fraternity for the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, who, of course, cannot bear the responsibility for the present actions of their leaders. By printing a succession of such articles, the Soviet press would have had to answer each one of them. The polemics with the Chinese leadership would have thus become the main content of our country's entire ideological

life. This would have meant diverting the attention of the Party and the people from the cardinal tasks, namely communist construction, the struggle against imperialism and aid to the revolutionary working-class and national-liberation movements. It is clear that this is something our Party will not do.

It should be noted once again that all your thoughts are directed towards further aggravating the polemics, intensifying factional activity and rejecting any collective discussion of the problems facing the Communist movement. On all questions of concern to Communists throughout the world, the CC, CPC has taken a stand that runs counter to the common interests of our movement, to the interests of strengthening the unity of its ranks.

In the light of this, the claim that the CC, CPC "consistently defends unity and struggles against a split" and that it is "making unflagging efforts to remove differences" is contrary to the facts. Under present conditions, as never before, the struggle for unity requires practical constructive action. However, your actions are aimed at hindering the settlement of the differences and worsening the situation in every possible way. The negative approach which marks the entire CC, CPC letter of May 7, and the utter unwillingness to meet the initiative of the fraternal parties half way can have only one explanation, namely that the Chinese leaders do not wish to take into consideration the opinions and interests of the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties, that they are waging a bitter struggle against them, deliberately seeking to split the Communist movement.

It is clear to all the participants in the Communist movement that the CC, CPC wants to postpone the world meeting to a remote date, in order to gain time to increase the number of its supporters, turn them into obedient tools of its policy and thereby create favorable conditions for itself at this future meeting. One does not have to be a prophet to predict the complete failure of these calculations. We have not the least doubt that with time life will prove with increasing force the indefensibility of the ideological and political platform and tactical line that the CPC leaders are trying to impose upon the Communist movement. The unseemly objective pursued by the Chinese leadership will become increasingly clear and those who have been temporarily deluded will come to see the truth. It goes without saying that the splitting activity of the CC, CPC can inflict and has already inflicted harm on the Communist movement, particularly on those of its contingents that are waging a struggle for the cause of the working class, against imperialist reaction in the difficult conditions of capitalism But each step forward in the struggle of the working class and each new success in the development of the world socialist

system will deal a blow at the erroneous and unrealistic propositions of the Chinese leaders and will prove the correctness and vitality of the Leninist line of the Communist movement.

In its letter the CC, CPC touches upon certain points of its ideological and political differences with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. Our Party has repeatedly set forth its stand on these points. We therefore do not find it necessary to return to them again in this letter, especially as your letter contains nothing new. For a long time now you have been indulging in outright abuse and in attaching labels, substituting this for an honest discussion of questions on which the CC, CPC has its own special opinion. The CC, CPSU emphatically rejects as patent slander your irresponsible assertion that the CPSU "strives for an alliance with U.S. imperialism with every fiber of its body," "opposes the national-liberation movement and the proletarian revolution" and is "plotting a major conspiracy, an open split of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement." Statements of this kind only discredit their authors, those who allow themselves to make such malicious attacks against the first country of victorious socialism, a country that carries the main burden of the struggle against imperialism. Who are these clumsy fabrications intended for? Do you seriously hope to find simpletons who would believe such slander? The real purport of your assertions is that you want to delude the masses of China, set them against the Soviet people, who are the friend and brother of the Chinese workers and peasants. All this benefits only imperialist reaction, whose cherished dream is to split the peoples of the socialist countries, sow enmity among them and bring them into conflict with each other.

With these acts you are trying to obscure the real substance of the differences that you actually have with the present political line of the world Communist movement. Throughout the world, Marxist-Leninists have long ago realized that the Chinese leaders have departed from the positions of the Communist movement on such questions as war and peace, the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the ways of accomplishing the socialist revolution, the role and ways of furthering the national-liberation movement, the struggle against the ideology and practice of the personality cult and the methods of building socialism and communism.

From all the rooftops you claim that you are irreconcilable adversaries of the ideas put forward by the 20th CPSU Congress. This is hardly something to be proud of, comrades!! You must realize that more than anything else this betrays you as people who today adhere to outdated positions, which have long been

rejected by life, by the practice of the entire world liberation movement, the entire world Communist movement. The 20th Congress of the CPSU, as is recognized by the entire world Communist movement and officially affirmed in the Declaration and Statement, initiated a new stage in the development of our movement. It has become the symbol of the creative spirit of Leninism, of a new line of the entire world Communist movement, a symbol of the change from the ideology and practices of the Stalin personality cult to Leninist principles and standards.

This was the change that laid the foundation for further successes in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism, for an enhancement of the prestige and influence of the world Communist movement, for its transition to a fresh offensive against the forces of reaction and war. The savage attacks against the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, against the propositions and principles of the Declaration and Statement are nothing more than the reaction of conservative forces in the Communist movement to the creative Marxism-Leninism of our epoch.

Evidently you do not even notice the extent to which the letter of the CC, CPC of May 7 is permeated with the ideology of the personality cult. Your demonstrative disregard of the will of the fraternal parties, your undisguised striving to avoid a collective discussion of the problems that have arisen and your methods of conducting polemics by piling up all sorts of political insinuations, of the most fantastic accusations, your intolerance and bitterness with regard to comrades engaged in the common struggle—all this bears the indelible imprint of personality cult practices.

The CC, CPC tries to cover up its departure from the general line of the Communist movement with the flag of revolution and struggle against imperialism, which is sacred to all Communists. But the real worth of this "revolutionary spirit" is shown by the practical deeds of the CPC leaders, by their entire activity aimed at splitting the revolutionary forces of our day. For example, the meaning that the CPC leaders attach to their notorious theory of a so-called "intermediate zone" embracing, besides China, the imperialists of Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Britain, has become especially clear of late. How happy the imperialists are to see signs of disunity in the Communist movement, in the socialist camp, is evidenced by their attempts to find some way of effecting a rapprochement with those who are sowing disunity. Have the CPC leaders paid attention to the fact that precisely today when Chinese propaganda is shouting loudest of all about "revolution" and a "struggle against imperialism," the

ruling circles of these powers are displaying special readiness to establish closer relations with Peking. Even the U.S. imperialists, as can be seen from many statements by U.S. officials, declare that despite the bellicose tone of Chinese propaganda China is behaving "moderately" and that therefore the United States should "keep the door open" for possible changes in relations with China.

Today it is becoming increasingly clear to Marxist-Leninists throughout the world that "leftist" phraseology of the CPC leaders is nothing but a cover for their great-power designs and claims to hegemony which are manifesting themselves more and more clearly in their practical actions in the international arena and in the Communist movement. We should like to warn you, comrades, that the road you are taking is extremely dangerous, that you are gambling with the destiny of the people of China and with their revolutionary gains.

You are trying to portray criticism of your anti-Leninist views and stand as an "anti-Chinese campaign." You know perfectly well that in all of our Party's documents special emphasis is laid on the friendship felt by the Soviet Communists for the Chinese people, to whom we have rendered and are prepared to continue rendering the utmost aid in the building of socialism. The CC, CPSU does not engage in stirring up among our people distrust and hostility towards China, towards its great people and towards the peoples of other countries.

It is precisely because we cherish the friendship between the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the unity between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China and the solidarity of the entire world liberation movement that we are not relaxing our efforts to normalize relations with the CPC, despite the fact that the Chinese leadership is demonstrating more and more openly its unwillingness to improve these relations. Our patience and restraint are explained by the fact that we are devoted to the Leninist principles of internationalism, have our eyes on the future and believe in the ultimate triumph of these principles in the socialist community and the Communist movement.

We reaffirm our stand with regard to the need for convening a world meeting of Communist and Workers' parties as a reliable and tested method of securing the unity of Marxist-Leninist parties. We suggest that we should without delay agree in principle that a meeting be convened and that it should not be put off for long, and that agreement on its exact date as well as on its agenda and composition should be reached through further consultations with the fraternal parties.

The CC, CPSU considers that at the present stage the main

effort should be concentrated on holding a preparatory conference. We reaffirm our proposal that a preparatory conference should be convened and attended by representatives of the 26 parties chosen by the world meeting of Communist Parties as members of the Drafting Commission in 1960 and representing the interests of Communists in all the main regions of the world. We consider it necessary to reach agreement with the fraternal parties on the exact date of such a conference in the immediate future.

As before, the CC, CPSU expresses its preparedness to hold a bilateral meeting of representatives of the CPSU and CPC on any agreed date. This question can be decided at any time by agreement between the CPSU and CPC.

The method of examining the problems of the Communist movement collectively is at present the only true method recognized by all Communist parties. Therefore no Party can, without breaking with internationalism, hinder the convocation of the meeting or unilaterally dictate terms under which such a meeting must be held. All parties are equal and, on the basis of the democratic principles proclaimed in the Declaration and Statement, jointly decide questions concerning our entire movement.

In conclusion the CC, CPSU considers it necessary to emphasize that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will firmly continue to follow the Leninist line laid down for it by the 20th and 22nd congresses and consistently implement the general line of the world Communist movement as set forth in the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement. Our Party and the entire Soviet people are faced with the epoch-making task of building a communist society. Together with all peace-loving forces we bear the responsibility for averting a thermonuclear world war, for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. We shall spare no effort in the struggle to accomplish the great tasks of our time.

Such, too, is the position from which we approach the matter of surmounting difficulties in the world Communist movement, and strengthening the unity of its ranks. We place the interests of world communism above all else and are guided by them in our relations with the Communist Party of China as with all other parties.

The CC, CPSU hopes that the CC, CPC will give serious consideration to the proposals made in this letter, will once again weigh all the possible consequences of the stand taken by it and, for its part, will take steps aimed not at a split but at unity with all Marxist-Leninist parties.

With fraternal greetings,

Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

June 15, 1964

FOR AN ANTI-MONOPOLY GOVERNMENT, FOR AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE WORKING CLASS AND THE MIDDLE CLASSES OF TOWN AND COUNTRY

REPORT* BY GASTON MOULIN, MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM, TO A CC MEETING

In order to be defeated, the monopolies have to be isolated first. This can be done when the working class unites with the middle classes of town and country. This is the way to power for the working class.

WHAT ARE THE MIDDLE CLASSES?

What do we have in mind when we speak of the urban and rural middle classes? A precise definition is difficult to give. It is clear, however, that these are economically the weakest strata, which do not employ hired labor; the strata most threatened with ruin and particularly ruthlessly exploited by the monopolies; the biggest strata most capable of uniting with the working-class movement in the anti-monopoly struggle.

In industry, 64 per cent of the enterprises have no hired labor. Their labor force numbers 183,125, making up 12 per cent of all workers.

In trade, 86 per cent of the enterprises are run by their owners and their families without hired help. The number of people engaged in them is 305,361, constituting 49 per cent of the total employed in trade.

In agriculture, 148,355 family farms (90 per cent of the total, with a labor force of about 450,000) do not employ farm hands.

Thus, the country has between 900,000 and 950,000 people belonging to the middle classes of town and country. They work at 500,000 enterprises.

The quantitative changes in these classes bear out what Marx and Engels said about small individual owners gradually disappearing under capitalism. The last decade has seen a considerable decrease in the number of small industrial and commercial enterprises which do not employ hired labor. At the same time, the number of enter-

*Abridged from **Drapeau Rouge**, July 1, 1964.

prises hiring from one to 50 workers has grown. About 6,000 farms —small ones, of course—go under every year.

Then there are the professions. They include over 23,000 doctors, veterinarians and lawyers, many of whom have private practices. The professionals undoubtedly belong to the intermediate strata, but their position is quite different from the position of the small shopkeepers, artisans or peasants who employ the labor of their families.

They are not directly exploited by the monopolies, but their interests are to a large extent connected with the conditions of the working class. Although these strata can be enlisted in the struggle for peace or structural reforms, they do not constitute the decisive element of the alliance which we are working to build.

The idea of the alliance of the working class and the middle strata of town and country is not new. It was politically substantiated by Marx and Engels long ago. Lenin elaborated many propositions in greater detail and carried them into reality before and during the October Revolution.

DISCONTENT OF THE MIDDLE CLASSES. DIFFICULTIES OF THE REACTIONARIES

Establishment of friendly contacts and anti-monopoly cooperation between the working-class movement and the middle classes of town and country assumes great importance at the present stage of political development characterized by the crisis of the capitalist system and the upsurge of the workers' movement.

Never before have the reactionaries discredited themselves so thoroughly as today. A shift to the left rather than to the right is taking place among the discontented masses. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the reactionaries to cope with their difficulties because of the advance of the working-class movement, which is manifested in the growing unity of Socialists and Communists in the trade unions, the growing political consciousness of the public utilities workers, the retreat of anti-communism, and the drawing together of the Confederation of Christian Trade Unions and the Belgian General Federation of Labor. To this should be added the Christian workers' discontent with the Christian Social Party.

The possibilities of the reactionaries are also limited by the change in the mood of the middle classes of town and country, whose growing discontent finds expression in a movement for immediate demands which brings them closer to the working class.

Fed to repletion with theories about the alleged advantages and superiority of economic liberalism as the basis of their independence and freedom, these masses have seen from their own experience that this system gives them neither freedom nor independence, nor yet security.

The time of economic liberalism is past. It can no longer be the basis of vigorous economic growth. Today the theories of planning and programming are counterposed to it.

The strata who only recently supported economic liberalism but were deceived by it are now tending in the opposite direction, asking themselves whether they should not look for security in structural reforms, control over and the right to be informed on prices and costs, and economic and social planning.

While reactionary demagogues from the traditional middle-class organizations hold forth on freedom and independence, the small shopkeepers, artisans and peasants are presenting other demands. They want curbs on rent abuses and protection against expropriation and against the stranglehold of the industrial trade and finance monopolies which entangle them in debts, strangle and ruin them and ultimately put them out of business.

The small peasants, shopkeepers and handicraftsmen who believed that the Christian Social Party was their sole defender, have seen that things go from bad to worse when this party is in the government, either alone or partnered by the Right-wing Socialists or the Freedom and Progress Party.

These strata are discontented with the present tax policy, the unjust social policy, the credit policy and the Common Market policy, which spells doom for the small businessman all over Europe. Consequently, the middle classes, once a traditional mobile reserve of the reactionary parties, are becoming less and less dependable.

We must clearly realize that the middle classes shifting to the Left, increasingly tend to give up their alliance with the bourgeoisie and to ally themselves with the working class.

However, this evolution is not an automatic process; it has to be assisted.

REMOVE IMPEDIMENTS TO MOVEMENT TOWARD SOCIALISM

In view of this tendency, the working-class movement should display due understanding and open the door before its new allies, for they are its friends by their very nature. This means familiarizing them with the working-class approach to an alliance with them, with the objectives of this alliance, and showing what the middle classes stand to gain from it.

The reactionaries are well aware of the danger. Seeing that considerable sections of the middle classes are slipping away from under their influence, they are doing everything possible to check the shift to the Left, on the one hand, and to retain their influence on the middle classes, on the other. They know that the active unity of the Left forces of the working-class movement promotes the unity of the middle classes with the Left forces.

ANTI-WORKING CLASS AND ANTI-DEMOCRATIC PROPAGANDA OF THE REACTIONARIES

What do the reactionaries say in their propaganda designed to lessen the discontent of the middle classes and retain them under their influence?

They allege that the blame for the plight of the small shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and peasants rests with the government, which they call a labor government and accuse of taking its orders from the trade unions. It is generally known, however, that the government, which is anything but a government of the working class, has yielded to the pressure of the reactionaries and pursues a pro-monopoly policy.

The cost of living and prices are going up, the reactionaries claim, because wages are increasing, taxes are being increased because the government is spending more and more on pensions, social benefits and holidays for workers.

This policy, reactionary propagandists say, leads to the loss of our freedom, our independence.

Brandishing the bogey of the working class which they allege gives orders to the government and is making a profit out of social welfare means, the reactionaries urge the middle classes to support an anti-democratic, anti-parliament, anti-trade union policy.

These reactionary calls are taken up by the press of the majority of middle class organizations, which are headed, as a rule, by the moneybags.

THE WORKING CLASS MUST ACT

If it is to be successful, the working-class movement must state its aims clearly and frankly and explain to the middle classes how it means to realize them.

It must therefore make it clear that it seeks to defeat the reactionaries and the monopolies and to win power, and that it wants to do this together with its allies, who have their own accounts to settle with big industrial, finance, landed or trade capital. The working-class movement must prove that its immediate program does not prejudice the interests of the middle classes, that it does not regard them as enemies.

COMBAT OPPORTUNISM AND LEFTISM

To realize this program both the demagogic and opportunist, as well as the sectarian trends in the working-class movement, all of which are opposed to a broad anti-monopoly front, must be combated.

The Right- wing Socal Democrats, who support the government's policy and make concessions to the monopolies, lavishly dispense promises to the middle classes of town and country, being prompted

solely by considerations of an opportunist or pre-election character. Having departed from the positions of class struggle, they do not regard an alliance with the middle classes as a means of fighting the monopolies.

The Right-wing Social Democrats are already talking about coming to an agreement with the Christian-Social Party after the elections. Their record shows that the monopolies have no reason to fear them. This runs counter to the interests of the middle classes.

This pre-election demagogy of the Belgian Socialist party is manifested, in particular, in the field of agricultural policy.

The agrarian commission of the Socialist Party has conducted a noisy campaign in support of the "agricultural charter" which the Socialist Party submitted as a bill in the House of Representatives, and which it is claimed offers an immediate solution of all economic and legislative problems pertaining to agriculture.

Although the bill's central idea is acceptable, in principle, it is unfeasible for the present. It does not give anything in the immediate future. What is more, it does not envisage any concrete measures against the exploitation of the peasantry by the monopolies. The very same Socialists did not support the proposal of the Communist group in the House of Representatives on control over the prices of machines, fertilizer and other manufactured goods for the farmers. The immediate demands put forward by democratically-inclined peasant organizations were also very coolly received by them.

On the other hand, the attitude of some sections of the Socialist Left to the middle classes and the peasantry and to an alliance of these classes with the working-class movement, just as the attitude of the Right-wing Social Democrats, leads to inactivity.

It goes without saying that by confining themselves within the narrow bounds of these positions while juggling with revolutionary-sounding phrases, the Left Socialists are thereby rejecting or ignoring all prospects of real, concrete revolutionary struggle and, in the final analysis, are undermining all trends towards a broad anti-monopoly front and willy-nilly grinding the axe of the reactionaries.

This can only lead to isolation of the working class, the worst thing that can happen to it, for that would make it utterly impossible for the working class to establish itself as the leading force and turn its present opponents into its allies.

Thus, it is a question of an alliance of the working class and the urban and rural middle classes and imparting a class, revolutionary character to this alliance.

IN WHAT MEASURE DOES THE WORKING-CLASS PROGRAM CONFORM TO THE INTERESTS OF THE MIDDLE CLASS?

Now let us see whether the working-class program does not run

counter to the interests of the middle classes and in what way it can benefit them.

The basic points of this program are generally known:

1. Peace; peaceful coexistence; reduction of military expenditures; "no" to the atomic weapon.

2. Democracy; structural reforms; control and information; democratic settlement of the relations between the people of the Walloon, Flemish and Brussels districts.

3. Economic and social demands.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

As we have noted already, a broad peace front has taken shape in Belgium, uniting people not only of different political and religious convictions, but also of different social status.

Are the middle classes of town and country interested in the struggle for peace and, consequently, in supporting this point of the working-class program? They certainly are.

THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY, STRUCTURAL REFORMS, FEDERALISM

Here there is an extremely topical point aimed against monopoly abuses. It concerns prices.

The idea is gaining ground in the working-class movement—perhaps, too slowly—that company accounts should be open to inspection.

Indeed, the explanations that are given for the price increases are difficult to understand; nothing is known about production costs or profits, which affect the cost of living. Hence the movement for democratic control and information.

The small peasant, shopkeeper and handicraftsman also suffer from the consequences of the monopoly policy of prices—either as consumers or as purchasers of goods or raw materials. The growth of prices of manufactured goods, fertilizers, machines, etc., is due to higher production costs. However, nobody is in a position to check upon the correctness of the prices and the size of monopoly-imposed surcharges.

Thus the middle classes have every reason to support the workers' demand for access to company books.

It is in the mutual interest of the workers and the middle classes that their representatives should meet to familiarize themselves with each other's views. The workers could explain why it is only fair that wages should be increased and social benefits extended. The peasants, for their part, would explain to the workers, the urban middle classes and all consumers in general the reasons for higher prices of agricultural products. The shopkeepers and handicrafts men, too, would explain why their prices are what they are.

Is it in the interest of the middle classes to take part in this struggle? Of course it is, and this idea is gaining ground, especially among the farmers.

As far as a federal solution is concerned, it would make it possible not only to settle the question of the relations between the Walloons, Flemings and people of the Brussels district, but also to tackle in a flexible and democratic way the economic development of the respective districts.

It is therefore quite evident that this point of the working-class movement's program for democracy and structural reforms should interest the middle classes.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEMANDS

Are the interests of the middle classes prejudiced by the workers' struggle for higher wages and social benefits, for better working conditions and guaranteed employment?

The working class is the biggest consumer in our country. If the worker has more money, trade will expand and with it the market for agricultural products.

The more leisure time the worker has, the better retail trade customer he will be. This opinion is shared by the shopkeepers in the industrial regions, who know full well to whom they owe their livelihood. We know of many instances when they sided with striking workers.

It is thus clear that the three main aspects of the working-class program do not contradict the interests of the small shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and peasants. Moreover, the latter may support this program, for, as Engels said, it will make their lot more bearable.

THE PEASANT MOVEMENT

Being producers, manual workers, farmers constitute a special category among the middle classes. They operate on their own responsibility. Accounting for only 8 per cent of the gainfully employed population, they nevertheless play an important economic role.

Thanks to the heavy investments made in the past 10-15 years to mechanize farming, increase the head of cattle, improve seed, extend the application of fertilizers and build more farm premises, they have increased production more than enough to meet the growing consumption of meat, butter and milk.

Their efforts have not been rewarded, however. With production costs going up 34.6 per cent in the last ten years, the prices have increased only 3.6 per cent. The higher production costs are connected, incidentally, with the rise in rents (39 per cent), in prices of machines (68 per cent) and taxes (52 per cent). The share of farm-

land belonging to peasants has decreased from a half to one-fourth. At the same time, their debts have grown. The considerable efforts the farmers took to boost production have not been matched by a corresponding increase in their incomes.

After 1962 there were new developments in agriculture. That year proved to be a turning point in agriculture, just as the strike of 1960-61 was a turning point in the working-class movement—and of the same irreversible nature.

In 1962, on the initiative of the peasants' youth organization supported by the Movement in Defense of Peasants and despite the position taken by the leaders of the traditional organizations, mass actions were undertaken by 60,000 Walloon peasants and several thousand Flemish peasants. Their demand—maybe not sufficiently clearly formulated—was parity. They demanded that their status should be the same as that of the industrial workers in particular as regards social welfare.

Alarmed by that movement, the leaders of the traditional peasant organizations tried to head it and contain it, in which they temporarily succeeded with the help of the government. As a result, the so-called law on parity was adopted. Imperfect as it is, it nevertheless obliges the government to make an annual survey of the situation in agriculture and submit proposals to Parliament so that proper measures could be taken when necessary, and agriculture thus be brought closer to the level of the other sectors of the economy.

That law did not change anything, naturally. The critical analysis was good enough, but the decisions were obviously insufficient, adding to the peasants' dissatisfaction with the inactivity of their leaders.

Such was the situation in which there appeared small producers' organizations which united, on the basis of a common program, with the Movement in Defense of Peasants. As a result of actions in the Verviers area, milk deliveries were discontinued. The struggle was crowned with success. It compelled the traditional organizations to adopt a favorable attitude, and milk prices were increased.

It was a rather difficult matter which demanded understanding on the consumer's part. On the initiative of the Movement in Defense of Peasants the new organizations established contact with the General Federation of Labor and the Confederation of Christian Trade Unions so as to explain to them why it was necessary to take strike action and demand an increase in milk prices. At the same time it was feared that this might lead to retail prices being raised.

On May 31, 600 farmers took part in the congress of the Movement in Defense of Peasants. It was attended by representatives of our Party as well as of the Socialist Party, the Walloon Popular Movement and the General Federation of Labor.

A resolution was carried unanimously stressing, among other things, the need to combat the monopolies through control over the prices of manufactured goods, extension of the powers of the prices commissions, and establishment of close contacts with the consumers, especially the trade unions, down to individual enterprises; the need to fight for peace, to demand reduction of military expenditures, defend democracy, and a parliament which would effectively uphold the interests of the electorate.

The stand of the Movement in Defense of Peasants served as the basis for reaching democratic solutions and for establishing unity of action between workers' and peasants' unions. This orientation is possible only given the normal functioning of democratic institutions. Indeed, the Movement in Defense of Peasants is the only organization which was founded and whose leadership at all levels are elected by direct ballot.

Experience shows how important it is to democratize the organizations of the middle classes, that the working-class movement can find worthy allies in the middle classes, that the peasantry is most favorably inclined towards an alliance with the working-class movement.

PRINCIPLES OF ALLIANCE OF THE WORKING CLASS WITH THE MIDDLE CLASSES

Thus, the working-class movement has good reason to seek an alliance with the middle classes. There also exist possibilities for practical cooperation in the anti-monopoly struggle.

It is also essential that the working-class movement determine the principles of this alliance. The working-class program alone can constitute its main basis. At the same time, the working-class movement can support all the demands of the middle classes which do not run counter to the interests of the workers or hamper the anti-monopoly struggle.

THE PARTY'S TASKS AND ACTIONS

It is in this spirit that we must determine our tasks and line of action.

Being a working-class Party whose strength lies in its Marxist-Leninist revolutionary concepts, our Party must act first and foremost in the working-class movement. Much work has to be done to convince the working class and its trade-union, political and other organizations of the importance and necessity of an alliance with the urban and rural middle classes.

This work will be fruitful only if based on practical experience. To this end, the Communists will explore all avenues to bring together workers, peasants, shopkeepers and handicraftsmen.

At the same time, the Party will support the demands of the mid-

dle classes—on the conditions we have mentioned. That is why we agree to back up a program that will improve the condition of the small shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and peasants.

★ ★ ★

This problem should be given the attention it merits. By wresting a considerable part of the small peasants, shopkeepers and handicraftsmen from under the influence of the reactionaries the working class will eliminate the means by which the latter are trying to check the advance to a workers' government, to socialism.

Our Party has never lost sight of this task, but today we approach it in a new way.

The policy towards the middle classes of town and country advocated by us is of a revolutionary character. It promotes the struggle for an anti-monopoly government relying on a broad front inspired by the working class and supported by its allies.

This is not a dream, and it is up to us to prove it.

INTERVIEW WITH MAX REIMANN

*MUNDO NUOVO** INTERVIEWS MAX REIMANN, FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

Q. The Communist Party of Germany has been illegal for the past seven years. What does the West German public think of this?

A. A broad public discussion of this question is now under way in Federal Germany.

Since the letter I sent Chancellor Erhard early in the year urging him to revoke the ban many publications and political leaders have come out in favor of such action. Prime Minister Franz Meyers of North Rhine-Westphalia, a prominent figure in the Christian Democratic Party, has called for annulment of the court decision; in his opinion this would improve the situation in the long run and be in the national interest. Prime Minister Roeder of Saar, another influential Christian Democrat, declared that it would have been better if the Communist Party had not been banned. Wilhelm Born, Chairman of the West Berlin Liberal Party, said that outlawing the Communist party had been a "blow at democracy." Olaf Radke, a member of the leadership of the Federal German engineering workers' union, described the ban as a dangerous act without either moral or constitutional justification. These are only a few of the many public statements made in West Germany indicating that public opinion is for a revision of the court decision.

Q. What effect would annulment of the decision have on European detente, security and peace?

A. It could promote democracy in the Federal Republic and strengthen the trend towards easing tensions in the world generally and in Germany in particular. All the activities of our Party are aimed at lessening tension in Germany, Europe and the whole world and building mutual understanding. Tens of thousands of German Communists gave their lives in the struggle against Hitler fascism and imperialist war. Today the German Communists, who are combating the revanchist schemes of the incorrigible extremists, are subjected to all kinds of police persecution.

Our aim is to prevent West Germany from being turned into a bridgehead of another war in which all the peoples of Europe might

---

*Mundo nuovo, weekly published by the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, June 21, 1964.

find themselves embroiled. We resolutely oppose the territorial claims of the West German revenge-seekers regardless of whether these affect South Tyrol, the Sudeten Area, Austria, Silesia, Czechoslovakia or the Soviet Union. Legalization of our Party, which would be in conformity with the constitution, would strengthen the forces working for relaxation and peaceful coexistence in Germany, Europe and the world. The outlawing of the Communist Party of Germany makes no sense whatever now that the idea of peaceful coexistence of peoples, irrespective of the differences between their social systems, is steadily gaining ground all over the world.

Q. What connection do you see between revoking the ban on the Communist Party and the reunification of Germany?

A. The road to reunification necessarily lies through the ending of tension between the two German states. The 1956 decision of the Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe which outlawed our Party declared that this was incompatible with reunification. Consequently, the decision is an obstacle to rapprochement between the two German states, to their gradual reunification. The Bonn government uses it to prevent contacts of an all-German nature and the easing of tension on the scale of the whole of Germany. The ban on the Communist Party (and, consequently, on the Communist press) was invoked recently to turn down the proposal made by Walter Ulbricht to exchange newspapers between the GDR and the FRG; since GDR publications are "Communist" they would be prohibited by the police. Similarly, citizens of the Federal Republic who wish to go to East Germany are arrested and imprisoned. Hence the court decision should be annulled not only for political but also for constitutional reasons. This would restore the legal status of a political party which has been fighting ever since 1945 for a united, peace-loving and democratic Germany and which seeks to promote good-neighborly relations with all nations.

Q. What are the chances of this being achieved?

A. In my letter to Erhard last January, I stated that the Communist Party considered the following measures possible and necessary for the gradual restoration of its legal rights:

1. An amnesty and recognition of the fact that there are no grounds whatsoever for the penalties connected with the banning of the Communist Party of Germany.

2. Extension of the freedom of opinion guaranteed by the constitution to all citizens of the Federal Republic who consider themselves Communists.

3. Guarantee of the Communists' electoral rights ensuring them an opportunity to nominate individual candidates or advance lists of candidates in conformity with the existing laws governing municipal, Landtag and Bundestag elections.

4. Legalization of the Communist Party. Consultations on this score could be conducted with the Federal government. For this purpose the Communist Party could name its political representatives and legal experts.

It is imperative to raise the ban on the Communist Party of Germany also from the standpoint of the constitutional stipulations concerning reunification policy. The responsibility here rests primarily with the Federal government. The initiative in this matter could also be taken by parliament, which could, moreover, amend the Constitutional Court act with a view to introducing a new procedural code. Such an amendment could be passed by a simple majority vote, as has been done in other cases. Prominent lawyers hold that such procedural changes are desirable from the legal point of view and could be effected already now.

FOR STRENGTHENING NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE, FOR GENUINE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND AN END TO THE DICTATORSHIP AND THE ABNORMAL SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

STATEMENT BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
IRAQI COMMUNIST PARTY (ABRIDGED)

BACKGROUND OF THE FEBRUARY 8 COUP

The Kassem dictatorship brought privation and suffering to our people. It also created a favorable climate for the intrigues of the imperialists and their agents and for the fascist coup of February 8.

The policy of suppressing the freedoms and democratic rights of the people, the unleashing of the war of aggression in Iraqi Kurdistan, the opportunities given to the counter-revolutionaries to remove patriotic elements from the army and the state machine — all this was utilized by CENTO circles, the oil companies and all reactionaries and Right extremists for their nefarious purposes. The same circles took maximum advantage of the split in the national forces, which was caused, in effect, by the imperialist machinations and intrigues and facilitated by the Kassem dictatorship.

The crisis of the regime was particularly aggravated by the war in Kurdistan. The regime could no longer survive without a radical change of policy. Therefore our Party advanced the slogan of preserving national independence and establishing a democratic regime — the main goal for which it had fought throughout the preceding years.

Taking advantage of the absence of unity among the democratic and national forces, the enemies of the people initiated and carried out a counter-revolutionary coup.

The ideological, political and economic preparation for the counter-revolutionary coup of February 8, 1963, began as early as mid-1959, when Kassem began to pursue what was virtually a policy of capitulation to the dark forces, which gradually restored all their positions in the army and the state machine and in the economic and social life of the country.

The Baath, just as any other reactionary group, would have

been unable to accomplish the coup relying on its own forces alone, without the assistance of the imperialists.

In view of the growing might of the socialist camp, the victories of the national-liberation movement and the collapse of the colonial system, the imperialists are trying to win over new social groups and political forces which advance demagogic slogans deluding the masses and camouflaging their real aims. It is on these forces that the imperialists pin their hopes of restoring, in new forms, their positions in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Arab countries included.

The Baath leadership has proved to be the most demagogic of these forces, the willing tool of the imperialsts, a sworn enemy of the democratic movement with an insatiable lust for power.

Soon after the July revolution the Baathist Party stabbed the national front in the back and set out to divide the national forces. To cover up their action the Baathists also used the slogan of Arab unity, which they never carried out in practice. Their slogans, however, failed to win popularity and were rejected by the majority of the people. Whereupon the Baath Party, bent on seizing power, replaced the conventional political struggle with conspiratorial subversive methods and individual terror. In the course of accomplishing the February coup the Baath leadership went even further and concluded a secret deal with Anglo-American intelligence services and the oil companies.

The July revolution had struck a heavy blow at imperialist interests, and the growing strength of the democratic movement in the country was the main obstacle to imperialist conspiracies. The February coup was, therefore, marked by the ferocity of methods used against the democratic forces. It was not only an imperialist, reactionary coup, it was also a fascist coup which installed in government a party that guided itself by fascist ideas. The coup led to the establishment of an armed machine patterned after the Hitler model—the so-called National Guard. One of the features of that fascist regime was that it combined notorious fascist methods with medieval barbarity.

EVENTS CONFIRMED CORRECTNESS OF OUR ESTIMATE OF THE COUP

The February coup proved beyond doubt the far-sightedness of our Party and the correctness of its view that, with the present alignment of forces in the country, any coup would be of a reactionary nature and lead to the establishment of a regime even more terroristic and reactionary than that of Kassem. In many statements, the last of which was issued on February 6, 1963, our Party endeavored to alert the people to the diabolical

plot that was being hatched by the imperialists and rectionaries. The Party urged the masses to be vigilant and to act resolutely in defense of national independence. Our Party once again warned the Kassem government that its policy gravely endangered national independence and was pushing the country to the brink of catastrophe. It called upon all patriots to unite.

When the alarm signal resounded on February 8, 1963, the Iraqi Communists took up their position in the vanguard of the masses ready to resist the adventuristic coup and uphold national independence and the gains of the July revolution. Had the national forces been united, the February coup could have been defeated.

The battles of February 8 and the subsequent days were not fought between Communists and nationalists, as the plotters and reactionaries claimed. Those were battles between our people, on the one hand, and imperialism and its servitors and agents, on the other. Those were battles in defense of Iraqi independence, of the gains of our people and all the Arab peoples. We are proud of the fact that our Party honestly and loyally performed its patriotic duty to the people by heading the resistance to the putschists and to the fascist regime. We take pride in the fact that we did not retreat and did not renounce the cause of our people when bloody terror was launched against us. We are proud in the knowledge that in 1949 our Party sacrificed the lives of its best leaders—Fahad, Hazim and Sarim—on the altar of the struggle against imperialism. In 1963 more of its best, tried and tested activists and leaders gave their lives in the struggle, among them Salaam Adel, Jamal al-Haidary, George Talloo, Mohammed Abballi, Mohammed Abul-Is, Abdul Rashid Sherif, Nafi Yonis, Yusif Salman, Mahdi Hamid, Talib Abdudjabbar, Hassan Uwaina, Elias Hanna, Abu-Said, Muhammed Alchalabi. Thousands of the Party's courageous rank-and-file members, soldiers and civilians perished in the revolutionary struggle. The sacrifices and struggle of our Party helped to destroy the foundations of the Baathist regime.

NINE MONTHS OF THE BAATHIST REGIME

Here is a brief enumeration of the biggest crimes perpetrated by the Baathists against the Iraqi people:

Ferocious terror and savage reprisals; imprisonment of thousands of people in jails and concentration camps; dismissal of thousands of factory and office workers and expulsion of thousands of students.

Resumption of the dirty war of aggression against the Kurd people; soliciting help from the aggressive CENTO circles.

Although the main blow was directed against the Communists, the Baathists intensified the persecution of all patriotic forces, parties and elements, including the National Democratic Party, the National Progressive Party, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party of Kurdistan and the Independent Democrats. As soon as they seized power, they directed their fire against their recent allies, the nationalist groups.

Subordination to the oil monopolies and postponement of the measures against them envisaged by the July revolution; suspension of Law No. 80 of 1961 on the confiscation of unused land and the law on the establishment of a national oil company. The Baathists flung the doors wide open to imperialist capital and concluded agreements with Britain, the United States and West Germany, with restrictive strings attached. They reinstated more than 260 foreign companies which had been banned after the July revolution.

Wrecking of economic and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and slanderous campaigns aimed to discredit these friendly states.

Subversion of Arab solidarity; replacement of anti-imperialist and anti-reactionary Arab unity with the imperialist Fertile Crescent plan; the attempt to surround the UAR with reactionary regimes; recognition of imperialist rule over Kuwait.

Falsification of the trade union movement.

Stopping of industrialization and construction work, which increased unemployment and raised the prices of prime necessities.

Suspension of the agrarian reform law.

Weakening and dismemberment of the Iraqi army, execution or imprisonment of its most honest elements. The striving to place the National Guard above the army.

Abrogation of progressive laws, such as the law on the rights of the individual, which guaranteed some rights to the Iraqi women, and restoration of the anti-communist and anti-progressive laws of the Nouri Said period.

Such, in outline, is the picture of actions undertaken by the fascist regime against our people. So much for the slogan of "unity, freedom and socialism"!

CRISIS OF THE FASCIST REGIME. COUP OF NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Thus, far from allaying the contradictions that had led to the downfall of the Kassem regime, the February 8 coup further aggravated them. The Baathist regime rapidly approached its end.

Despite its ruthless measures, it was unable to destroy the Communist Party.

The main factors leading to the crisis of the Baathist regime were the growing discontent and heroic struggle of the masses, the setbacks suffered by the government troops in Iraqi Kurdistan. The isolation of the Baath party among the Arab countries and internationally, and the world-wide campaign of solidarity with out people also played their part. Our people were deeply impressed by the spirit of true internationalism manifested by the Soviet Union, the loyal friend of all oppressed people, which supported our cause. Added to all this was the aggravation of contradictions among the supporters of the February coup, the withdrawal of the Baathists' allies from their camp, and the acute contradictions which flared up in the Baath leadership itself and which led to an armed conflict.

It should be noted that the various supporters of the coup were on anything but friendly terms with one another. Prior to the coup, they were united solely by their opposition to democracy and their anti-communism. Soon after the coup the Baathist clique, which controlled the National Guard, took the upper hand and ejected its "nationalist" partners in the coup. Gradually the nationalists were removed from key posts and persecuted, an act which was prompted, among other things, by the success of the Baathist coup in Syria. However, the nationalist groups refused to capitulate and tried to overthrow the Baathist regime, especially after the failure of Baathist policy, after the collapse of the plan for the unity of three states and the refusal of the UAR to support the Baathists, who cooperated with the imperialists and whose hands were stained with the blood of Iraqi and Syrian people.

It should be added that the maneuvers of the imperialists and local reactionaries and contradictions among them also had a bearing on this struggle.

Favorable conditions thus arose for overthrowing the dictatorial fascist regime and resolving the crisis in the interests of the people. However, the democratic forces were unable to take the initiative and in this respect firstly, because the democratic forces had suffered great losses during the fascist regime, and secondly, because they were not united in a National Front.

The crisis was resolved by the coup of November 18, 1963, headed by a group of military nationalist leaders which included supporters of President Nasser, and a new government was formed, which in addition to the above-mentioned group, included several pro-imperialist elements.

While the coup of February 8 signified the establishment of

an alliance of all the anti-communist and anti-democratic forces, the coup of November 18 showed that the anti-communist front was divided.

Under the impact of mounting discontent among the people and the armed forces, the November coup was compelled to direct its main blow at the fascist regime. The ultra-reactionary Baathist group, the tool of the imperialists, was removed from top government posts. The fascist National Guard was disbanded. These measures conformed with the wishes of the people and were indeed the result of their struggle and sacrifices. This inevitably led to a slackening of the terror against the people and helped to create more favorable conditions for the national-democratic movement.

Termination of the war against the Kurds was another important step undertaken by the new government under popular pressure. A preliminary agreement was reached between the government and representatives of the Kurdish revolution regarding peaceful settlement on the basis of recognition of the national rights of the Kurd people. The Aref Government also re-activated Law No. 80 of 1961 on the confiscation of unused land from the old companies and ratified the law on the establishment of a national oil company.

However, there are still many unsettled political problems. The military regime has been preserved. An anti-democratic policy is pursued. Political parties are banned. Thousands of patriots remain imprisoned. Democratic elements continue to be court-martialed. The sequester on patriots' property has not yet been lifted. Thousands of students and factory and office workers are still kept out of work and studies. Democrats are still denied passports. This is a dangerous situation and one which facilitates the intensification of imperialist activity in the country.

It is in this atmosphere that the imperialist and reactionary forces are trying to block agreement with the Kurd patriots and distort the meaning of the national rights of the Kurd people, thus creating the threat of renewed tension in Iraqi Kurdistan.

Iraqi society is a class society. The nation consists of different strata and classes, of Arabs and Kurds and other minorities having common interests in addition to specific interests which should be guaranteed and preserved. Political parties are only the vanguard of these strata and classes. All the parties which fought and continue to fight imperialism and its agents should be given equal democratic rights.

The present regime continues to rely on military dictatorship and political reaction. The country has neither parliament nor

constitution. Political parties and trade unions are banned. There is no freedom of the press or assembly. The imperialists and local reactionaries take advantage of the regime's hostility towards democracy and its isolation from the people to step up their activities and realize their own schemes. All this again endangers the independence of the country, and threatens the national cause and the democratic aspirations of our people.

FOR STRENGTHENING NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE, GENUINE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, AN END TO THE DICTATORSHIP AND THE ABNORMAL SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY, AND A REGIME CONFORMING TO THE DEMANDS OF ALL ANTI-IMPERIALIST FORCES

Our people have experienced different forms of imperialist yoke and repressions. Despite the success scored by the mass national-liberation movement (dismantling of British military bases, overthrow of the monarchic feudal regime, the beraking of the chains of the Baghdad pact, annulment of a number of unjust treaties, and so on), the battle against imperialism is only half won. The imperialists still retain important positions, especially in the economy of our own and neighboring countries. They continue to plunder our national resources, robbing us of almost half of our national income. They are the mainstay of the local reactionaries and the chief obstacle to the progress and prosperity of our people. The imperialists are the instigators of aggressive pacts and blocs directed against the peace and security of the peoples. They plot reactionary coups and support dictatorial regimes hostile to our people and all the Arab peoples. They have not and never will cease their criminal efforts to stifle the liberation movement and perpetuate the slavery of the people.

The Iraqi Communist Party reaffirms that the main task of the patriotic parties and forces of our country is to fight against imperialism, for the liquidation of its political, economic and ideological footholds in the country, for complete national independence. The Party considers that political independence is indispensable for completing national liberation and securing the economic independence of the country. Our Party, as before, resolutely opposes all views and trends which underestimate the importance of the cause of national independence and subordinate it to other, less important matters.

Our Party emphasizes once again that there is on organic connection between the cause of national independence and the cause of democracy (social and political). In order to guarantee the genuine independence of the country, it is necessary not

only to combat imperialism, but also to take equally resolute measures against the semi-feudal regime, such as abolition of old forms of land tenure and distribution of vacant land among peasants. This is social democracy. On the other hand, democratic procedure must be applied by administrative bodies, and the people must be granted political freedoms. This is political democracy.

The experience of our country has proved the untenability of undemocratic forms of government. It has shown that governments and regimes which oppose democracy and resort to dictatorship, open or camouflaged, are short-lived.

Imperialism is Enemy No. 1 not only of national independence, but also of democracy both in Iraq and in all other Arab countries. The imperialists realize full well the importance of democracy for strengthening the national-liberation movement and enhancing the vigilance and militancy of the masses. That is why they support dictatorial regimes and all measures against democracy, and disseminate views distorting the democratic essence of the party system and the principles of the parliamentary-constitutional regime. All this is being done to justify dictatorial regimes. The reactionaries claim that "the parliamentary system is imported from the West, and has proved untenable in our country." They ignore the fact that the parliamentary system is a fruit of the struggle of several generations and not the imperialists' gift to the peoples. They oppose restoration of the party system in Iraq on the pretext that it proved ineffectual, referring to the collapse of the reactionary parties which represented imperialist agents during the monarchic-feudal rule, and to the downfall of the Baath party, which sold out to imperialism.

Our Party considers that the best way to strengthen national independence would be to establish a national-democratic regime in conformity with the will of the people, through a Constituent Assembly elected by the people, and in accordance with a republican democratic constitution guaranteeing the rights of the people. The Party believes, furthermore, that our people has every possibility of implementing these tasks provided all the parties and national forces opposing imperialism pool their efforts. In these conditions the most urgent tasks facing the national movement are:

1. To put an end to the state of emergency and to the military regime, and guarantee democratic freedoms.

2. To grant the Kurd people their legitimate national rights. Cease all propaganda calling for national assimilation of the Kurds. Take steps to promote Kurd-Arab brotherhood in the common struggle against imperialism and its agents, for demo-

cracy and complete equality for the Turks, Armenians, Assyrians and other national minorities.

3. Release all imprisoned patriots, both civilians and servicemen. Abolish military tribunals. Reinstate factory and office workers and students victimized for their patriotic views. Abolish all other arbitrary measures, such as withdrawal of passports; lift the sequester on property.

4. Bring to trial all those responsible for the heinous crimes against patriots and democrats perpetrated during the Baathist regime.

5. Purge the army of pro-imperialist agents. Reinstate patriotic leaders in their previous posts.

6. Take a firm stand with regard to the imperialist oil companies. Deny any privileges to the oil monopolies. Set up a national oil company free from imperialist capital. Take measures to increase Iraq's share in the oil profits and ensure her participation in the capital of the oil companies currently operating in the country. Institute strict government control over the activities of the oil companies; put a stop to their intrigues and liquidate their spy network. Develop, with the help of socialist countries, a petrochemical industry free from imperialist influence.

7. Take radical measures to reduce unemployment, bring down prices, eliminate the housing shortage, lighten the tax burden on persons with low incomes, and combat profiteering and swindling.

8. Take serious steps to carry out the agrarian reform and annul the reactionary amendments to it introduced by Kassem and the Baathists. Grant the peasant communities the right to form associations.

9. Improve the living standard of the working class. Grant freedom to the trade unions. Provide a democratic system of social security for the workers; prohibit arbitrary dismissals and similar actions.

10. Industrialize the country and develop a state sector in the economy.

11. Pursue a policy of Arab solidarity against imperialism and Zionism. Promote cooperation with Algeria, the UAR and Yemen. Support the struggle of the peoples of the Arab principalities in South Arabia and on the Persian Gulf coast. Implement the resolutions of the conference of the heads of Arab states. Build Arab unity on the basis of democracy and complete liberation from imperialism; respect the will of the Arab peoples and the specific features of every newly-free Arab country.

12. Resolutely resist aggressive pacts. Consolidate Afro-Asian

solidarity. Work for cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and draw on their unselfish economic and technological assistance toward the country's economic development.

13. Introduce universal, direct and equal elections by secret ballot to a Constitutional Assembly which will approve a democratic constitution and initiate a democratic parliamentary system.

Our Party considers that the success of the struggle of our people for these aims will pave the way for a stable regime of national democracy, a regime which will represent a union of all democratic and patriotic forces and which will be able to ensure the fullest and most radical realization of the basic aims of the national-democratic revolution, such as general and comprehensive agrarian reform, development of the national economy, elimination of the economic strongholds of imperialism, and other important political, social and economic aims.

THE NATIONAL FRONT: THE TRIED AND TESTED ROAD TO VICTORY

The contemporary history of Iraq offers examples of major successes scored by the national movement. It shows that these successes were greatest when the patriotic parties and groups acted in common, and that, conversely, defeats were sustained when they were disunited.

The slogans and aims common to the different parties and groups opposed to imperialism, reaction and dictatorship constitute a solid basis for cooperation and alliance. Establishment of a National Front would be a major victory for all the parties and forces of the national movement, as well as for all the classes and social strata of our people. It would be a defeat for the policy of the imperialists and reactionaries, who seek to sow discord among us. It would lay the foundation for still greater victories for our people. The National Front is the key to the solution of the present crisis. It is the key to the solution of the problems facing the national movement; it is a tried and tested way to a regime representing the will and interests of all the anti-imperialist classes of the nation. Today our people need unity more than ever before in order to restore the National Front, which is a guarantee of the solution of the present political crisis in the interests of the people, a barrier to imperialist conspiracies and military gambles of the reactionaries, and a means of effecting the transition to a normal democratic life in the country.

All patriotic parties and strata must draw a lesson from past experience and take an active part in setting up the National Front as a union of all the political forces opposed to imperialism and reaction — Communists, democrats and other patriots, nationalists

fighting imperialism, party members and non-party people from among the Arabs as well as the Kurds and other national minorities. The responsibility for the choice of organizational forms and for the formulation of the aims (program) of the Front, common to all its members, lies with all these forces.

While working for the alliance of all the anti-imperialist forces without exception, our Party does not rule out bilateral cooperation with any individual organization or patriotic force. The Party sincerely stretches out a hand to all who are prepared to cooperate on the basis of all or part of the common aims.

In the Party's opinion, agreement on limited joint actions by patriotic forces in day-to-day struggles could be a preliminary step towards subsequent cooperation at a higher level in building the National Front. Holding high, as before, the banner of national alliance, the Party urges every honest patriot to do everything possible to achieve unity on a firm foundation and march forward together with our people and with the victorious movement of the Arab peoples fighting against imperialism, reaction and backwardness, for peace, national independence, democracy and happiness for the people.

Long live the National Front, the tried and tested road to the victory of our people!

Central Committee,
Iraqi Communist Party

RESOLUTIONS ON INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

NATIONAL CONFERENCE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDONESIA

DEVELOP AND CONSOLIDATE UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS OF ALL COUNTRIES

In the matter of settling differences of opinion and in bilateral meetings of fraternal parties, an attitude as objective and patient as possible, conforming with the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement and proletarian internationalism, is a preliminary condition for the holding of an internatioal conference of all Communist and Workers' parties. The Communist Party of Indonesia is firmly resolved to do its utmost to develop and strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement on the foundation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

ALWAYS MARCH AHEAD AND ENSURE THE SUCCESS OF THE SECOND AFRO-ASIAN CONFERENCE

The Communist Party of Indonesia calls for closer Afro-Asian unity and solidarity and for rallying further all the forces in each government in order to ensure the success of the Second Afro-Asian Conference in accordance with the principles elaborated by the recent preparatory meeting of ministers.

U.S. GAMBLE IN LAOS

The Communist Party of Indonesia emphatically denounces the open intervention and aggression of U.S. imperialism in Laos and urges the government of the Republic of Indonesia to render active assistance to the revolutionary struggle of the Laotian people; it insists on the immediate convocation of a meeting of the 14 countries signatory to the 1963 Geneva Agreement.

SUPPORT THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM IN THEIR STRUGGLE TO BANISH U.S. IMPERIALISTS

The Communist Party of Indonesia calls on the government of the Republic of Indonesia not to permit the U.S. imperialists to step up and extend their aggression in Vietnam, and considers that the government should actively contribute to ensuring the observance of the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

PROTEST AGAINST U.S. BRUTAL ATTACKS ON CUBA

The Communist Party of Indonesia condemns and vigorously protests against the aggression of the U.S. imperialists which violates fundamental principles of international law.

RELEASE SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS NOW

The Communist Party of Indonesia resolutely condemns the atrocities of the Verwoerd racist government and demands the immediate release of Nelson Mandela and all other South African fighters.

RELEASE POLITICAL PRISONERS IN BRITISH GUIANA NOW

The Communist Party of Indonesia vigorously denounces the British colonialists' arbitrary practices and the U.S. interference, and demands that Brindly Benn and all other political prisoners should be freed without delay.

PROTEST AGAINST THE CRIMES OF THE REACTIONARY MILITARY DICTATORSHIP IN BRAZIL

The Communist Party of Indonesia emphatically protests against the crimes perpetrated by the reactionary military regime in Brazil and insists on the immediate release of all political prisoners, restoration of democratic rights, and respect for international law.

SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE OF ADEN AGAINST BRITISH IMPERIALISTS

The Communist Party of Indonesia urges all Indonesian progressives to give every support to, and express warm solidarity with, the struggle waged by the people of Aden against the British imperialists who are aided and abetted by the U.S. imperialists.

ENSURE THE PEACEFUL ROAD*

Louis Corvalan,

GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

ENTERING A NEW STAGE

The political struggle before the elections has entered a new stage, characterized by greater possibilities for the victory of a people's candidate for the presidency and, accordingly, the development of a new crisis in the anti-democratic front bent on preventing establishment of a people's government.

In the months before the elections one can foresee deterioration of the country's economic and social position and a vigorous upsurge of the struggle of the masses for their demands — a prospect which, along with the growing popularity of Allende's** candidature, destroys the reactionaries' hope of retaining power by traditional means and drives them to desperation.

The current struggle is unprecedented for its scope and intensity. Conditions today are such that a genuinely people's government can be set up which would end the suffering of the people and not allow their hopes to be upset. The situation is becoming ever more serious. A powerful movement has arisen in Chilean society aiming to eliminate the main causes of backwardness and poverty and for ever remove reactionary oligarchies from power. Hence the imperative need for a clear realization of the alternatives of the social process in Chile.

We know full well that the reactionary classes never relinquish voluntarily the positions unlawfully held by them and that they will do their utmost to keep their privileges. It is essential therefore that during the election campaign the popular and democratic forces, all parties and leaders conscious of their responsibility for the destiny of the country should calmly and objectively consider the possible implications of the present situation.

Chile is one of the Latin-American countries with strong democratic traditions. These traditions are maintained and developed by the constant struggle of her people. This should always be

---

*Abridged from the May-June, 1964, issue of **Principios,** theoretical and political journal of the CC, Communist Party of Chile.

**Salvador Allende, leader of the Socialist Party, is the candidate of the Popular Action Front.

borne in mind. But it would be suicidal to consider this factor alone or to overestimate it. The reactionary classes are guided by their narrow interests in the first place, putting them above the interests of the nation. In certain conditions they will not hesitate to resort to subversion, civil war, terror and national betrayal.

POSSIBILITIES FOR VICTORY OF THE PEOPLE AND MANEUVERS OF REACTIONARIES

It is our patriotic duty to tell the country not only that the possibilities of a peaceful victory of the people have grown, but that there also exists the danger of an abrupt turn in the trend of events and of an aggravation of the situation.

This danger emanates from imperialism and the most diehard reactionaries. The ultra-reactionaries are dead set on preventing Allende's victory by any means or refusing to recognize it and blocking the establishment of a people's government. All their policies are designed to realize this objective. When the possibilities of Allende's victory are discussed the ultras say: "We cannot allow this. Everything else, but not this" and go on to discuss recipes and think up all kinds of maneuvers, from support for Frei* to plans for a coup, including the refusal to recognize the victory in the National Congress.

Such are the intentions of the Right. They are out to ignore the will of the people, throw overboard all democratic liberties, trample underfoot the much-vaunted representative democracy and deny the Chileans the right to have a government of their choice. The country should be aware of the danger of such an attitude.

THE ENEMY RESORTS TO FRAUD AND LIES

Anxious to find an anti-democratic way out of the situation, the ultra-reactionaries are taking recourse to fantastic inventions about the Popular Action Front and its candidate. They claim that freedom and democracy are in danger, that religion and believers will be persecuted, that families will be destroyed and children torn away from their parents, that all property will be taken over by the state and private initiative abolished, that executions will become routine. Chile is heading for a disaster, they say, for Allende's victory means communism, and communism spells chaos and death.

These contentions, with which the reactionaries deceive and blackmail certain sections of the population, are a downright distortion of the aims of the popular movement and of the gov-

*Eduardo Frei is the Christian Democratic candidate.

ernment it intends to set up, a distortion of the character and content of the present-day struggle, and of communism. The enemies deliberately resort to deception, lie and falsification, regarding this as part of their anti-democratic plans. By so doing they serve as the allies and agents of the most rapacious North-American imperialists, who keep saying that the United States will not tolerate a new Cuba in Latin America. These declarations are indicative of the United States' striving to liquidate the right of the peoples to self-determination and the principle of non-interference.

Ever since the beginning of the election struggle the ultra-reactionaries have been employing every ruse to check the popular movement. Their first attempts were aimed at amending the Constitution and the electoral laws so as to artificially divide the voters into Marxists and non-Marxists and ensure Alessandri's re-election, or at securing a "second round" of elections in which the supporters of the anti-democratic front and the Christian Democratic Party would unite against the Popular Action Front.

These maneuvers fell through. Today they insidiously, impudently and egoistically work to ensure that the joint session of the two Chambers of the Congress elect any candidate but not Allende, no matter whether he will have come first or second in the poll.*

We repeat that, considering Allende's program and the fact that he, possessing limited means, is faced with a violent campaign conducted by the imperialists, the anti-democratic front and definite circles of the Christian Democrats, his victory — even by an insignificant relative majority — will be the most graphic demonstration of the people's striving for change. It will lead to recognition and support on the part of considerable sections of the Radical and Christian Democratic parties, which also want change, being part of the Chilean people.

The present situation may change yet and lead to the withdrawal of the candidature of Duran,** limiting the choice to two candidates. Then it would be impossible for the anti-democratic front to find a common solution to extricate itself from the quandary. In the final count, the forces united in the anti-democratic front may go different ways. It can be expected, for instance, that given the polarization of the forces of the Left and Right camps the bulk of the Radical Party membership and the

---

*According to the Chilean Constitution, if none of the candidates poll more than 50 per cent of the votes, the president is elected at a joint session of both Chambers from among two candidates who received the biggest vote.

**Julio Duran is the candidate of the right-wing faction of the Radical Party.

considerable popular forces now supporting Frei will side with the candidate of the people.

In any case, whether the situation will change or not and whether four, three or two candidates will run in the September elections, Allende has a better chance. This prospect increases the danger of a coup. At the same time, it is becoming easier to divide, isolate and defeat the advocates of a reactionary, adventuristic solution.

HOW TO RESIST THE DANGERS

What is to be done in face of such a grave menace?

In the first place, the popular movement must foil these reactionary plans, especially the plans for a coup. It can and must succeed in this. A coup and the transition to new forms of struggle are not inevitable. Whether or not there will be a coup or something in the nature of a reactionary uprising, depends not only on the plans and intentions of the enemy. To a still greater degree this depends on the correlation of forces, the tactics employed, international solidarity, and other factors. The people of Chile can and must ensure the peaceful road, guarantee the holding of the elections, hamstring the reactionaries and make violence impossible.

The main thing is to ensure a preponderance of forces, to promote the popular movement, the struggle, organization, unity and political consciousness of the masses. These tasks, familiar to all, arise in every sector of the struggle, and all of them are important. Implementation of every concrete task, day-to-day activity of hundreds of thousands of fighters is essential for the victory of the people.

Ever greater importance attaches to the struggle for concrete demands. In the course of this struggle the working people not only uphold their vital rights but mature politically, learn to distinguish between friend and foe and come to realize who is in unlawful possession of power and how to fight for it, which is the main problem.

The propaganda, organizational, financial and other tasks of the struggle for the victory of Allende are becoming the pivot of all revolutionary activity. It goes without saying that, far from contradicting, these tasks coincide with the interests of the masses in the struggle for their rights. It is a mistake to appraise the mass movement only by the number of strikes and other sections in defense of the working people's rights. In addition, the election struggle is being waged on a fairly big scale today. Furthermore, what else but a broad and vigorous mass movement, the most vivid expression of the obviously political nature of this movement,

are the big meetings and demonstrations in support of Allende, the pre-election polls, and the propaganda work conducted by thousands of fighters?

Consequently, to draw new strata into the popular movement, to secure their support of Allende and thus rally the majority of the Chileans in the struggle for a government by the people means to erect a stronger barrier against which the reactionaries' anti-democratic plans will be smashed.

The conclusion is clear. Further activization, consolidation and extension of the movement is decisive for ensuring the victory of the people and upsetting the enemy's anti-democratic plans. Only the movement of the masses, the powerful pressure of the people can contain the reactionaries and force them to retreat. As yesterday, today our task is to unite the vast majority of the Chileans behind Salvador Allende's candidature, and this is quite feasible.

IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

It is also of the utmost importance to elucidate the ideological and political issues to the masses, popularize the program of the people's candidate for presidency, defeat hostile counter-propaganda, and systematically explain our attitude to the problems of freedom, ownership, religion, the family and others, so as to expose the slander and lies piled upon us by the enemy.

The popular movement has a definite standpoint on each of these problems. It is firmly resolved to complete the Chilean revolution, which conforms with the interests of 90 per cent of the population. This movement acts openly. Its parties, leaders and candidate speak outright of the need to put an end to the imperialist rule, latifundias and private monopolies and install a government of the people. The motto of this movement, "Prepare to rule together with Allende," expresses the intention to set up, not a paternalist government ostensibly for the people, which the Christian Democratic Party wants, but a government *of the people, for the people and by the people,* a government of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and middle-class employees —those who comprise the vast majority of the population and who have governed their state before.

Elementary logic shows that this government will be more democratic than any of its predecessors, that it will guarantee broad political and religious freedoms and care more than any previous government for the family and children. Also, this government will be stable and strong. It will use its power to complete consistently the changes the country needs, without ever resorting to violence to attain this end.

The people are filled with justified hatred for the reactionary castes and Yankee imperialists. But they are not guided by a desire for revenge. Otherwise they would be oriented on changing the state of things in such a way that, for instance, the big latifundists would be deprived of all their property and have to work for 500 pesos a day and live on stale bread and a handful of beans, as their farmhands do now. But this is well known not to be the intention of the Popular Action Front and its candidate. It has been stated repeatedly that not all the land of the latifundists will be expropriated but they will retain 100, 200 or more hectares, depending on its fertility, so that they could live, maintain their families and bring up their children. The position of the people's parties, the attitude of the people are this absolutely clear. Far from being vengeful, they are magnanimous and humane.

NO SETTLING ACCOUNTS WITH INDIVIDUALS

When speaking of the need to expropriate the big latifundia, nationalize the imperialist-owned enterprises, abolish the private monopolies — in short, to liquidate caste privileges — the popular movement proceeds from a conviction based on reality and the data of social sciences. These measures are essential for improving the conditions of the masses. The movement is not prompted by a striving for the physical liquidation of individuals, for settling accounts with them.

Moreover, the government fought for by the people will expropriate not all capitalists in general, but only the foreign monopoly enterprises and the big landlords, and establish control over the local monopolies. The non-monopoly national industry may rest assured that under the people's government it will be developing in favorable conditions. Let us take but one example. The shoe-making industry, which can produce 26 million pairs of footwear a year, is currently turning out only 19 million pairs. Under the people's government, the purchasing power of the masses will rise, hundreds of thousands of peasants will appear on the consumer market, export will increase, and the shoe-making industry, like many other branches, will be able to operate to full capacity. The credit and trade policy and the change in the taxation system and in the aims of production contemplated by the popular movement will benefit the non-monopoly industrialists, tradesmen and farmers.

The capitalists naturally, will be required to change their treatment of the working people. The people's government will not tolerate violations of the laws on wages, family benefits, etc.,

or any abuses and arbitrary rule. The needs of the people will be its chief concern.

History, no doubt, will continue its onward march. When, however, by virtue of the very necessity of social development and the will of the majority of the country's population, the need will arise to go farther than the aims set forth today, i.e., to advance to socialism, we hope to draw upon the experience and capabilities of many capitalists. There is a real possibility to go over then to the education and re-education of, and cooperation and mutual understanding with, the numerous local non-monopoly capitalists. We, for our part, will do everything to realize this possibility. The difficulties that are bound to arise will be caused by some of the capitalists. They will not occur through any fault of ours.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE FUTURE

Internationally, there will be no difficulties caused by us, either. To listen to the ultra-reactionaries, were a people's government to be installed in the country tomorrow, U.S. aggression and armed invasion of Chile would be inevitable. Some of them even go to the length of alleging that we seek complications with North America and that to this end we shall start all kinds of conflicts with it.

Firstly, to say that we want complications with the United States and that we shall look for a pretext for a quarrel with it, is so much nonsense. On the contrary, while being resolved not to forgo a whit of our national sovereignty or of the program of the people, we want the best relations with the United States and all countries, based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit.

Secondly, we know, of course, that the U.S. imperialists do not like the Chilean popular movement and that they will try to pursue some kind or other of aggressive policy. But that is not the only important thing. As we all know, times have changed. North-American imperialism was powerless to realize its plans against Cuba. The glorious Cuban revolution is five years old already, and there is every indication that more and more North American circles, including the ruling stratum, are coming to see that this reality cannot be changed.

The world balance of forces is increasingly changing in favor of the peoples and not the imperialist forces. There is no doubt that the revolutionary processes will be confronted with ever lesser difficulties and that revolutionary governments will have to take less and less frequent resort to coercion with respect to their enemies.

It can be said that the future of the Chilean revolution holds forth lesser difficulties for the country than those that Cuba has had to overcome. If the Chilean revolution develops peacefully — which is most likely to happen if the people come to power through elections — and even if the enemy compels people to take a different road, an open intervention by imperialism is less probable, and can be prevented.

The future people's government will certainly encounter many problems, the most serious of which will evidently be to find a way out of the economic decline and financial collapse precipitated by the present regime. On the other hand, it will have many favorable opportunities and advantages. It will enjoy the powerful support of the people and broad strata of technical specialists and the intelligentsia.

In addition, being an exporter country, Chile can rapidly increase production, for she has a market all over the world. Even such commodities as saltpeter and farm products, which are not easily marketed today, can be sold on the basis of trade agreements free from artificial and unlawful restrictions.

We are far from idealizing the future. We merely want to dispel unfounded fears and exaggerated difficulties. We also want to stress that as we develop the movement of the masses and rally our people and nation in the struggle for their new future, less and less difficulties will be encountered. This, in the final count, is the main thing.

Explanation of each of these points will help to isolate the ultra-reactionaries, defeat the anti-democratic plans, and enhance Allende's popularity and prestige.

HOW TO COUNTER A REACTIONARY UPRISING?

What should be done if, despite all efforts to prevent it, a reactionary uprising does take place after all?

We must be prepared for such a contingency as well. Not all forms of the people's retaliation can be determined, specified and made public right now. But those who are aware of the spirit of our people, their political consciousness and determination, cannot doubt that already during the electoral campaign the working class and the masses in general would, as the initial reply to a reactionary coup, stop work and go out into the streets to defend freedom and the right to have their own government. This would be a nationwide retaliation. We could also count on the active assistance of the peasantry in many regions of the country, as well as on the support and sympathies of the middle strata.

The need for a militant reply to a reactionary uprising has already been realized by large sections of the people, and this

objectively constitutes a component part of the preparation of the masses for a possible change of the forms of struggle and of the road itself, if circumstances force them to do so. Clearly, the political education of the masses in this direction should be continued.

So much for the political aspect of the problem. But there are also organizational and other aspects which demand that various measures be taken as regards both work among the masses and Party work.

The communities around the capital support Allende and constitute the bulwark of the popular movement. Their population will play an important role under all circumstances. Hence the need to devote ever greater attention to them and, in particular, to form there strong committees of Allende's supporters, drawing tens and hundreds of thousands of people into vigorous actions and resolute struggle.

The problem of self-defense is also on the order of the day. There is a serious danger that in the course of the election campaign resort will be taken to aggressive actions and the services of hired assassins and gangsters, that local organizations and their leaders will be attacked and violence used against the people. In view of this, protection of Allende's secretariat, Party offices and people's leaders must be ensured. These self-defense measures could play an important role in countering a possible reactionary uprising.

If the elections, as can be expected today, are won by the people, it will be necessary to go over without delay to enlarging the election committees and turning them into committees of defense of the victory of the people.

Besides, the masses should be vigilant towards the ultra-reactionaries and the adventurist Trotskyites and other provocateurs, whose actions dovetail, in effect, with the plans of the enemy.

The people's parties must prepare themselves to work in any conditions. Not all our comrades and, which is worse still, not all our leaders realize the need to be ready for any contingency. Some of them are over-confident that events will develop as we want them to. This erroneous attitude must be changed.

LET THE ENEMY THINK TWICE

The purpose of the above-mentioned steps, as we have said, is to resist unfavorable development and crush a possible reactionary rebellion — or to prevent this rebellion and thus ensure the peaceful road. We hope that the reactionaries will pay heed to what we say and abandon the anti-democratic plans nurtured by reckless elements. We also expect the sober-minded members of the Right groups to realize the danger of gambles.

To work and struggle the way we have indicated means not only to step up and broaden our activities, but to prepare for the most unfavorable turn of events as well. This also means to create conditions in which a crushing blow could be dealt at the enemy if he tried to direct the struggle along a different channel, and promptly turn the course of events in the necessary direction, thereby ensuring the continuity of the peaceful road.

It must be clear that we do not want violence. Under all circumstances we shall do our utmost for developments to take the least painful course. But let it be also clear to all that the people are ready to wage the struggle in any conditions.

The country thirsts for a change, preferably by peaceful means. The elections may prove to be first step. Were anybody to urge the people to take a different road, to take up arms today in order to win political power, nobody would listen to him. Let nobody delude himself. The people are ready to do everything to uphold their rights, to fight against deception and meanness, against those who would like to employ unseemly means in the struggle, against violence "from above."

It is to be hoped that this warning will be heeded also by those who want fraudulently to deprive the people of their victory by using a temporary majority in Parliament or through a coup on the eve of or after the September elections.

After this idea was expressed by various leaders of the popular movement, the newspapers *El Mercurio* and *El Ilustrado* alleged that we, in violation of the Constitution, intended to take recourse to violence if we failed to win by peaceful means.

No, gentlemen! Although we are not supporters of the current Constitution, in the given instance we act within its framework, the framework of law and tradition. If there are people who are out to abandon the normal path of development, it is you and not we.

Our policy is clear. We repeat this once again. We want revolutionary changes, which the country needs. We seek to achieve these changes by peaceful means, without bloodshed and unnecessary violence. We are doing and will continue to do everything for events to develop in this direction. We believe that as the movement gains scope and the prestige of Allende's candidature grows, the reactionaries will realize the hopelessness of their criminal designs.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR by G. Deborin $2.00

A new thoroughly documented book, based on Soviet archives.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75

393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75

404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50

735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

INFORMATION

bulletin

18

Included in this Issue

DRAFT PROGRAM OF
COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA

STATEMENT OF
COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN

JOINT STATEMENT OF CP's
OF AUSTRALIA AND CHILE

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
Publishers

FILE COPY

information bulletin - 18

contents

DRAFT PROGRAM OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA 5

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Resolution of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Martinique **33**

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF AUSTRALIA AND CHILE 35

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN (abridged) 38

COMMUNIQUE

on talks between delegations of Communist Parties of Belgium and Bulgaria **52**

INTERVIEW WITH KOSTAS KOLLIANNIS,

First Secretary of Central Committee, Communist Party of Greece **57**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

as a supplement to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, North American edition of the monthly journal, PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM, published in Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
September 11, 1964

DRAFT PROGRAM OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA

The achievement of national independence by India on August 15, 1947, opened a new epoch in the long history of our people. The national-liberation struggle, which our people conducted for over a hundred years against the British invaders, from the war of Independence of 1857 to the Quit India Movement (1942) and the rebellion of the naval ratings in 1946, had achieved success.

The achievement of Indian independence was a historic event not only for our own people, but for all mankind. The vast millions of our people, whose labor, wealth and freedom had been subjected to long years of foreign domination and plunder, were now free to remake their future in the midst of a new world that was rising at the end of the Second World War.

Taking advantage of the Hindu-Muslim division which they always fomented into a communal frenzy to disrupt the nation's independence movement, the British imperialists divided the country into two states of India and Pakistan, conferring independence on both, but in reality wishing to keep both at loggerheads with each other, to weaken the independence of both and compel them to depend on their former masters for "peace and aid."

When the imperialists were making a great show of "voluntarily conferring" freedom on India, they were at the same time conspiring to weaken her independence.

The partition of the country and the movement of millions of refugee populations from one state to another led to communal massacres. The invasion of Kashmir by the Pakistani forces was calculated to perpetuate the retention of British forces in India. Some feudal princes were instigated to refuse to accede to India and to carve out kingdoms of their own in the old feudal way. The assassination of Mahatma Gandhi was expected to sow confusion and weaken and disarray the forces of national liberation.

The new Indian government and the people fought back and defeated these onslaughts and maneuvers of imperialists and reactionaries. Invasion of Kashmir was foiled by the prompt intervention of the Indian Army and the patriotic resistance of the people of Kashmir. But the Kashmir issue, being taken to the UNO, remained a weapon in the hands of the imperialists to create tension between the two states from time to time and prevent a peaceful settlement. The princely states were abolished and integrated with the Indian Union.

The armed services were brought under Indian command and the British Civil Services were pensioned off.

A Constitution based on parliamentary form of democracy was adopted and India was declared a sovereign Republic on January 26, 1950. Elections were held on the basis of adult franchise to give an elected government to the country.

One stage of India's revolution was over with the attainment of national independence from imperialism. It had now to carry forward that revolution to a new stage, to complete the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal tasks left over, to regenerate and build a prosperous national economy and better living standards for the people and enlarge the field of democracy so that the road to socialism was opened for our people.

II

TOWARDS INDEPENDENT DEVELOPMENT

During the British rule, Indian economy had remained backward; it was dependent and colonial in character. But, in comparison with other colonial and semi-colonial countries, it had a greater measure of capitalist development. During the Second World War, the national bourgeoisie had strengthened its positions in relation to the British monopoly capital.

The formation of the national government of independent India by the National Congress meant the formation of the government of the national bourgeoisie. The aim of the Indian bourgeoisie, after getting state power and having consolidated it, was to further its own class interests by building an independent economy on capitalist basis.

The imperialists who had lost political power over India, still cherished the idea of keeping Indian economy tied up to imperialist finance and market. The monopolists of Britain and America tempted the Indian bourgeoisie by their talk of "aid" in building its economy with such schemes as the Colombo Plan.

The national bourgeoisie and the leadership of the National Congress had different ideas. Attracted by the example of socialist Soviet planning which had regenerated backward Czarist Russia into a highly industrialized socialist economy, the National Congress, since long before liberation, had progressive schemes of "planning" the future economy of India, which are recorded in the Report of the National Planning Committee headed by Jawaharlal Nehru (1938).

In January 1947, one the eve of transfer of power, the Congress government and leadership called an Asian Relations Conference to which it invited the Central Asian Soviet Republics and began

to develop ideas of Asian solidarity and friendly relations with socialist countries for future growth.

Later, the Government of India established contacts with the socialist world. It began to mobilize the internal resources of capital, the remnants of the sterling reserves, profits of the Korean war boom, even the internal blackmarket money from evaded taxes, for the purpose of economic planning and industrial growth.

Measures like the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 which reserved all the strategic industries for the state sector, the nationalization of the Reserve Bank of India in 1949, the nationalization of the airlines and of the Imperial Bank in 1953, nationalization of Life Insurance companies and gold-fields in 1956, did not accord with the policy of the imperialists as these measures sought to mobilize the initial resources for planning growth and gave the government a grip over finance and initiated the establishment of a state sector in industry. These measures were also not to the liking of the top monopoly groups of Indian capitalists, who wanted the state sector of independent India to be restricted to defense industries, transport and public utilities, leaving the whole field of industry free for the private sector (Tata-Birla Plan, 1944).

While the First Five-Year Plan had no perspective of building heavy industry, the Second and the Third Five-Year Plans took measures to establish heavy and machine-building industry along with other lines of production. Iron and steel, machine-building, power, mining, oil and gas, chemicals and fertilizers, which were the monopoly of the private sector so long — all have come into the Plan and also in the state sector. The state sector developed not only in industry and finance, but also to a certain extent in state trading.

The imperialists, particularly the American imperialists, refused to give "aid" for building heavy industry, especially in the state sector. They were not so much averse to lending aid for irrigation, power and such other items which helped to produce industrial raw materials for export.

The sabotage of India's plans for building heavy and basic industries at the hands of the imperialist monopolies did not meet with success. India approached the Soviet Union and other socialist countries for aid in building industry. Socialist aid was without any strings, was efficient and cheaper and the know-how and technical training were given to our workers without reservation. India succeeded in laying the foundations of a heavy machine-building industry, and in considerably expanding iron and steel, machine-tools, coal mining and oil industries.

In these years, apart from the growth of the state sector and

the emergence of basic industries, significant progress was registered generally in the field of industrial development. Between the years 1951 and 1961, industrial production rose by 120 per cent and national income rose by 42 per cent. Considerable expansion took place in the field of medium and small industries. Food production, which was the weakest sector of development, rose by 43 per cent.

Thus, a survey of the five-year plans and the achievements under them would show that the policy of the imperialists to keep Indian economy in a stagnant, semi-colonial state has received a rebuff. Internal mobilization of capital, labor and talent, combined with massive aid from the socialist countries in the most vital sectors of industry and trade have helped in this crucial change, breaking the bonds which the imperialists wanted to impose on our independent industrial growth. If India had remained dependent on and linked, as before, only to the world capitalist market, she would never have been able to take a step forward and pursue an independent foreign and home policy.

Without giving up her link with the world capitalist economy, if even a partial simultaneous link with the world socialist economy could help her forward so much, one can imagine how fast would have been our progress if the policies were not compromising and not guided by the class interests of the bourgeoisie.

III

CONTRADICTIONS OF THE PATH OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT

The outstanding and dangerous characteristic of the situation that must not escape attention is that all this is taking place on the basis of capitalist relations in industry and remnants of semi-feudal relations in agriculture. Despite the loud talk of socialism what is developing under the leadership of the Congress Party and its government is capitalism in the private sector and state capitalism in the state sector.

The boureoisie draws the resources for the industrial and economic development of India by laying increasing burdens on the common people, mainly in the form of growing indirect taxation, inflation and fleecing the peasantry through the capitalist market. Therefore, there is increasing contradiction between the growing industry and the impoverishment of the people. The rate of economic development lags seriously behind even the plan targets and recently has failed to keep pace with the growth of population.

The national bourgeoisie in India, in spite of its need for capital

and a reliable base for growth, refuses to nationalize the concerns of the foreign monopolists which control our foreign trade and some vital lines of production as in tea, jute, oil, etc. Foreign private investments have in recent years increased phenomenally, both due to the investment of retained profits and inflation. The non-banking foreign private investments have now reached the figure of nearly Rs. 800 crores as compared to Rs. 250 crores in mid-1948. This foreign private capital is entrenched in vital industries such as oil, aluminium, etc.

A very substantial share of India's exports and imports goes to the foreign monopolies. As a result, every year many crores of rupees are pumped out of the country as profits, dividends, royalties, allowances, freight charges, interest payments, repatriation of inflated capital and under various other visible and invisible heads. This plunder considerably diminishes capital accumulation for our economy.

The conditions on which so-called economic aid from the imperialist powers is secured hit our national interests and serve the interests of imperialism. The economic aid from the West goes largely to meet balance of payment deficits resulting largely from India's unequal trade with the West.

So long as foreign private monopolists are allowed to maintain their entrenched positions in our economy in this manner and are given even more concessions, India cannot develop fully her national economy. Nor can the country's political life be made safe from the pressures, interference and blackmail by the imperialists who function closely linked with the reactionary circles within the country.

The Indian national bourgeoisie is not a homogeneous class. It has contradictions within itself. As a result of capitalist development and competition inherent to it, there has been a considerable concentration of capital and economic power in the hands of a few big monopolists who seek to enrich themselves at the expense of the people and the other broader sections of the national bourgeoisie.

It has been noted that in the capital assets of the private sector, amounting to Rs. 3,000 crores, two monopoly houses (Tata and Birla) alone control Rs. 600 crores, i.e., one-fifth of the entire private sector in India.

Five big banks dominate the credit structure of the country. A study of 4,174 directorships showed that 44 persons held 2,000 of them and 520 persons held the remaining 2,174.

They not only hold these positions in their own private sector but infiltrate into the state sector companies and banks and use "public money" for their own personal aggrandizement and profits.

The strategic state sector itself being under bureaucratic management and devoid of democratic control, is vulnerable to the pressure of these monopoly groups who seek to sabotage its proper growth and strive to gain control over it. The growth of monopoly and its increasing grip over the country's economy have led to corruption and blackmarketing on a wide scale, rising prices and the resulting impoverishment of the people.

But the growth of Indian monopoly and foreign collaboration deals in recent years have not succeeded in halting the process of India's independent economic development. That development has continued, though the threat to such growth has increased and it would be a grave mistake to underestimate or ignore it.

IV

CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE

The condition of the people, in spite of growth in production, has not improved materially as most of the increasing wealth is being concentrated in the hands of the exploiting classes. The working class, the peasantry, the middle classes and even the small and medium entrepreneurs and businessmen are hit by the policies of the government and the growing domination of the monopolies. The discontent of the toiling people finds expression in various forms of struggle.

Not only total production, but also the productivity of the worker has increased. Yet his share in the increasing wealth has fallen, while that of his employers has risen. The rise in price depresses the real wages of the worker. When he fights and succeeds in getting a wage rise, it proves to be unstable due to rising prices of essential goods.

During these last few years, the working class has succeeded in forcing the employers and government to introduce some order and standard in the anarchy of wages prevailing in the capitalist system by means of wage boards, commissions, tribunals, tripartite conventions and collective bargaining. Sickness insurance, provident fund schemes, holidays with pay have been secured in organized industries. A well-defined national minimum wage has been accepted as being necessary. The organized strength of the trade unions and the striking power of the working class have increased.

Yet, for securing the implementation of all these gains, the worker has had to pay a high price in sacrifices and struggles. The right of recognition to trade unions and collective bargaining can still be denied by the employers at their will. While the worker is forced to accept his obligations to production, the em-

ployer can deny his with impunity. While employment has risen with the establishment of new factories, unemployment is growing faster, thus depressing the living standards of families of the working people.

Trade union rights which are the essence of democracy have no sanctity and are violated on the slightest pretext by the employers. In government establishments and factories, even established laws and practices are not observed. The result is that industrial peace is disturbed and workers have to resort to strikes and other forms of action to protect their interests.

Millions of our peasants live in appalling poverty and backwardness. Despite the Acts abolishing landlordism, three-fourths of the peasantry have practically no land of their own to work on. Legal limitation on rents, provision of credits and loans, development of irrigation and other facilities have brought some relief to a certain strata of the peasantry. But the high taxes of the state and the expropriatory activities of the capitalist market often nullify these gains.

The agricultural laborers and poor peasants have no certainty of work or a living and in many backward areas they are treated no better than serfs.

The middle classes in the towns are faring hardly any better. High cost of living and declining living standards are their lot too. In recent years, the number of middle-class unemployed has grown considerably. The middle-class wage-earners in government services, private offices, banks, commercial concerns, newspapers, schools, colleges and the like are faced with the same problems of life as the industrial worker.

The large mass of the urban and rural intelligentsia, especially the youth, is suffering from growing high costs and the inadequacy of higher educational and cultural facilities, in science, technology and the arts. And not all those who are lucky in getting such necessary education get jobs due to low rate of industrial and economic growth.

Even many industrialists, manufacturers, businessmen and traders are hit by the policies of the present government and by the operation of the foreign and Indian monopolies and big financiers. Allocation of raw material, transport facilities, import-export and capital issue licences are made by the government and bureaucrats in such a way that the cream of capitalist development falls to the share of big business.

V

AGRARIAN QUESTION

Agriculture constitutes the major sector of our national econ-

omy, accounting for 46.8 per cent of the national income. As much as 69.5 per cent of the total population derives its livelihood from agriculture, which covers 324 million acres of cultivated land while 60 million acres of cultivable land are lying fallow.

Independent India inherited from the British rule a backward and decaying agrarian system which, despite the growth of commodity production and money economy that took place during the British regime, remained under the domination of feudal landlordism and a variety of other semi-feudal vested interests. The main features of this agrarian system were:

1) a rack-rented, pauperized and resourceless peasantry which was the victim of triple exploitation of heavy rents and taxes, usurious rates of interest and a price mechanism which fleeced it both as a producer and consumer;

2) primitive methods of cultivation with an extremely low level of yield per acre;

3) very poorly developed means of irrigation and the almost complete dependence of crops on the monsoon and other seasonal vagaries;

4) total absence of modern credit facilities and the subjection of the mass of peasantry to the usurious exactions of moneylenders; and

5) total absence of any direct state aid to the peasantry for developing agricultural production. It is patent that such a system, which imposed heavy shackles on the forces of agricultural production, brought about a continuous fall in purchasing power of the peasantry and thereby seriously curtailed and restricted the home market, could not serve as a base for the economic development of the country after independence.

The national bourgeoisie, having secured state power, set itself the task of putting the country on the path of independent capitalist development. This development could not take place without the initial reorganization of agriculture, which had to be lifted out of its age-long backwardness and freed from the shackles of feudal vested interests if the needs of a growing industrial economy in respect of food and raw materials were to be met.

The main aim of Congress agrarian legislation has been to replace semi-feudal relations and forms of production in agriculture by capitalist relations and capitalist forms of production. In pursuance of this general aim the Congress governments have substantially curbed feudal vested interests through various legislative measures; they have enacted laws for tenancy reforms, for imposing ceilings on landownership, for the consolidation of land holdings, for minimum wages to agricultural laborers, etc. The enactment of these anti-feudal measures has gone hand in hand

with conscious efforts to develop and foster a class of rich peasants and capitalist landlords who could become the backbone of the new capitalist agrarian set-up and who, with state aid, could expand production, adopt modern techniques, develop money crops as raw materials for industries, build and sustain cooperative credit institutions, etc. But it is important to note that the ruling national bourgeoisie, being itself an exploiting class, did not pursue these aims on the basis of an all-out offensive against the semi-feudal vested interests, but through a process of compromise with and concessions to the latter. Hence, Congress agrarian reforms did not bring about a radical transformation of the agrarian set-up in the interests of the mass of the peasantry. On the other hand, while effecting certain changes in the old order, they left a considerable scope for the semi-feudal exploiting interests to maintain and rehabilitate themselves under various legal and other devices. In most cases, the positive aspects of the legislation were conteracted by negative developments arising out of certain loopholes left in the legislative measures themselves. No wonder that in the totality the gains of agrarian legislation under Congress rule have been partial and limited, being confined mainly to the upper strata of the rural population, while a large section of the toiling peasantry still lives in conditions of gross poverty and is subject to multifarious forms of semi-feudal exploitation.

To sum up, the net effect of Congress agrarian legislation has been as follows:

1. Statutory feudal landlordism has been abolished in the erstwhile zamindari* areas, but in such a manner that strong semi-feudal survivals still persist. They are are also there in the erstwhile ryotwari areas. The stranglehold of usurious loans has not been broken.

2. In spite of the abolition of statutory landlordism and various tenancy laws, a considerable concentration of land in the hands of landlords still exists.

3. Capitalist relations in agriculture have grown and a certain development of cultivation by modern methods has taken place, though this is restricted to a small strata of rich peasants and big landholders.

4. The economy of the bulk of the self-cultivating peasantry has not improved and continues to be a deficit economy on ac-

---

*The zamindari and ryotwari land rent and tax systems were introduced by the British at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The former was designed to harness the large-scale feudal land holding system to serve the interests of the colonialists, while the latter was devised to achieve the same end in relation to the small feudal and communal holdings. The zamindari system became widespread in Eastern and Central India, and the ryotwari system in the West and the South. The term "zamindari" sometimes designates landlord tenure, and "ryotwari," peasant holdings.

count of the continuation of semi-feudal burdens and the exploitation of the producers through the market.

5. The number of agricultural laborers has grown as a result of mass evictions in the course of the agrarian reforms introduced by the Congress and the general impoverishment of the peasantry.

The stranglehold of commercial and financial interests over the rural market during the last several years has been tightened enormously. The price mechanism and market manipulations deprive the peasants of whatever little benefits they secure on account of land reforms and technological development. The peasant is fleeced by commercial capital, both as a producer and as a consumer. Utter instability of agricultural prices makes agricultural operations a gamble in which the producer invariably loses to big business. Violent fluctuations in the prices of commercial crops often bring ruin to millions of cultivators. Hence the question of remunerative and stable prices of agricultural produce has assumed great importance for all sections of the peasantry. It is in this context that the question of state-trading in foodgrains has assumed urgency. The failure of the Congress governments to introduce state-trading in agricultural commodities has not only strengthened big speculators and hoarders but has thrown the mass of the peasantry to the tender mercies of commercial and financial sharks.

The agrarian policies of the national bourgeoisie are now in a state of crisis. All its vacillations, weaknesses and compromises in favor of the rural and urban propertied classes are now coming home to roost.

The solution of the agrarian problem, which directly affects the interests of the vast majority of our population, is of the utmost importance for the national regeneration of India. Without radical agrarian reforms, it is impossible to solve the food problem and accelerate the economic growth of the country. Hence a clean break has to be made with the past by reorganizing our vast agricultural sector, eliminating all feudal and semi-feudal survivals, breaking up the concentration of land through the imposition of real ceilings and distributing surplus land to the landless and land-hungry peasants, enabling the peasants through abundant state aid and cooperative effort to use modern techniques and develop production, nationalizing banks and other credit institutions, supplying cheap long-term credit to the tillers, breaking up the monopolistic trading interests in agricultural produce, ensuring stable and remunerative prices for the peasants both as producers and consumers and guaranteeing an adequate living wage to agricultural workers. The Communist Party, the party of the working class, will bend all its energies for bringing about these radical trans-

formations in the agrarian life of the country. Basing itself on the agricultural laborers and poor peasantry and uniting all sections of the peasantry in their struggles, the Communist Party will leave no stone unturned in thus putting the toiling millions of our countryside on the high road to a new life of prosperity and freedom.

BOURGEOISIE AND THE STATE

The state in India is the organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole.

In the formation and exercise of governmental power, the big bourgeoisie often wields considerable influence.

The national bourgeoisie compromises with the landlords, admitting them in governmental composition, especially at the state levels and giving them concessions at the cost of the peasantry.

In spite of the bourgeois class character of the state, the ushering in of the bourgeois democratic state was a historic advance over the imperialist-bureaucratic rule over our country.

The Constitution of the Republic of India provides for a parliamentary democracy based on adult franchise and certain fundamental rights for the people and directive principles for the state.

Although the Constitution provides for certain fundamental rights, the people can exercise them only to a limited extent. Many of these rights are misinterpreted, distorted and even violated by the authorities of the estate in favor of the exploiting classes. Freedom of assembly is denied to whole areas and regions embracing lakhs of people. The violence of the state organs becomes particularly brutal against the workers, peasants and other toiling and common people when they act in defense of their rights and demands in a resolute manner.

Even with these limitations, the existence of these rights in the Constitution can be made the platform and instrument of the struggles of the people for enlarging democracy and defending their interests.

Although a form of class rule, India's present parliamentary democracy has enabled the people to a certain extent to fight the distortion of that class rule in the direction of autocracy in the service of reactionary monopoly and landlord interests. India's Parliament has provided a forum for the people to intervene in the affairs of the state in a measure and to voice the cause of peace, national freedom and democracy, to counter imperialist conspiracies and for demanding social transformations in favor of the people such as land reforms, working class rights, curb on monopolies, etc.

Within the national bourgeoisie itself, as the top monopolist groups get more and more differentiated from the rest of the bour-

geoisie, a struggle grows among the various sections to get hold of the parliamentary machine in order to wield power over the budget and other economic measures, laws and policies and to shape them in their own particular group interests.

The influence of foreign monopoly interests is also felt in these developments, in which they generally support those monopoly groups and princely feudal circles who demand measures that facilitate the entry of foreign capital in the country, who demand curtailment of the state sector and the abandonment of non-alignment.

The monopolist groups and feudal circles represent the main anti-democratic forces of reaction in the country. Their constant effort is to exercise pressure to shift Parliament and government policies to the right. Hence they oppose extension of democracy, support restrictions on parliamentary democracy and promote bureaucratic authoritarianism.

Hence the democratic and socialist forces back the strengthening of the state sector and its democratic control and parliamentary democracy.

Since there is no right to recall, the masses have no means to intervene immediately when their elected representatives are found going against their interests, except through the five-yearly elections. The elections under the capitalist regime, however free they may be, are intrinsically loaded against the toiling masses as the press is controlled by monopoly interests, the ruling party is influenced by the millionaires' donations to the election funds.

Under such conditions, only extra-parliamentary mass struggles become the effective vehicle of influencing and changing the course of parliamentary policies in favor of the masses and against the monopolists, which in effect means the defense of democracy and Parliament itself.

One of the most important problems which Indian democracy had to face on the attainment of national independence was the refashioning of the state structure in a manner which would ensure democracy and opportunities of economic and political development in equal measure to all the constituent units of the Indian nation — units distinguished by their well-defined territory, developed language, history and cultural features.

After independence, the leadership of the Congress was expected to remodel the state structure of Republican India on the basis of the linguistic principle, granting full autonomy to the states so formed. The national bourgeoisie abolished the princely states and merged them in the Indian Union. But, under the influence of the shortsighted and reactionary monopolist groups, it refused to reconstitute all the states on a linguistic basis and to

redraw their boundaries on the basis of contiguity and taking village as the unit. The solution of the problem came ultimately, though haltingly, under the stress of the struggle of the democratic masses of Andhra, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Gujarat and has even now left some unsolved problems.

The Communist Party has always stood for the formation of linguistic states, for regional autonomy for the tribal people, in their majority areas, ensuring equal opportunity for development and democracy to all the constituent units of the Indian Union. The Communist Party stands for the complete eradication of untouchability and caste discrimination.

Although our structure is a federal one, practically all power and authority is concentrated in the Central Government. The constituent states of the Indian Union enjoy limited autonomy and power. This restricts their rapid economic and cultural growth.

The administrative system being based on a highly centralized bureaucracy, power is concentrated at the top and exercised through privileged bureaucrats who are divorced from the masses and who obediently serve the interest of the exploiting classes. As these classes in their competition utilize their power of money to influence the administrative organs for their private gain, there is a tendency for corruption to taint the highest circles of authority and the lower circles follow suit.

Local organs of self-government, which are supposed to draw the masses into direct administration of local problems and development and thereby provide a democratic correction to bureaucratic centralization, are themselves made subject to the dictates of high officials with their control over revenues, advances and loans for the work of the panchayats and their constructive activities.

The limitations of parliamentary democracy that exist arise from the class role of the bourgeoisie. With the growth of monopoly and right reaction, a new threat arises aimed at undermining even the existing democratic liberties and parliamentary democracy as a whole.

It is the right reactionary forces which undermine the parliamentary system, both from within and without, by making it an instrument to advance their narrow class interests and repress the toiling masses. The Communist Party defends the parliamentary and democratic institutions and strives to preserve and develop them further, to make democracy full and real for all.

VII

FOREIGN POLICY

The foreign policy pursued by the Government of India is, in

the main, a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. It conforms to the interests of the national bourgeoisie, meets the needs of India's economic development and reflects the sentiments of the mass of people of India. It is sometimes vitiated by lapses and compromises, but as a whole the main character of the policy has been generally preserved.

Disillusionment with Anglo-American imperialist policy with regard to India and other Southeast Asian countries, the growing contradictions between the consolidation of independence and independent development of national economies of young countries and the neo-colonialist ambitions of imperialists, the self-confidence and strength born out of the consolidation of the Indian state structure, the rising tempo of the national-liberation movement in Asia and Africa, the weakening and retreat of imperialism and the mounting strength of the socialist world, brought about a new turn in India's foreign policy. The policy of non-alignment was positively formulated. There was the famous Panchsheel Pact with the People's Republic of China in 1954 and the Bandung Conference in 1955. Friendship with the socialist countries began to be developed and economic cooperation with them on the basis of equality and mutual benefit followed. The policy of anti-colonialism was demonstrated in the forthright condemnation of the imperialist invasion of Egypt and unequivocal support given in the UNO to the resolution on anti-colonialism and the liberation of all colonial countries. The government voiced support for peace and peaceful cexistence, for general and complete disarmament, for the banning of atomic weapons and for Afro-Asian solidarity.

The policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism was strengthened further when India took military action in December 1961 to liberate and recover her territory of Goa, Daman and Diu, from the four-hundred-year-old occupation of the Portuguese imperialists who refused to yield to negotiations. The Anglo-American imperialists disapproved of these actions of India, while the socialist camp and newly-liberated countries supported the government and people of India in their just action. The policy that was pursued strengthened the forces of peace and anti-colonialism and earned for India a high place in the peace-loving countries of the world.

The imperialist disapproval of India's policy is also seen in their encouragement to Pakistan in its aggressive attitude towards Kashmir and its claim to that state of the Indian Union. The imperialists support the policy of creating a hotbed of tension in Kashmir by befriending Pakistan in the Security Council. As a result, Pakistan refuses to agree to India's repeated proposal for a pact of friendship, non-aggression and peace.

The Chinese invasion of October 1962 gave a rude shock to the

Indian people. The anger of the people was sought to be used by extreme right reaction to attack India's policy of non-alignment. Nehru himself was assailed and his resignation demanded since he was the main architect of this policy. Immense pressure was put on Prime Minister Nehru to give up the policy of non-alignment and sign a defense pact with the Anglo-American imperialists.

Thanks to the firm stand taken in defense of the policy of non-alignment by Nehru backed by the Indian people, the correct positions taken by the Communist Party of India in regard to national defense, the settlement of the Cuban crisis which averted world war, the friendly attitude of the USSR and other socialist countries towards India and the ceasefire by the Chinese after a short-lived advance, India's foreign policy survived the severest crisis it ever faced.

But Chinese aggression had so strengthened the political onslaught of right reaction that for some time they were able to weaken the policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism.

The main opponents of India's foreign policy are certain monopoly capitalist circles having strong links with Anglo-American capital and the remnants of the feudal princely order who go with them. These circles often get support from the right-wing inside the Congress. Thus they are in a position to attack it, both from within and outside the Congress, and exert pressure on government for a shift towards a close alliance with the Anglo-American bloc.

As a result of these pressures, there are often serious vacillations on the part of the Congress government, which are not in conformity with India's general foreign policy. The democratic forces must exercise vigilance and mobilize the masses in broad peace and solidarity movements to counteract these pressures and to prevent these weaknesses and vacillations in India's foreign policy.

The policy of non-alignment, peace and anti-colonialism has strengthened India's political independence and also enabled her to obtain resources from friendly countries for peaceful economic construction. The policy of non-alignment is a positive and progressive policy of all non-socialist newly-liberated countries and its main strength is derived from the existence and support of the socialist camp in the new epoch, when socialism is becoming the decisive trend in world history and when imperialism is finding it increasingly difficult to subvert independence attained by its former colonies.

Progressive forces in the country continue to defend this policy and combat reactionary pressures against it.

VIII

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION AND THE PATH FORWARD

Which path should India take in order to complete the national democratic revolution, to wipe out all legacies of the former imperialist rule, develop industry and agriculture rapidly, abolish unemployment, raise the incomes and standards of living of the masses, help their cultural advancement and take the country forward to a bright, happy future?

Life itself teaches our people that they cannot free themselves from exploitation, poverty and hunger, along the path of capitalist development which India is following at present.

The people's urges for rapid progress and for a better life are seen in the tremendous popularity of the ideas of socialism. Socialism goes on influencing and radicalizing the minds of our people chiefly by its economic and other achievements. No wonder, even bourgeois politicians today are constrained to use socialist slogans. The ruling Congress party has even proclaimed the establishment of a "socialist state" as its goal.

The example of the socialist countries in successfully solving problems similar to the ones we are facing, the possibility of drawing on the varied and increasing assistance from socialist countries for India's rapid industrialization and development, the general discrediting of capitalism and our people's own painful experience of it, the growing force of attraction of socialist ideas among the masses, the advance of the democratic movement and the increasing role of the working class in the political life of the nation — all this shows that both external and internal factors favoring the development of our country on non-capitalist and democratic lines are growing.

The Communist Party believes that rural socialist reconstruction of society, which is free from capitalist crisis, can be built by applying the scientific and universal truths of Marxism-Leninism to Indian conditions.

The basic requisites of socialism are the social ownership, control and management of the main means of production, exchange and distribution, and the establishment of a state of workers, peasants and the middle classes headed by the working class. The Communist Party of India declares that this is the goal of India's future economic and political development. It leads the working people to the establishment of a proletarian statehood, a real, genuine democracy for carrying out socialist transformation.

In order to embark on the socialist road and begin the construction of a socialist society, India has, however, to go through the

stage of completing the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution.

As the development proceeds along this path, it is not capitalism or capitalist relations as such which will be the immediate target of attack and elimination.

FIRST and foremost, the grip of foreign monopoly capital on our economy will be completely eliminated.

SECONDLY, a state sector, independent of foreign monopolies and functioning on a democratic basis, will be expanded and strengthened as a powerful lever for building a self-reliant national industry and economy.

THIRDLY, the growth of Indian monopoly groups will be effectively curbed and their economic power broken.

FOURTHLY, the power of landlord and feudal remnants will be completely eliminated; radical agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasantry will be carried out and the grip of usurious, trading and bank capital on our agriculture will be removed.

This will open up for our people a path of development which, through far-reaching reforms, unshackles the productive forces in industry and agriculture, ensures rapid economic growth, rising living standards of the masses and their active participation in the production. This will create the pre-requisites for putting our country on the road to socialism in the next stage. This intervening stage can be described as the stage of non-capitalist path of development.

What are the classes interested in carrying through this program?

FIRST and foremost, the working class, which stands for the complete and consistent carrying out of this program and which has already begun to rise in countrywide mass actions, demanding the implementation of some of the items of the same.

SECONDLY, the broad masses of the cultivating peasants, including the rich peasants and the agricultural laborers. The completion of the radical agrarian reform in the interests of the peasantry, as well as other democratic reforms given in the program will unshackle the productive force of the cultivating peasantry and enable fuller employment of labor power of the landless peasants and agricultural workers, ensuring steady rise of agricultural production and of the living standards of the rural masses.

THIRDLY, the rising class of urban and rural intelligentsia which is suffering from unemployment, impoverishment and inadequate facilities for educational and cultural development under the present dispensation.

FINALLY, the national bourgeoisie, excluding its topmost monopoly sections, which is objectively interested in the accomplish-

ment of the principal tasks of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, without which, it knows, truly independent national economy cannot be built, nor backwardness and impoverishment eradicated.

Thus, in order to create the instrument for implementing the program we will have to build a National Democratic Front, bringing together all the patriotic forces of the country, viz., the working class, the entire peasantry, including the rich peasants and agricultural laborers, the intelligentsia and the bulk of the non-monopolist bourgeoisie. Such a front is not in existence today, when not only the national bourgeoisie but a considerable section of the democratic masses are behind the present policies of the ruling party, while another section of the democratic masses is fighting for bringing about a leftward turn in these policies in the direction of the program. Such a National Democratic Front will arise and take shape in the course of overcoming this main rift among the democratic masses. It will be forged in the course of countrywide national mass movements and struggles, which are aimed at isolating and defeating the forces of right reaction seeking to subvert national policies, which strive to bring about changes in government policies and radical reforms necessary for the implementation of the above program.

The working class, forging the unity of its class organizations, will have to take the initiative in launching this national mass movement. Its struggle for the defense and betterment of its living standards, for democratic measures like the nationalization of banks, oil monopolies and foreign trade, and for the expansion and democratization of the state sector will form a vital part of this national movement.

This national movement will attain its countrywide sweep and striking force when it embraces the broad mass of peasantry and the agricultural laborers in the vast rural areas. The struggles of the broad masses of the cultivating peasantry for consistent and thorough completion of agrarian reforms eliminating feudal survivals, for putting peasant economy on a sound footing, for ensuring protection from the exploitation by trading and usury capital, for the expansion of credit facilities and the increasing use of the modern technique; as well as the struggles of the landless peasants and agricultural laborers for fallow and surplus land, for minimum living wage, for setting up state farms and other rehabilitation schemes for scheduled caste and Adivasi landless — all these struggles of the broad rural masses have a national significance. Their struggles for these demands are not only for raising their living conditions but also for the raising of the country's agricultural production, for eliminating the recurring food crises

and for creating a reliable base for our expanding industrialization.

On the working class in the cities and urban areas rests the responsibility to assist the peasants and the agricultural workers to build their mass organizations and to develop their struggles as a part of the national campaign. This will bring into being the worker-peasant alliance, which, together with the mobilization of the middle classes and the intelligentsia will be the main driving force behind the National Democratic Front.

The national movement will, of course, embrace the broad-based campaign for strengthening India's independent foreign policy of non-alignment, peace, anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, for establishing relationships of friendship and cooperation with all countries, and especially socialist countries, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, for defending India's sovereignty and territorial integrity, for solving outstanding disputes with neighbors like Pakistan through peaceful negotiations and without interference of imperialism.

Developing out of the joint actions of the mass organizations of workers, peasants, employees and agricultural workers, as well as of the Communist Party and other left and socialist parties, the National Democratic Front will draw into its ranks not only the masses following the Congress but also its progressive sections.

As the National Democratic Front becomes ever more broad-based, militant and powerful in the course of the rising tempo of the mass movement, it is able to isolate and defeat the forces of reaction, paralyze the right-wing inside the ruling Congress Party and to enforce decisive leftward shifts in government policies. There arises a shift in the balance of forces in favor of the democratic front. The victorious National Democratic Front is in a position to form its own government and create its own state, the state of national democracy, representing the fighting alliance of all the patriotic and democratic elements in the country pledged to carry out its program.

This state of national democracy will be qualitatively different from the present state which is a state of bourgeois democracy, representing the interest of the entire bourgeoisie, including its right-wing, and pursuing a vacillating and compromising policy vis-a-vis the forces of reaction. The state of national democracy, on the other hand, will be an organ of struggle against these forces, and will break the power of monopoly groups and utterly rout the feudal elements.

National democracy also differs from the state of people's democracy, which we had put forward as our central slogan in our Program of 1951. The class composition, as well as the program which were put forward for people's democracy in our 1951 docu-

ment, are about the same as put forward for national democracy here. The difference consists in this that, in a people's democracy the alliance of the patriotic classes is under the exclusive leadership of the working class. In the case of national democracy, the leadership of the alliance of the patriotic classes is shared between the national bourgeoisie and the working class.

The slogan of setting up the National Democratic Front and later the government of the NDF — the state of national democracy — has today the greatest mobilizing force. That is why we make it the central slogan of this period.

The state of national democracy, which will arise on the crest of the national mass movement, will be an instrument of the National Democratic Front. Such a government, including the national bourgeois elements, and acting under the constant pressure of the national mass movement from below, will be forced to act unitedly and implement the program of national development in a non-capitalist way, i.e., eliminating foreign monopoly, curbing Indian monopoly groups, carrying through radical agrarian reforms, extending democracy to ensure the active participation of the working class in the economic and political life of the country. In this process the balance continuously shifts in favor of the working class and the worker-peasant alliance, paving the way for the strengthening of the leadership of the working class in the state and thus creating the conditions for transition to the stage of construction of socialism.

IX

POLITICAL PARTIES

The Indian National Congress, the party of the Indian bourgeoisie, is the ruling party today. The role it played in leading the struggle for national freedom and in taking measures to consolidate independence under Pandit Nehru's leadership has given it a big mass base, which extends to all classes, including big sections of the working class, peasantry, artisans, intellectuals and others.

The influence of the Congress, though much less than what it was in the days of the freedom struggle, is still vast and extensive. Thus the Congress has been and is still a very important factor in the political life of the country.

The division between the masses that follow the Congress and the masses that follow the democratic opposition is the most important division in our democratic forces today.

The bourgeoisie not being a homogeneous class, its contradictions reflect themselves within the Congress and in government

policies also. Furthermore, the contradictions between the anti-people policies of the Congress governments and the interests of the masses, expressed in mass discontent and struggles—accentuate the political divisions inside the Congress.

As a result, differences on policies and governmental measures are growing inside the Congress. For instance, there are differences on such vital issues as foreign policy, aid from socialist countries, conditions for the import of foreign monopoly capital, nationalization of banks, price control, state-trading in foodgrains and the implementation of land reforms.

Centering around these differences, progressive and reactionary trends inside the Congress are in the process of formation. There is no question of building a general united front with the Congress as a whole because the Congress also includes reactionary elements. Nevertheless, no National Democratic Front would be real unless the vast mass following of the Congress and the progressive sections of the Congress at various levels take their place in it. It is the task of the Communist Party to make ceaseless efforts to forge unity with the progressive forces within the Congress directly and through common mass movements for the realization of the demands of the National Democratic Front.

Among the parties of the left, other than the Communist Party, is the Samyukta Socialist Party. It will be the constant endeavor of the Communist Party to win this party for the National Democratic Front.

As against these parties, there are parties of right reaction. The Swatantra Party is the open party of the monopolists and feudal classes, though these classes have not yet withdrawn their support from the Congress. They are trying to capture the leadership of the Congress through the extreme right within the Congress, and simultaneously they have set up the Swatantra Party in opposition to the Congress and other democratic parties. Their aim is to reverse the policies of the Congress in reactionary directions. The Swatantra Party tries to unify all anti-national reactionaries against the progressive aspects of Congress policy and acts as the center of pro-imperialist conspiracies. It is growing in the wake of the growth of the monopolies and the compromise of the Congress government with imperialism and feudalism.

The Jana Sangh and the RSS are not only communal organizations but they are fascist type parties organized along paramilitary lines and committed to violence against all progressive elements. They foment communal fanaticism against the minority community and organize communal rioting. The Muslim League is reviving its existence as a communal party.

The reactionary organizations exercise a pull over a section of

the masses by utilizing their elementary discontent against the anti-people policies of the government, and playing upon backward, feudal and semi-feudal sentiments and prejudices. Very often the chauvinism and communalism of the rightist elements within the ruling party and the government bring grist to their mill. The National Democratic Front cannot grow without firmly combating the reactionary, communal, chauvinist leadership of these organizations and weaning the masses away from their influence.

X

PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

The victorious National Democratic Front will form a national democratic government which will implement the following program with a view to transforming the existing social-political order and lay the foundations for building of socialism.

International Relations

The national democratic government will defend and strengthen India's independent foreign policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism and firmly counteract all efforts to weaken or paralyze it.

a) It will strengthen the camp of peace by participating in common initiatives of peace-loving countries and all other peace forces for the reduction of international tension. It would fight for universal and complete disarmament, for the banning of nuclear weapons and the liquidation of all foreign military bases.

b) It will build solidarity with Afro-Asian and Latin American countries fighting colonialism and neo-colonialism. It will give moral and material support to all countries which are struggling for national freedom. It will build close political, economic and cultural relations with newly independent underdeveloped countries.

c) It will work for peaceful settlement of all differences and disputes with neighboring countries such as Pakistan, China, Nepal, Burma and Ceylon and will establish friendly relations with them on the basis of Panchsheel.

d) It will develop relations of close cooperation with the socialist countries.

STATE STRUCTURE

The National Democratic government will pursue policies and adopt measures which will strengthen national independence, the

territorial integrity of the country and the sovereignty of the people. It will safeguard and strengthen the secular character of the state and take all steps to cement India's national unity and the internal cohesion of our national-political life.

Strengthen and Broaden Democracy

a) The national democratic government will put an end to the present bureaucratic set-up and will reorganize the administration and the services in such a way as to make them subordinate and responsible to popularly elected state organs at all levels.

b) It will concretely enforce the directive principles of the Constitution through appropriate legislative and administrative measures, particularly the right to work, living wage, free education, social security, etc.

c) It will ensure inviolability of person and domicile, unhampered freedom of conscience, religious belief and worship, speech, press, assembly, strike and combination; freedom of movement and occupation.

d) It will guarantee equal rights to all citizens irrespective of religion, caste, sex, race or nationality; equal pay for equal work irrespective of sex.

e) It will abolish social disabilities from which women suffer. Women will be given opportunities to secure and exercise equal rights with men in such matters as inheritance of property, marriage and divorce laws, entrance to professions and services.

f) It will abolish social and economic oppression of one caste by another, as also all social and personal bans and prohibitions imposed by the so-called upper castes on lower castes, especially the scheduled castes, in the name of custom, tradition or religion. Such oppression shall be made punishable by law. It will pursue a policy of giving financial and other assistance for the educational and cultural advancement of the people belonging to scheduled and socially oppressed castes, to eradicate these inequalities.

g) It will strengthen the secular basis of the state. It will ensure that any religious or communal institutions as such are not assisted from state and public funds. It will ensure that the interference by religious institutions in the affairs of the state and the fostering of religious and communal hatred is not given the protection of any rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

h) It will grant universal and equal suffrage to all male and female citizens of India who have attained the age of eighteen years, in the elections to Parliament, Legislative Assemblies

and local bodies, through secret ballot. The principle of proportional representation will be adopted in all elections and the right of recall of elected representatives by the majority of electors will be established.

i) It will abolish the second chambers and such reactionary, outdated institutions and practices as the post of state governors, rule by ordinances, detention without trial, and privy purses and other privileges of the princes. It will accomplish India's withdrawal from the British Commonwealth.

Cement India's National Unity

I. The national democratic government will complete the process of the formation of linguistic states and work out solution of the problem of inter-state boundaries.

II. At the state level, it will ensure wider powers and greater financial resources to the various states comprising the Indian Union in the interest of the rapid economic and cultural development.

III. It will ensure that English as the medium of administration and instruction is replaced by Indian languages. Every state shall use its own language for its internal administrative purposes in all government departments and public institutions. It will also be the medium of instruction at all levels.

Industry And Commerce

1. The national democratic government will take effective steps to stop further entry of foreign private capital into the country. It will further adopt all necessary measures to bring about the total elimination of the existing foreign private capital from Indian national economy.
2. It will institute an enquiry into the anti-national and anti-people practices of the concerns of the Indian monopolists and will introduce measures to curb their power in the life of the country. It will nationalize banks and other big credit institutions of the country. It will impose a ceiling on the profits of the monopolists.
3. It will rapidly expand the scope of the state sector and make it the dominant sector in our national economy, by developing the key and heavy industries in the state sector as envisaged in the Industrial Policy Resolution; and also by extending the sphere of nationalization to banks, general insurance, foreign trade, oil, coal and other mines, and plantations.

It will reform and democratize the management of the state sector undertakings by removing persons connected with mono-

polists and by ensuring the participation of the elected representatives of workers in their management.

4. It will give facilities to all non-monopolistic private sector enterprises by providing them with raw materials at reasonable prices, credit and marketing facilities, and allowing them reasonable profits.
5. It will help the organization of handicraftsmen into their respective cooperatives and will provide them with all possible help like cheap raw materials, cheap credit, remunerative prices and marketing facilities.
6. It will abolish the present unjust taxation system where the main burden falls on the common man and will introduce a taxation system based on the principle of capacity to bear the burden. It will introduce a ceiling on profits and incomes and a graded tax system in industry, trade and agriculture.
7. It will introduce state trading in essential commodities like foodgrains, cloth, etc., and supply them to the people at reasonable prices.

Win Workers' Cooperation

a) The national democratic government will ensure the implementation of rights of workers and other middle-class employees.

It will fix a national minimum wage based on the needs of the employees as decided by the tripartite conventions. It will also fix a sliding scale of DA, bonus, gratuity and holidays with pay.

It will ensure the progressive reduction of hours of work.

b) It will enlarge and liberalize social security measures, such as provision against unemployment, ill-health, and old age. It will also provide housing facilities on cheap rent.

It will guarantee the employees full trade union and democratic rights such as compulsory recognition of trade unions on the basis of the secret ballot of workers, collective bargaining and the right to strike.

Agriculture

The national democratic government will take the following effective measures for the radical reorganization of agrarian economy and the solution of peasant problems:

a) The monopoly in land will be broken by abolishing all forms of landlordism and land will be distributed to agricultural laborers and poor peasants free of cost. Suitable amendments will be made in the existing legislation of various states with this end in view.

All types of fallow lands in the hands of the state will be distributed to agricultural laborers and poor peasants.

b) The still remaining unpaid portion of compensation to big zamindars and jagirdars will be stopped.

c) All debts which the peasants and agricultural laborers owe to the landlords and usurers will be cancelled.

d) All facilities will be provided to the cultivators of land so as to encourage them to produce enough food for people and raw materials for industries. Cheap credit, better seeds, manure will be provided through cooperatives. Cheap irrigation facilities will be provided through the construction of irrigation dams and through providing electricity on a wide scale.

e) Adequate wages and living conditions will be ensured to the agricultural laborers.

They will be provided with free house sites and financial help to build houses.

The problem of under-employment of the agricultural laborers will be solved by starting rural industries and providing them with alternative jobs in the off seasons.

f) State farms run on mechanized and modern lines like the Suratgarh farm in Rajasthan will be started where vast tracts of land are available as models to the cultivators on how modern collective agriculture will increase incomes, while reducing the load of hard labor from the backs of the cultivators.

The cultivators will be encouraged to form cooperative farming societies on a voluntary basis and carry on cultivation through the aid of machinery and other modern methods.

XI

STRUGGLE FOR PEACEFUL PATH AND ITS POSSIBILITIES

The Communist Party of India strives to achieve the establishment of national democracy and create conditions for the advance to the goal of bringing about a socialist transformation by peaceful means. By developing a powerful mass revolutionary movement, by winning a stable majority in Parliament, backed by such a movement, the working class and its allies will strive their utmost to overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and transform Parliament from an instrument of serving the bourgeoisie into a genuine instrument of the people's will for effecting a fundamental transformation in the economic, social and state structure.

The rallying and cohesion of the revolutionary forces of the working class and all working people and the expansion of mass revolutionary action is of decisive importance for winning a stable parliamentary majority, for the victory of the revolution.

The form of transition depends on the international situation

and on specific internal conditions, mainly on the latter. The Communist Party and the working class work for creating and strengthening necessary conditions for the peaceful path to socialism by developing broad-based popular struggles for the strengthening and extension of democracy, by curbing the power of the monopolistic big bourgeoisie and reactionaries and by isolating them, by giving a resolute rebuff to the opportunist elements, by ceaselessly developing class struggle of the workers, peasants and other democratic sections of the people against the forces of reaction.

It needs to be always borne in mind that the ruling classes will not relinquish their power voluntarily. Experience shows that they defy the will of the people and seek to suppress it by lawless and violent methods. It is, therefore, necessary for the revolutionary forces to so orientate themselves and their work that they can face up to all contingencies, to any twists and turns in the political life of the country.

To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anti-communism — that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism. A greater effort is required in explaining the ideas of socialism to the masses, to educate the working people in a revolutionary spirit, to develop their revolutionary class consciousness and to show all working people the superiority of socialist society by referring to the experience and achievements of the countries of the world socialist system, demonstrating in concrete form the benefits which socialism will actually give to workers, peasants and other sections of the population in each country.

Communism assures people freedom from the fear of war, from imperialist oppression and exploitation, from unemployment and poverty, from economic crisis, from tyranny of moneybags over the individual, by guaranteeing lasting peace, general well-being and a high standard of living, a rapid growth of productive forces for the benefit of society as a whole, all-round spiritual development of man, the fullest development of talent, unlimited scientific and cultural progress of society. All sections of the population, with the exception of a handful of exploiters, stand to gain from the victory of the new social system, and this must be brought home to millions of people in our country.

XII

FOR CREATIVE MARXISM-LENINISM

The Communist Party of India places this Program before the

people and sets forth the principal urgent tasks of the day in order that our people have a clear picture of the objective they are fighting for as well as of the course of a democratic national advance.

In all its activities and struggles the Communist Party is guided by the philosophy and principles of Marxism-Leninism, which alone show to the toiling masses the correct way to the ending of exploitation of man by man and to their complete emancipation.

In the struggle for the realization of the noble aims of mankind in the present epoch, our Party firmly relies on the Statement of the Meeting of representatives of the 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties in Moscow in November 1960 and also on the earlier Declaration of 1957. These two great documents of creative Marxism-Leninism are a reliable guide for the Communists, the working class and the progressive forces the world over.

Carrying forward the revolutionary, fighting traditions of our people, the Communist Party of India combines patriotism with proletarian internationalism and takes its place in the worldwide struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. The Party unites in its ranks the most selfless sons and daughters of the working people, imbued with the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and revolutionary patriotism. The Communist Party of India has no interest apart from the interest of the working class and the working people of our country.

(July 9, 1964)

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF MARTINIQUE

On June 7, 1964, the CC of the Communist Party of Martinique heard a report by Comrade Armand Nicolas on the situation in the world Communist movement.

After a thorough discussion and consideration of the documents published by the Chinese leaders the meeting approved the report and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

At its meeting of November 3, 1963, the CC of the Communist Party of Martinique stated its position on the ideological differences in the world Communist movement, voicing its disagreement with the erroneous views propagated by the Chinese comrades on the questions of peaceful coexistence, the personality cult, and the role of the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process. At the same time, however, it expressed the hope that these differences, which had arisen in a complicated international situation marked by a great variety of conditions of the struggle would be overcome through fraternal discussion in keeping with the principles set forth in the 81-Party Statement of 1960.

Unfortunately, despite the efforts of the CPSU and other fraternal parties to stop the open polemic and start a fraternal discussion, the Chinese leaders levelled more insulting and slanderous attacks against the CPSU and other fraternal parties and set about splitting the Communist parties of some countries.

Progressives all over the world reject as impermissible slander the Chinese leaders' assertions that capitalism is being restored in the USSR, that the USSR opposes the national-liberation movement and wants to divide the world with U.S.imperialism, and that Soviet aid to the newly-independent countries is designed to enslave them.

The facts refute these fantastic inventions. The Soviet Union has always given and continues to give invaluable assistance to the peoples fighting for their liberation and for the consolidation of their political and economic independence. Postwar events have shown that the Soviet Union's might and support have been de-

*Justice, organ of the CC, CPM, June 11, 1964.

cisive for the victories of the national-liberation movement. The recent statements by President Ben Bella of Algeria, President Nasser of the UAR, and President Al-Sallal of Yemen, as well as the tremendous assistance rendered to Cuba testify that the Soviet Union is the best friend and champion of the freedom of the peoples. The glorious CPSU will always be cherished by thousands of millions as the first party to overthrow capitalism and to build, at the price of heroic efforts and sacrifices, a socialist society of working people, masters of their own destiny, the first party to blaze the trail to communism.

The CC, CPM stresses that while concentrating fire on the CPSU and other fraternal parties the Chinese leaders have not uttered a single word in protest against the repressions launched against the Martinique anti-colonialists. Moreover, by declaring that "France has completed decolonization" they demonstrate their disdain for the liberation struggle of the people of Martinique and whitewash Gaullist colonialism.

Together with the vast majority of the Communist parties the Central Committee resolutely denounces the intrigues of the Chinese leaders, who are trying to split international democratic organizations and to undermine the Communist parties of some countries by setting up so-called "Marxist-Leninist parties" consisting of diverse elements (renegades, expellees, adventurers, Trotskyites) who have demonstrated their inability to lead mass actions and to submit to proletarian discipline.

The slanderous attacks and disruptive machinations of the Chinese leaders find no support in the Communist Party of Martinique.

In reality they play into the hands of the imperialists and gravely harm the entire world revolutionary movement, in particular the peoples fighting for national liberation.

Proceeding from the abovesaid, the Central Committee of the CPM considers that a conference of all the Communist parties should be called without a delay to reaffirm, with due regard for the changes that have taken place, the general line of the world Communist movement and to take measures necessary for upholding its unity.

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES OF AUSTRALIA AND CHILE

A delegation of the Communist Party of Chile, Comrades Orlando Millas and Jose Miguel Varas, visited Australia from June 22 to June 30.

This was the first delegation to visit Australia from any Communist Party in Latin America, a continent which is becoming more and more important in world affairs.

The delegation was prevented from attending the Twentieth National Congress of the CPA by the Australian Government, which delayed granting a visa to Comrade Varas.

The delegation had an opportunity to study some aspects of the work of the CPA and had full and comradely exchange of views with its leadership.

There was complete unanimity of views on all issues discussed. Though our countries are separated by the vast waters of the South Pacific, the bonds of fraternal solidarity and a common Marxist-Leninist approach to all issues ensured understanding and agreement.

Both Parties agree that an urgent common task is action against the projected nuclear tests by France at Mururoa Island in French Polynesia. This is a dire threat to the health of the peoples and a menace to peace in the South Pacific. These tests breach the Moscow test-ban treaty, signed by over 100 countries.

Both Parties agree to intensify their work to arouse public opinion and action to bar the way to French imperialism. The struggles of the Algerian and other African peoples drove the French tests out of Africa, and the peoples of the Pacific can do the same.

The campaign against the French tests is a vital part of the world-wide struggle against imperialism, for peace and total disarmament. It is an important part of the longstanding fight of the Communist parties to ban all nuclear tests, to force an agreement to prohibit use of nuclear weapons, and to destroy all existing stockpiles. Nuclear war would be an unparalleled disaster for the peoples of the world, and the struggle against it is the first task of all Communist parties.

The struggle against the French tests is also important in the efforts to keep nuclear weapons out of the Southern Hemisphere,

as has been done in Antarctica, and for a nuclear-free Pacific, objectives supported by both Parties.

Both Parties place in the foreground of their activity the struggle against U.S. imperialism, which remains the main threat to world peace and to the independence of all nations. We express full solidarity with the heroic Cuban people, courageously defying continued U.S. attempts at intervention.

The CPA warmly welcomes and supports the magnificent struggle of the CP of Chile for national independence against the U.S. monopolists who ruthlessly exploit the people and natural resources of Chile. The CPA expresses its full agreement with the line of developing a broad people's movement with the aim of nationalizing the enterprises of the U.S. monopolies, achieving land reforms, improving the people's living conditions and broadening democracy. It expresses best wishes for success in the present campaign to elect a progressive President and set up a People's Government capable of implementing a program agreed upon by the parties making up the Popular Action Front, and calls for world support against U.S. plots and interference in Chile. The CPA enthusiastically welcomes the growth of the CP of Chile in its struggle against U.S. imperialism and domestic reaction.

The delegation of the CP of Chile noted the CPA's campaign against U.S. penetration, and supports its efforts to build working-class unity and develop the people's struggle against capitalist monopolies which are selling the nation piecemeal in their craving for profit. It welcomes the resolute fight of the CPA for an independent Australian foreign policy, for the independence of New Guinea, and its firm and traditional support for the national-liberation struggles of the peoples of Southeast Asia.

This is a struggle against U.S. imperialism, which is involving the Australian Government still further in its aggression in Southeast Asia.

The two Parties condemn the further expansion of the imperialist war the U.S. is waging against the people of South Vietnam in an effort to crush their national-liberation movement. Both Parties consider that this war is a menace to world peace, and call for struggle against it.

The Communist Parties of Australia and Chile denounce the racism of the imperialists and pledge full support for the people of South Africa in their heroic struggle against apartheid and for the Negro people of the USA in their fight for equality.

The two Parties discussed the present situation in the international Communist movement, and found their viewpoints were identical. Both Parties stand firmly by the decisions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings and strive to apply these principles to the

struggle in their countries. Both Parties resolutely oppose the line of the leaders of the CP of China, which runs counter to the jointly agreed general line of the world Communist movement and aims at splitting it.

The two Parties favor an early meeting of all Communist parties, with the aim of discussing the issues in a fraternal manner and reaching the maximum possible agreement. This should include the ending of outside interference in the affairs of fraternal parties, which the CPC leaders have tried in both Australia and Chile, without success. Such a world meeting would clarify issues and strengthen the struggle against imperialism, for peace, peaceful coexistence, national liberation and socialism.

The parties decided to strengthen relations between them by future exchange of visits, exchange of experiences and mutual support.

Signed: For the Communist Party of Chile,
O. Millas.

For the Communist Party of Australia,
L. Sharkey.

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN (abridged)

I

Spain stands on the threshold of one of the most crucial periods in her history: a movement, though a slow and complicated one, has started **towards abolishing the fascist forms of the dictatorship of monopoly capital connected with Franco's personality and the consequences of the war which in 1936-39 set Spaniard against Spaniard.**

Events of the last three months corroborate this view of ours. New advances have been made by the democratic and anti-Franco movement. Big strikes took place in Puertollano, Riotinto and Sagunto, followed by workers' demonstrations in Madrid, Bilbao and San Sebastian. The mammoth general strike of the Asturian miners and metalworkers was supported by the solidarity strikes of 25,000 Biscayan metalworkers, more than 20,000 workers in Guipuzcoa and 3,000 metalworkers of the Nueva Montana Quijano company in Santander province, as well as the strike of 1,000 workers of Corrales de Buelna in Santander, the demonstrations of May 18 in Las Palmas (Canary Islands) and May 26 in Barcelona, the agricultural workers' actions in Cadiz, and a series of strikes in rural localities and factories in other provinces.

A characteristic feature of these actions, especially of the general strike of the Asturian miners and metalworkers and the demonstration in Bilbao, is that not only economic, but also political slogans were advanced, such as the demand for trade union freedom or the right to strike. Similar demands are being voiced all over the country and are openly presented by workers' commissions and delegates to the authorities and Francoist trade union officials.

There is no doubt — as the Bilbao demonstration has shown — that behind the demand for trade union freedom and the right to strike stands the demand for democracy in the broadest sense of the word, in support of which the masses go out into the streets when they feel sufficiently strong to do so.

All this shows that a major qualitative leap has been made by the working-class and popular movement since the 1962 strikes.

The workers' actions are supported by other social strata whose interests are also infringed by the dictatorship.

The rise of the mass movement and its obvious political charac-

ter have faced the regime with the choice of **either trying to suppress this movement by force and violence, or admitting its own impotence and bankruptcy,** for Francoism does not and cannot have the means for resolving problems through dialogue and discussion which a democratic system possesses.

The past few months have offered ample evidence of this. Some of the rulers, no doubt, tend to favor **drastic measures;** and it is not excluded that to avenge their impotence, they will at some moment resort to new monstrous crimes. If so, they will show that they have lost not only the game but their heads as well, for any new excesses, any act of violence will isolate and weaken them still more, aggravating the already deep crisis experienced by the country.

There is a deep-rooted reason for this powerlessness in face of the mounting mass movement: **the ruling classes and the institutions they rely upon have prolonged the existence of the present regime, at the cost of draining its strength to the utmost.** They have done so out of fear of change, because of their conservatism and reactionary nature. There is no doubt that in their heart of hearts many of them regret having lacked the courage to agree to changes when the possibilities for maneuver were greater than now. But one thing is clear, the more this regime spends itself and the longer it survives, the fewer possibilities for maneuver it has and the greater the prospects of its downfall as a result of general mass action.

It is a fact that all the positive changes, insignificant as they are, are the result of the vigorous mass actions of the working people, the militant protests of the students and intellectuals, the resistance of the peasants and the growth of the national-democratic struggle of the people of Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia.

The policy of national accord has vastly promoted the establishment of a new political climate favorable for militant mass actions. This policy presupposes, on the one hand, the drawing together of the various classes and social strata of the people, and on the other, ever more resolute and courageous actions and struggle against the dictatorship and the kernel of the exploiting classes — the monopoly landlord oligarchy. By initiating this policy the Communist Party dispelled the Francoist myth that the war had been lost by the **reds** and won by **all those** who fought in the ranks of the so-called "national" forces. In reality the war was won by the few dozen families comprising the oligarchy and the several hundred — or thousand, at most — adventurers who have been waxing prosperous in the past 25 years, and lost by the people, both those who defended the Republic and those who were

deceived into following Franco. The policy of national accord remains a policy of national unity, of alliance of all anti-monopoly and anti-feudal forces. It has indicated the road and created the most favorable conditions for the struggle. The policy of national accord can be considered a "failure" only by those who visualize it as reconciliation between Francoism and the people, between the oppressors and the exploited — in other words, those who maliciously slandered our Party by accusing it of such intentions.

The Communist Party of Spain declares that **intensification of the struggle of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and students, the anti-monopoly strata and the national movement of the Catalonians, Basques and Galicians, is the only correct and reliable road to the democratization of the country.** The complete liquidation of Francoism and the fascist forms of government, and the transition to democratic freedoms calls for the stepping up of the struggle of the toiling masses and all democratic and anti-Franco forces, unity, organization and still greater militancy; and that **the whole of Spain should follow the example of the Asturias.** To work towards this objective is a duty of all democratic forces and above all of our Party.

In view of the present situation in the country, the Communist Party declares that any attempt to introduce **anything new, to create a new situation** on the basis of such flimsy institutions as the Falangist movement or principles permeated with the spirit of civil war; any attempts to present Franco as the initiator of a new stage or as the patron of institutions that will succeed him, would not constitute any break with the past and would therefore remain ineffectual and without popular support. In the long run, that would doom them to a resounding fiasco.

At the same time the Communist Party solemnly reaffirms its determination to work for unity and mutual understanding in the struggle against Franco with all political and social forces, irrespective of their nature and their views with regard to the future political order. The Communist Party is firmly resolved to support any effective and earnest political steps towards this goal. It is ready to come to agreement with any forces prepared **to make a step** in this direction.

The Communist Party considers that everything taking place in Spain today — the strikes in the Asturias, the demonstrations and other actions elsewhere — testifies to the impermissibility of further postponing the achievement of mutual understanding for the purpose of accelerating the liquidation of the fascist rule.

II

The changes that have taken place in Spain, particularly since

the strikes of April and May 1962, have provided certain political circles of the liberal-Catholic trend with an opportunity of stating legally, though within narrow limits, their views with regard to political forms that should replace the present regime. At the same time, under the impact of the processes connected with the disintegration of the dictatorship, the legal press is beginning to discuss — which has never happened before — what has come to be called the problem of "succession." It is necessary to take into consideration the narrow bounds within which this discussion proceeds and the class nature of some of its participants. In the course of this discussion, which has its positive aspects as well, many ideas are expressed which may cause confusion or lead to a misapprehension of the conditions needed for a genuine change.

The Communist Party deems it necessary to join in this discussion, believing that its position coincides with the views of all genuinely democratic-minded groups and individuals. It considers it necessary to state that the minimal conditions for the effective liquidation of the fascist forms of government and for ensuring freedoms should be the following:

1. **Amnesty for all political prisoners and emigrés.**
2. **Recognition of the right to strike.**
3. **Trade union freedoms.** The trade unions must become **genuinely working-class organizations,** independent of the employers and the government.
4. **Freedom of the press, speech and association,** which naturally presupposes the possibility of forming political parties free to voice the opinion of the various trends existing in the country.
5. **Freedom of conscience**, freedom to preach and profess any religion or to be an atheist.
6. **Universal suffrage,** as the source of political power.

Until these six conditions are complied with it will be impossible, even if Franco is removed from power, to speak of abolishing fascist forms and establishing political freedoms in Spain.

In the struggle for these six demands the Communist Party is ready to conclude agreements, to establish mutual understanding and carry out joint actions — both agreed and tacit — with all the social forces of the country. We are prepared to do so within the framework of both common action for all these demands and limited action for some of them.

III

The Communist Party considers that abolition of the fascist regime, which was established by means of foreign military interference and which has tyrannized the country for more than 25 years, destroying all rights and freedoms and, resorting to ruth-

less repressions and terror to smother any opposition, is not a mere political crisis that can be resolved through formal changes in government and replacement of the head of state.

It is a revolutionary process, for the main economic and social problems which are, in fact, problems of the democratic revolution and which have been kept from coming out into the open and aggravated by the fascist regime, have now, when this regime is experiencing a new crisis as a result of the growing mass struggle, been again posed before the nation and imperatively call for a solution.

The feature of Spain's economic structure which contnues to determine the entire development of the country is the existence of big landlord property. It is worth while recalling the official data of the cadastral survey which government propaganda and the apologists of neo-capitalism pass over in silence: 51,283 landlords, or 0.85 per cent of all landowners, possess a total of 22,-881,100 hectares, or 53.51 per cent of all lands. In other words, less than one per cent of the proprietors own more than half of Spain.

A similar picture of distribution of land cannot be found in any economically developed country. This is not fortuitous. Preservation of what is actually feudal distribution of land not only determines the backwardness of agriculture, but also hinders and deforms all economic development. The backwardness of agriculture narrows down the domestic market and greatly hampers industrial development.

Spain is still far behind the economically developed countries. Any unbiased observer will see that the distance between Spain and the developed West European countries is greater today than, let us say, in 1930 — to say nothing of the fact that such countries as Poland, Hungary and Rumania have left us far behind thanks to development along the socialist road.

It is clear that the elimination of the fascist dictatorhsip will not lead to the destruction of the economic might of monopoly capital. At the present stage of the development of capitalism the economic might of monopoly capital can be fully destroyed only by the socialist revolution. But the abolition of the fascist dictatorship in our country will in itself be a powerful blow at the rule of monopoly capital. The fascist dictatorship has for a quarter of a century enabled monopoly capital to hold unchallenged sway in the country, utilizing the machinery of state in order fully to subordinate the national economy to its own interests. All other non-monopoly classes and social strata, from the workers and peasants to the bourgeoisie not belonging to the oligarchy, were deprived of all their rights, their organizations, the right to defend

themselves not only in the political but also in the economic field.

Restoration of democratic freedoms will signify the loss by monopoly capital of the political hegemony which the "mailed first" has until now ensured it. It will then be compelled to realize its claim to political hegemony in struggle between parties, in entirely new conditions, when other social classes and strata will have their own political weapon and be able to contest this hegemony.

Not only the political but also the economic and social implications of this change should be properly assessed. The downfall of the dictatorship will weaken monopoly capital; its political possibilities will be vastly curtailed, since it is responsible for all the suffering and injustice, for all the corruption and despotism which the country has endured for so many years. By destroying, through the dictatorship, all political parties, the bourgeois parties included, monopoly capital has made it even more difficult to preserve its political positions in conditions and freedom.

Whereas in various European countries, after a certain period of time and in a concrete national and international situation, monopoly capitalism restored its political hegemony and removed the democratic forces from power, in the present international situation and in view of the peculiarities of our country, there is a possibility that this process may lead to the consolidation of the democratic forces which will be in power. In any case, this is what the working class and its party should orient on.

With the correlation of social and political forces which exist today and which will be consolidated when the fascist dictatorship is, at long last, destroyed, it will be necessary to pose and solve within a very short space of time (under mass pressure, within a few years), highly complex problems which in the developed capitalist countries were resolved in the course of many decades and some of which, such as the land problem, in the course of centuries and through violent revolutions.

Under these circumstances the implementation of every economic measure will acutely pose the question: in whose favor and at whose expense? Until now this question has been decided by the dictatorship in favor of the landlord and finance oligarchy, in favor of monopoly capital. In the future democracy, it will be decided through acute class struggle, with the masses active as never before.

The democratic forces will offer their own solutions and will lead the struggle for their adoption.

These solutions envisage:

1. Radical agrarian reform to do away with big latifundia once and for all.

2. Improvement of the standard of living of the factory and office workers and civil servants.

3. Promotion and democratic orientation of education, science and culture generally.

4. A tax system based on high progressive income and inheritance taxes.

5. The coalition of democratic forces will fight for the nationalization of credit, i.e., banks. In the conditions of our country, nationalization of the banks will considerably facilitate the subsequent nationalization of the big monopolies.

6. The democratic reforms will also lead to a change in the character and orientation of state-run enterprises, which will turn more and more from an instrument of the monopolies into a powerful weapon of the anti-monopoly struggle and Spain's rapid industrialization.

7. The democratic reforms call for recognition of the multinational character of our state, full recognition of national rights, specifically the right of the Catalonians, Basques and Galicians to self-determination.

8. Finally, the democratization of Spain demands a policy of positive neutrality and non-alignment, a policy which will enable her to make a big contribution to the international policy of peaceful coexistence, consistent and controlled disarmament, and peace.

In short, every political step towards democracy will make it possible to take new measures for restricting the economic positions of monopoly capital, while the weakening of the economic might of the oligarchy will, in turn, facilitate new steps towards democratization.

The correlation of the political and social forces which has emerged in Spain and which will assume a still clearer shape after the abolition of the fascist dictatorship, provides all the conditions for ensuring by the will and effort of the people, and through political, economic and social actions, the adoption of these solutions, which conform to the vital needs of the country and the interests of the overwhelming majority of the Spaniards.

Through these actions the working class, the peasantry, the democratic-minded intellectuals and all anti-monopoly strata should establish and consolidate a democratic power supported by the people.

When, referring to these concrete historical circumstances, we Communists speak of democratic government, we do not mean formal democracy. We mean the social nature of this government. We have in mind an efficient government resolved to implement the above-mentioned reforms; a government representing the working class, the peasantry, the petty and non-monopoly bourgeoisie;

government by parties expressing the interests of these classes and strata; a government relying on an effective state machine.

This process, which, we repeat, is a revolutionary process by virtue of the profundity and urgency of the changes it implies, can be peaceful if the working class, the peasantry, the petty and non-monopoly bourgeoisie succeed in building a solid front; if the indomitable strength of the masses is brought into play; if the more conscientious and honest elements of the armed forces come to realize that the need for changes in Spain and for her development demands destruction of the economic foundations of both the old feudal and modern monopoly oligarchies; if the new trends supported by Pope John XXIII and his "Pacem in Terris" encyclical gain ground in the Church and the Catholic movement; if we Spaniards prevent imperialist interference in our disputes and internal controversies. In a word, this revolutionary process will be peaceful if these conditions materialize and prevent the monopoly oligarchy from unleashing violence contrary to the will of the overwhelming majority of the Spaniards.

If, however, the Spanish reactionaries take recourse to their traditional violent methods, the Spanish people, with the Communists at the head, will not hesitate to fight. Considering the present world situation, that would lead to the social and political defeat of the reactionaries and the final victory of the forces of democracy.

The Communist Party is resolved to do everything possible for the inevitable revolutionary process in Spain to take a peaceful course. We are convinced that the fanaticism which has marked the political struggle in Spain is the result of the obstinacy with which the reactionary forces defended their anachronistic privileges. We believe that the bitter experience of our country, the political maturity of our people, the present balance of forces and the international situation, which hampers the imperialist export of counter-revolution, will help the struggle to proceed along peaceful lines.

We cannot conclude the exposition of our views on the progress of the democratic revolution in Spain without saying a few words about its final stage, its development into socialist revolution. The Communist Party makes no šecret of the fact that the purpose of its existence is to ensure the victory of the society of the highest type which will put an end to exploitation of man by man — socialist and communist society.

The productive forces cannot develop sufficiently to meet all the material and cultural requirements of man until they are freed from the fetters of capitalism.

If the Spanish people succeed in passing through the stage of

democratic revolution in the conditions we have spoken about, all the prerequisites will be created for the peaceful transition to socialism. Indeed, in present-day society, when the anti-feudal struggle can develop only in conjunction with the anti-imperialist struggle, and when democratic development calls for depriving monopoly capital of political hegemony and proceeding to the consistent restriction of its economic domination with the help of the machinery of state, there is no sharp dividing line between the democratic and socialist stages of the revolution (when the transition from one stage to the other presents a qualitative leap); the revolutionary process is a continuous one.

In the second half of the 20th century, when one-third of mankind already lives under socialism, when the forthcoming decade — if the peoples win peaceful coexistence — is bound to prove irrefutably the superiority of the socialist mode of production over the capitalist in labor productivity and in meeting the material and cultural requirements of people, there is full reason to foresee that in the anti-monopoly coalition fighting staunchly for the democratic revolution in our country forces will rise and gain in strength which will declare for the socialist mode of production.

The proletariat will exercise its hegemony without which the socialist revolution is unthinkable not because the doctrine demands this, but because it will have achieved this hegemony in the course of the entire process of the struggle, because of its decisive role in production, due to its advanced ideology and its ability to form alliances with the peasants, the middle strata, all forces to whom socialist transformation has become the most favorable prospect for the subsequent progress of Spain.

The Communist Party reaffirms its striving — recorded in our Program — to remain allied with the socialism-oriented forces and their parties in the socialist stage as well. We intend to work jointly with all democratic groups, in particular the Socialist Party, the trade unions and the progressive-minded Catholic circles.

IV

The **struggle** of the working class and all democratic forces, their **unity** and **organization** and the **level** of their political consciousness are factors which may determine whether Spain will take the democratic road or proceed along the monopoly road, which means difficulties and privations for the people.

Development of the working-class and democratic movement is marked both by signal successes and obvious weaknesses. In order to make an objective analysis one has to bear in mind that, despite its obvious enfeeblement, the Franco regime retains its

fascist repressive nature. We Spaniards are still deprived of all freedoms that exist in other bourgeois countries. That is why the will and sentiment of the masses can only be expressed in an open challenge to the existing order. Under the present conditions our hands are tied and our mouths are gagged, and the slightest expression of opposition, especially on the part of the working class and the toiling peasants, involves considerable personal risk. It should not be forgotten that there are no genuine trade unions, no party system, no free press, free speech, right to strike and demonstration. Added to the current repressions is the memory of the past terror — a kind of moral shock which has not been fully overcome yet and which the regime maintains with the help of such crimes as the murder of Julian Grimau, Moreno Barranco, or the two young anarchists.

In Spain, actions which are at first glance due to purely economic causes carry a political charge of tremendous power, which is not to be observed — to the same degree, at any rate — in the other developed capitalist countries. Take the general strike in the Asturias, the demonstration in front of the Trade Union Congress building in Madrid, or the May Day demonstrations in Bilbao and San Sebastian. These were actions of a purely political character, testifying to a high level of political consciousness, without which their participants would not have dared to face the risks involved.

The successes in the struggle for working-class unity scored in the Asturias, Biscay and at many big enterprises and in rural localities throughout the country should be regarded as evidence of considerable progress. In all instances concrete forms of unity of action and organization between Communists, Socialists, Catholics, syndicalists and nationalists were to be observed. These bonds must be further strengthened in view of the outlook for still more massive actions.

Notable progress towards unity has also been achieved in the movement of the intelligentsia and students. This is instanced by the direct support given by the latter to workers' actions. This is a new phenomenon indicating that an alliance of democratic forces headed by the working class is taking shape.

But it is in the movement for amnesty that contacts are established perhaps on the biggest scale, extending not only to anti-Francoists but also to many people who hold aloof from politics and are prompted solely by humane considerations.

A superficial glance which records merely the absence of unitary national bodies and overlooks the numerous ramifications and variety of forms of unity between different circles and the universal rapprochement expressed in mutual solidarity and assistance

despite the class differences in the present Spanish society; a glance which fails to perceive the essence of the developing phenomena and trends or to note the tendency towards their affirmation, cannot suffice for a realistic and objective assessment of the successes in forging anti-Franco unity in the country. Such an approach cannot make for a correct interpretation of the changes that are taking place and inevitably results in the mistake of attributing the current phenomena, not to their real authors, but to the "more modern views" of some sections of the ruling oligarchy.

It is precisely thanks to these phenomena and not to any section of the oligarchy that the strike is becoming a weapon in the economic and political struggle in a country where fascism still exists and where, under the existing "law," to strike is an act of "sedition." This is a very real gain which should not be underrated in making an objective analysis of the present situation in Spain, just as one should not underrate the fact that ever more frequent resort is being taken to such an advanced form of struggle as street demonstrations.

This deep-going popular movement, supported by world public opinion, is forcing repression to retreat. Recent months have seen a decrease in the number of political trials. Colonel Eymar's special tribunal, that symbol of fascist terror, has been dissolved. Hundreds of prisoners have been released, and the demand for a general amnesty for political prisoners and emigrés has become the order of the day.

The intensity of this movement has won it the support of various circles of the Catholic Church, influencing the official attitude of the Church to the regime in the direction of greater reserve and reticence, despite the reactionary views of the higher prelates. It is having an effect also on the army, where doubts and criticism of the present state of affairs have begun to be voiced.

Under the pressure of mass forces acting in the same direction all over the country, the regime has been compelled to embark on a course of "liberalization" and to make some relatively important, though not radical, concessions to the opposition.

The real and decisive factor in the processes taking place (with the dictatorship still existing) is the struggle of the working class and other democratic forces, the growing political consciousness and determination of the people. Also of tremendous importance is the form in which not only economic but also political demands are being expressed, specifically, the demands for trade union freedom, the right to strike, and for extensive democracy. These demands are already openly voiced in Biscay, the Asturias, Madrid, Barcelona, Guipuzcoa, Puertollano, Cadiz and elsewhere, and will

soon be heard all over the country. This is graphic evidence of the growth of the political consciousness of the working people. On the one hand, it is due to the realization that their standard of living will not improve unless these demands are satisfied; on the other hand, it is an indispensable step in the direction of the open demand for the abolition of the dictatorship and the establishment of democracy.

This demand can be voiced openly, resolutely and extensively in the nearest future if the shortcomings still existing in the working-class and democratic movement are overcome through the courageous and efficient work of the Communists and other progressives and democrats.

The road is indicated to us by three recent examples: the Asturian strike and the demonstrations in Bilbao and Las Palmas. It is necessary to prepare a general political strike of the working people which, given the solidarity of the other social forces — small and middle tradesmen, office employees, intellectuals and students — and supported by powerful street demonstrations, can develop into a national strike which will put an end to the dictatorship and install a government that will respect the will of the people.

The Communist Party holds that the general political strike and its development into a national strike is not a temporary slogan to be advanced at one or another moment only to be withdrawn, and whose success or failure can be gauged by the scope of some particular action. It is the slogan of the highest form of struggle possible at the present stage, one which can help overthrow the dictatorship and pave the way for democratic freedoms.

Under the Franco regime, the general political strike and the national strike can be prepared only through actions for partial political and economic demands, workers' and peasants' strikes and demonstrations, protests and other forms of opposition by the other social strata.

This is by no means an easy matter, it calls for great effort, self-sacrifice, and determination. At present the heroic vanguard role in preparing the general strike is being played by the Asturian miners supported by the whole of Spain as well as by the Asturian and Biscayan metalworkers and the agricultural laborers of some districts in Andalusia. Their example is followed by the workers of other provinces, among them the transport workers of the Canary Islands, the workers of Altos Hornos in Sagunto and other big enterprises in the Levante, the metalworkers of Santander, the dockers of Pasajes, the workers of some Catalonian factories and textile mills and enterprises in Galicia. The example of unity, organization and struggle is being taken up all over the country. Ultimately these vanguard contingents will lead the whole of the

working class, inspiring it with their example and bringing it up to their level.

Such is the road. There is no other way to genuinely democratic changes under the present conditions. We do not deny the possibility of the pressure of the mass movement and the self-seeking interests of the oligarchic groups leading, at a certain moment, to changes in government and even to the removal of Franco. But, in the first place, this can happen only when the popular movement develops into a direct threat, and, secondly, any such change, even if it signifies a definite retreat from dictatorial forms, cannot lead to democratic reforms unless the masses take vigorous street action.

The difficulties in organizing the general political strike and the national strike can be briefly and clearly explained as follows: to abolish a fascist regime like Franco's which was established as a result of war and which has survived by the rule of terror for 25 years, is not a simple matter. Those who fail to realize this do not know the ABC of revolutionary struggle.

Rejection of the general political strike and the national strike as forms of the struggle for democracy would be capitulation, to put it bluntly. It would mean giving up democratic initiative and leaving the proletariat and the people generally under the influence of the political initiative of the oligarchic groups. The Communist Party of Spain, being loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, will never agree to capitulate and give up the struggle.

V

While opposing the ultra-Leftist views, which at present could only lead to the isolation of the Party and to adventurism in policy and thus play into the hands of the ruling oligarchy, the Communist Party also rejects neo-capitalist and revisionist trends, which can impel the Party into reformist positions.

The exponents of these trends deny that the fall of the Franco regime would initiate a democratic revolutionary process in Spain in the course of which the task of the proletariat allied with the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie would be to eliminate the survivals of feudalism and semi-feudalism in agriculture and then progressively to limit and eventually to abolish the rule of the monopoly oligarchy.

By insisting that the Party should reconcile itself to the continued rule of the oligarchy, join in the "liberalization" policy and adapt itself to a situation wherein the workers and the employers will jointly "enjoy the blessings" of neo-capitalism, the exponents of these opportunist views merely reiterate, in different words

and different conditions, the old reformist theories which were long ago combated by Lenin.

Our Party is fighting for Spain, for a democratic Spain free from the yoke of the feudal and monopoly oligarchy, for a socialist Spain. The Communist Party calls upon the workers, peasants, professionals, office employees, civil servants, students, all those who want to devote themselves wholly to this revolutionary and patriotic cause, to join its fighting ranks.

Executive Committee,
Communist Party of Spain.

June 1964

COMMUNIQUE* ON TALKS BETWEEN DELEGATIONS OF COMMUNIST PARTIES OF BELGIUM AND BULGARIA

On the invitation of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party a delegation of the Communist Party of Belgium visited Bulgaria from June 22 to July 3, 1964. The delegation consisted of Ernest Burnelle, member of the Political Bureau and Chairman of the Party, Frans van den Branden, member of the Political Bureau and Deputy Chairman of the Party, Joseph Turf, member of the Political Bureau, and Jacques Witages, member of the Central Committee and First Secretary of the Antwerp Federal organization.

The delegation visited several enterprises, agricultural cooperatives, cultural institutions and health resorts and acquainted themselves with the life and achievements of the Bulgarian people.

The representative of the Communist Party of Belgium also met Party, trade union and government leaders as well as numerous representatives of the working people.

In the talks between the delegations of the two Parties the Bulgarian Party was represented by Todor Zhivkov, member of the Political Bureau and First Secretary of the Central Committee, Mitko Grigorov, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee, Boyan Balgaranov, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee, Nacho Papazov, Secretary of the Central Committee, Dimo Dichev, member of the Central Committee and Head of the Foreign Policy and International Relations Department, Vasil Ivanov, alternate member of the Central Committee and Head of the Propaganda Department.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of complete unanimity and understanding. The delegations noted with satisfaction that the two Parties held the same views on all basic issues concerning the international situation and the world Communist and working-class movement.

Ernest Burnelle told the BCP delegation of the efforts of the Party and the working people of Belgium to maintain world peace, of their opposition to the country's participation in aggressive imperialist blocs, to the monopolies who are blocking the demands of the working people and the expansion of democracy. He noted

*Drapeau Rouge, July 7, 1964.

that working-class unity was steadily growing stronger and that favorable conditions were being created for uniting all progressive and democratic forces in the country on the basis of a common program of action in defense of peace and economic and political demands.

The BCP delegation noted with satisfaction that the Communist Party of Belgium had made a major contribution to the numerous actions of the working class.

The BCP salutes the active participation of the CPB and the Belgian people in the common struggle being waged by the nations to preserve peace, and wishes them new successes in this lofty cause. It shares the deep feelings of friendship and respect which the Bulgarian peoples have for the industrious people of Belgium. The Bulgarian Communists highly appreciate the activity of the Communist Party of Belgium to promote the broad peace movement in which the major working-class and democratic organizations of Belgium are participating; they hail its efforts to expand democracy in the country, for a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw member countries, and the dismantling of military bases in West Germany and Belgium.

Todor Zhivkov informed the Belgian Party delegation of the progress of socialist construction in the People's Republic of Bulgaria, of the Party's political line since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the April (1956) plenary meeting of the Central Committee, of the country's achievements and perspectives. He acquainted the Belgian comrades with the measures taken by the Party and government to develop the country's productive forces, socialist industrialization, agriculture, science, technology and culture and to expand socialist democracy. Comrade Todor Zhivkov described the headway made in such important industries as the engineering, chemical, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, and the tasks ahead. He spoke of the great value of Soviet aid for the country's progress and also of the big role played by the Council for Mutual Economic Aid and international socialist division of labor in developing Bulgaria's economy.

The Belgian Party delegation applauded the achievements in socialist construction in Bulgaria and stressed that they have been made possible by the victory of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria, that they conclusively demonstrate the advantage of socialism over capitalism. The Belgian Party delegation wished the Bulgarian people new successes in their work to build socialism and communism under the leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party.

The delegations of both Parties hold that in the present international situation the paramount task of the peoples is to work

for the preservation of peace and that the only correct policy making this possible is the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. They are firmly convinced that all international issues can and should be settled peacefully through negotiation, that an agreement on general and complete disarmament is essential for the establishment of lasting world peace.

Both delegations stress the importance of the Moscow partial test-ban treaty which has helped to reduce radioactive fall-out in the atmosphere and to create more favorable conditions for achieving new successes in the struggle of the peoples to lessen international tension. The delegations welcome the declaration made by the Soviet, U.S. and British governments to restrict the production of fissionable materials for military purposes; they assess this as a new victory won by the peoples in their fight for peace and peaceful coexistence.

The representatives of the two fraternal Parties agreed that everything must be done to prevent nuclear weapons being given to other states. They hold that the plans to create a multiple nuclear NATO force will block the way to disarmament and greatly imperil world peace.

The CPB delegation and the BCP delegation consider that liquidation of the vestiges of the Second World War, the conclusion of a German peace treaty and normalization of the situation in the West Berlin are among the most urgent international issues that must be settled. They therefore welcome the Treaty on Friendship, Mutual Aid and Cooperation recently concluded between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic, as a new step towards a detente in Europe and throughout the world.

On behalf of their Parties the participants in the talks support the insistent demand of the German people to legalize the Communist Party of Germany which is waging a steadfast fight in defense of the interests of the German working class and against West Germany being turned into a new cockpit of war, for mutual understanding and the normalization of relations between the two German states, and for the peaceful settlement of the German question.

Both delegations consider that the creation of atom-free zones in various parts of the world, especially in Europe, is of utmost importance. The Belgian Communist Party delegation hails Bulgaria's consistent policy to improve the political climate in the Balkan peninsula, to turn the Balkans, the Adriatic and the Black Sea into zones of peace and good-neighborly cooperation.

The delegations discussed the development of the national-liberation struggle of the colonial peoples and the peoples dependent

on imperialism. They were of the unanimous opinion that the survivals of colonialism were the constant source of conflicts and tension, and expressed profound satisfaction with the mounting struggle for freedom waged by the peoples still under the colonial yoke.

Both delegations fully support the struggle the working class and all progressive forces in the capitalist countries are waging for peace, democracy and progress.

The Bulgarian and Belgian Communists are agreed that common action by the countries of the socialist system, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement is the earnest of further successes in the struggle to put an end to colonial oppression in all its forms and guises.

The delegations of both Parties reaffirm their solidarity with the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and particularly of the peoples of the Congo, Angola, the Republic of South Africa, Portuguese, Guinea, Mozambique, Cyprus and Laos, and express their determination to support the struggle of all oppressed peoples for their complete political and economic emanciation, to help the newly-free peoples to repulse all encroachments on the part of imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Both delegations agree that world developments fully confirm the assessments made by the 1957 and 1960 Meetings.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is conducive to new successes along the road of social progress and the development of the international working-class movement. This is demonstrated by the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in all spheres of activity, by the scope of the working-class struggle in the capitalist countries, by the successes of the national-liberation and world peace movements.

The two delegations resolutely censure the actions of the Chinese Communist Party leaders who have centered their efforts not on fighting imperialism but on attacking the Communist and Workers' parties that are true to Marxism-Leninism. By their actions and smear campaign against the fraternal Parties, the CPSU in the first place, the Chinese leaders are undermining the unity of the socialist camp and splitting the ranks of the international Communist and working-class movement.

The Belgian and Bulgarian Communists have always considered factionalism to be the greatest danger to the revolutionary cause of the working class. The delegations therefore note that the most important, the paramount task is to carry on an energetic and

consistent fight against factionalism in the individual Parties, and especially in the world Communist movement.

The delegations declare that as in the past, so too now the CPSU by its activity represents a constant source of knowledge and experience for all the Communist and Workers' parties. They express the determination of the Belgian and Bulgarian Communists resolutely to uphold Marxist-Leninist theory, to combat dogmatism, sectarianism and revisionism, and to wage an unflagging fight for the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and the decisions of the 1957 and 1960 Moscow Meetings.

Both delegations agree that political and organizational measures must be taken to preserve and strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement. They favor calling a new meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties which would consider the issues that have arisen with the CPC leaders, uphold the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, reaffirm the correctness of the general line of the International Communist movement in the light of the changes that have taken place in the international situation in recent years, and help further consolidate the unity of the international Communist movement.

The Bulgarian and Belgian Communist Parties have always maintained close ties of friendship. Both Parties will continue to make every effort to preserve and expand these ties, to strengthen them on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in the name of our common goal — communism.

The Communist Party of Belgium and the Bulgarian Communist Party consider it their prime internationalist duty to devote all their efforts to the struggle for the triumph of peace, democracy and socialism, for the happiness of their peoples and the peoples of the world world.

On behalf of the
Bulgarian Communist Party,
TODOR ZHIVKOV

On behalf of the
Communist Party of Belgium,
ERNEST BURNELLE

INTERVIEW* WITH KOSTAS KOLLIANNIS,

FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

Q. What is your Party's appraisal of the post-election situation in Greece?

A. The situation after February 16, 1964 has been characterized by the further growth of the powerful popular movement, which played the decisive role in defeating the ERE government, the instrument of the finance oligarchy and foreign interests. The masses and their vanguard, the working class, have organized some impressive demonstrations such as that held in Athens on April 6, the Marathon peace march of May 17, the prolonged mass strikes of miners, tobacco, textile and other workers, and the campaigns of solidarity with the fraternal Cypriot people, especially those of young workers and students.

Genuine democratization in all spheres is the basic demand of the masses. This presupposes abrogation of all anti-constitutional emergency laws, elimination of the aftermath of the civil war and the subsequent period, restoration of democratic order, and a return to legality.

In face of these clearly expressed demands of the masses, the Papandreou government which came to power after the recent elections and which is dominated by Right elements of the Center Union, is taking an increasingly inconsistent, negative stand and reneging on its election promises. In the field of foreign policy, it has declared its intention to act within the bounds of the Atlantic alliance, although this is clearly contrary to the national interest. In domestic policy, the government limits itself to partial measures utterly incompatible with the aspirations of the working class and above all with the demand for the liquidation of the anti-constitutional regime set up in the years when the Rights held undivided political sway.

This attitude of the Center Union government can only encourage the Rights, who have of late stepped up their efforts to thwart any move toward democratization — an objective they have not relinquished even after their defeat.

Q. What is your opinion of the government's stand on the crucial problem of democratization?

---

*L'Humanité, June 30, 1964.

A. During the election campaign the leadership of the Center Union made restoration of "genuine" democracy the main plank of their political program. After the elections, Prime Minister Papandreou has taken every opportunity to declare that the restoration of political democracy has already been accomplished. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth. True, the Papandreou government has effected some measures, some political prisoners have been released, but not all. The government has not yet annulled all the emergency decrees inherited from the epoch of the civil war and the period of disturbances that followed it. For instance, although four months have passed since the elections, the draft government decree on the abrogation of the fascist Law No. 509 banning the Communist Party has not yet been presented to parliament. There still exists the barbaric system of civic loyalty certificates required for employment in many government and private services, which is, in effect, an attempt to deprive thousands of people of the right to work. The anti-constitutional decrees denying citizenship and the right of repatriation of tens of thousands of political emigrés remain in force. Last but not least, the government continues to keep in prison 130,000 Resistance fighters who were indicted on the trumped-up charge of espionage and in accordance with the fascist Law No. 509 which the government itself has virtually annulled, thereby admitting its anti-constitutional character.

It should be added that the machinery of state left after the period of the Rights' rule, with all its semi-governmental and supra-state institutions has been left almost intact, and nothing is being done to punish the ERE leaders and activists, who are guilty, in addition to everything else, of the assassination of the champion of peace and democracy, Grigorios Lambrakis.

As regards the "social" democracy promised by the government, the mounting struggle of the workers for their economic demands to which the government turns a deaf ear speaks for itself.

Q. How do you pose the problem of the legalization of your Party?

A. Our position on this question was stated in detail in the letter our Central Committee sent on April 5 to the government, parliament and various political parties.

Our Party was outlawed in the civil war period, 15 years ago. Whatever opinions may be held regarding the reasons for this state of affairs (civil war), international and Greek experience has shown that the situation can be remedied only through a general political amnesty.

Legalization of the Communist Party of Greece is first and foremost a demand of the people, explicitly expressed in the results

of the February elections. At the same time it is a national necessity, for it is impossible to solve the numerous problems inherited from the eleven-year rule of the Rights without the support of all the national forces.

The concept of democracy is incompatible with the banning of a party representing and voicing the interests of the working class and other strata of the working people and exerting an influence on the people which is recognized by all.

Finally, I should like to stress that so long as the Communist Party of Greece remains outlawed, so long as the foundations on which the neo-fascist regime of the Rights developed remain, thus permitting the name of Greece to be associated with the names of Franco Spain and Salazar Portugal, there can be no question of restoration of democracy, to say nothing of "genuine" democracy.

The Communist Party of Greece considers that genuine democratization is impossible without the abolition of all the emergency decrees and anti-constitutional laws, without the legalization of the Communist Party, repatriation of political emigrés, and a general political amnesty.

The Greek people know that in their struggle for democratization they can count on the international solidarity and support of the democratic forces, which have always been especially active in France.

Q. What is the Communist Party's stand on the Cyprus question?

A. The Communist Party of Greece has always supported the demand for the independence and integrity of Cyprus and the Cypriot people's right to self-determination. During the new critical phase of the Cyprus problem our Central Committee exposed, in a special statement of June, 1964, the constant pressure brought to bear on Greece by the imperialists, the U.S. imperialists in the first place, to force her consent to a solution that would serve, not the national interests of Greece and Cyprus, but the Atlantic interests.

The latest events have demonstrated the imperative need for the mobilization of the masses and all patriotic forces to achieve a solution that would guarantee the independence and integrity of Cyprus and the right of its people to self-determination.

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

New books from Progress

CHALLENGE OF THE '60s by Leslie Morris.....$0.15

Keynote address of the national leader of the Communist Party of Canada at March 1964 18th Convention outlining a 3-point program for Canada.

THE SECOND WORLD WAR by G. Deborin $2.00

A new thoroughly documented book, based on Soviet archives.

MARXIST PHILOSOPHY by V. Afanasyev $1.75

393 pp. cloth

A popular course outline dealing with philosophy as a science.

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
by P. Nikitin $1.75

404 pp. cloth

An Academy of Sciences of the USSR award winner.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MARXISM-LENINISM
ed. by O. Kuusinen $2.50

735 pp. cloth

Second revised edition (1963) dealing in one volume with the world outlook, scientific basis, philosophy, theory and tactics of the International Communist movement.

Order from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3

or from your local bookstore

PRICE TEN CENTS

FILE COPY

Included in this Issue

INTERNATIONAL MEETING—

ROAD TO SOLIDARITY OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF AKEL (Cyprus)

MESSAGE OF CP OF VENEZUELA

INFORMATION

bulletin

19

Issued by

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 19

contents

INTERNATIONAL MEETING—ROAD TO SOLIDARITY OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Lead article in PRAVDA **5**

CHINESE LEADERS STEP UP PROVOCATIONS
Editorial in RUDE PRAVO **15**

TO THE CC, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA
June 12, 1964 letter of the CC,
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party **20**

STATEMENT OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY **27**

LETTER OF PROTEST OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM TO COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA **28**

RESOLUTION OF THE FOURTH PLENUM OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF AKEL (Cyprus) **29**

COMBINE ALL FORMS OF POPULAR STRUGGLE
Documents of 30th meeting of CC,
Communist Party of Colombia **37**

MESSAGE OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF VENEZUELA TO THE PEOPLE OF VENEZUELA (abridged) **47**

PARTY ACTIVITIES **54**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
September 18, 1964

INTERNATIONAL MEETING — ROAD TO SOLIDARITY OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

PRAVDA'S LEAD ARTICLE OF AUGUST 10, 1964

The question of convening an international Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties is today in the center of attention of Communists throughout the world.

As a result of the discussion of this question two positions have been rather clearly revealed. The absolute majority of Communist Parties have spoken in favor of convening a new international Meeting in the near future. The CPSU shares this view. A different position has lately been taken by the leaders of the Communist Party of China; they are of the opinion that a Meeting should be convened not earlier than 4-5 years hence and still better not to convene one at all. The Communist press rightly considers this stand as a refusal to take part in collective consultations with other Communist Parties, as a desire to dictate its will to them.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist-Leninist Parties have come out in favor of convening a Meeting of Representatives of Communist Parties both because of the necessity of collectively solving urgent problems of revolutionary struggle in the present-day epoch and because of the long standing traditions which have formed in the international communist movement: that questions concerning the general interests of Communists in all parts of the world should be solved at international forums of fraternal parties.

This year marks the centenary of the first international meeting of representatives of the revolutionary proletariat which was convened on the initiative of Marx and Engels and which laid the beginning of an international association of Communists, the First International. In the course of the subsequent decades representatives of workers' parties regularly conducted congresses and conferences in order collectively to discuss common tasks of the revolutionary struggle.

An international Meeting, under present-day conditions, is the most expedient form of joint creative work of Communists the world over, the most effective way of strengthening the solidarity of fraternal parties, of successfully overcoming difficulties which they encounter.

The significance of the 1957 and 1960 Meetings was recognized

by the entire world communist movement. They played a truly historic part in the promotion and strengthening of the communist movement on the basis of Leninist principles. The Declaration and Statement adopted by these Meetings greatly contributed to the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, the rallying of all Communists, the stepping up of the struggle for working-class interests and the consolidation of the forces of socialism. The evaluations and conclusions contained in these documents have been a good orientation for the further growth of the national-liberation movement, for intensifying the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, and a great help for all progressive forces. It is now impossible to imagine the revolutionary teaching without these documents, without the conclusions and propositions on matters of principle formulated in them. All parties which took part in the meetings voluntarily and unanimously pledged to abide by the principled propositions set forth in these documents.

The experience of recent years has borne out that the general line of the world communist movement collectively drawn up by the fraternal parties is the only correct policy. Four years have passed since the 1960 Meeting. During this time there have occurred no a few important changes in the world which call for new collective study and discussions, for new evaluations and conclusions. The need has arisen for Communists to get together and sum up the results of the path traversed since 1960, exchange newly gained experience, consider in a creative way the new problems that face the world communist movement and carry forward the ideas of the Declaration and the Statement.

Marxist-Leninists cannot ignore the fact that the profound differences that have appeared in their ranks during the past four years, far from losing their sharpness, are becoming more serious. These differences today have expanded to become an open conflict which, if not overcome by joint effort, can lead to a split in the international communist movement.

More and more facts show that attempts are being made in the camp of imperialism and reaction to cash in on the differences which have arisen within the ranks of Communists through the fault of the CPC leaders. The political struggle against the Marxist-Leninist Parties started by Peking, undermines the friendship between the peoples of the socialist countries, sows confusion in the ranks of the working-class and national-liberation movements and may weaken the force of attraction of socialist ideas. It harms the entire communist movement and exercises an extremely negative influence on the activities of many Communist Parties, especially in capitalist countries. The inner-Party factionalist struggle inside the ranks of certain Communist Parties,

instigated by the Chinese splitters, makes it easier for the reactionaries to launch an offensive against the interests of the working people. Great harm is being done to the cause of rallying the anti-imperialist forces. This is especially dangerous since fascist forces are renewing their activities in a number of countries. The imperialists strive to maintain the old hotbeds of war danger and kindle new ones. The fact that the U.S. imperialists and the South Vietnamese militarists, who do their bidding, have stepped up their aggressive activities in South-East Asia is further evidence of the desire of our enemies to use the difficulties that have arisen as a result of the splitting activities of the CPC leadership.

Under these conditions it is imperative to take measures to rally all the anti-imperialist forces of the world today, and above all their main detachments—the peoples of the socialist countries, the communist, the working-class and national-liberation movements. Their united efforts should be aimed at intensifying the struggle to preserve and strengthen the forces for peace, against the intrigues of the imperialists, colonialists and reactionaries. In the present situation, each of these detachments is faced with specific and with common tasks in the joint struggle for democratic development, security and social progress.

Faced by such a situation the Communist Parties cannot remain indifferent. As in the past, when newly arising problems were discussed and solved by joint effort at international congresses and conferences, Marxist-Leninists believe it necessary today to come together and hold an international Meeting to exchange opinions and work out joint decisions.

In defiance of the opinion of the absolute majority of Communist Parties, the CPC leaders declared that under present-day conditions nobody had the right to convene an international Meeting and that it was "impermissible for any one party or a group of parties" to convene such a Meeting. When they were reminded of the instructions given by the 1957 Meeting to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union "to take upon itself the function of calling meetings of the Communist and Workers' Parties after consultations with the fraternal parties," they started to assert that the words "after consultations with the fraternal parties," meant "given the unanimous consent of the fraternal parties."

Such a point of view actually means nothing but to give one party the right to block, at its discretion, an international forum that other parties wish to hold, to give one party the right to obstruct a joint discussion of any problem, to prevent at will an international Meeting in defiance of the wishes of the absolute majority of parties. Is this not a desire of one party to impose its will on the entire international communist movement and to

establish its dictate over it? No Marxist-Leninist can agree to such claims.

Another "argument" against the holding of an international Meeting of Communist Parties is that up till now "the CPC and the CPSU have not yet reached common views through consultations." Having evaded in every way consultations with the CPSU and having continued to slander it, the CPC leaders hypocritically hint, seeking the support of vacillating persons in the communist movement, that the international Meeting can be a success only if all the problems subject to a joint study, discussion and solution are considered and solved beforehand by two parties—those of the Soviet Union and China.

There is no doubt that the achievement of a mutual understanding between the CPSU and the CPC would assist greatly the successful holding of this Meeting. Our Party attached great significance to bilateral consultations with the CPC. Delegations of the two parties met last summer on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee. However, this meeting was cut short by the Chinese side. In the time that has passed since then the Chinese side showed no interest in consultations with the CPSU. On the contrary, it has stepped up its attacks and slander campaign against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties.

During the past year the CPSU Central Committee had on many occasions stated its agreement to hold a new meeting, had unilaterally stopped public polemics for a long time and had put forward a number of constructive proposals in the interests of the unity and cohesion of the CPSU and the CPC, and of all Communist Parties in the world. All these proposals have been rejected by the leaders of the CPC.

It should be emphasized, however, that the CPSU has never held that one or two parties separately—even parties as big as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China—can take upon themselves to solve problems that have an immediate bearing on the interests and destinies of the whole international communist movement. To take up such a point of view would be tantamount, as our Party firmly believes, to a return to the day of the personality cult, to dividing the parties into "higher placed" and "lower placed" parties. Our Party will never assume such an anti-Leninist position and will wage an implacable fight against any attempt to impose the diktat of one party on the whole communist movement.

Topical problems that now confront the communist movement, as well as the differences existing between Communists can and must be examined and resolved by the collective effort of all Marxist-Leninist Parties. Every communist party bears responsibility to the working class and the working people of its country,

and also to the international working class, for the situation in the communist movement as a whole, for the preservation and consolidation of its unity and cohesion.

By proposing to solve in advance all problems through agreement between two parties, the leaders of the Communist Party of China are obviously reducing the role of an international Meeting to a formal parade, a get-together of representatives of other parties who would have only to put their signatures to the resolutions prepared for them. It is hardly necessary to say that such an approach to the Meeting and the nature of its work completely contradicts the Leninist principles of relations between parties.

Yet another "argument" of those opposed to the Meeting is that it has been "insufficiently prepared" and that, they allege, no consultations have been held with fraternal parties, as envisaged in the resolution of the 1957 Meeting. As for consultations, they have been held for more than two years, beginning in 1962. During this time a true referendum has been conducted among the parties, and at present the positions of all the Communist and Workers' Parties on the calling of the Meeting are fully known. These positions have been formulated in decisions of central organs, in correspondence between them, in statements made by leaders of the fraternal parties, in joint statements on the results of bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and in other forms. The absolute majority of the Communist Parties insist that the convocation of the Meeting should not be postponed for a long time. Proposals have been made to hold a new international Meeting approximately in the middle of next year. Thus, the stipulation on conducting consultations contained in the resolution of the 1957 Meeting has been fully implemented.

And how do matters stand with "big preparatory work" for which so much verbal concern is shown in Peking? If preparatory work for the Meeting is to be understood as work to overcome differences and to strengthen unity in the communist movement, then the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties have been tirelessly conducting it for the past four years. Unfortunately, the leaders of the Communist Party of China persistently avoid participation in this work, flatly refusing to stop on a mutual basis public polemics and put an end to their undermining activities in the fraternal parties. Not so long ago they made a cynical statement that they would "continue doing so, only much better and on a wider scale." Evidently it is for this kind of "preparatory work" that they need to gain time at any price and keep their hands free, and it is for these ends that they suggest the Meeting should be postponed for 4 to 5 years, or even longer. This is how the Marxist-Leninist Parties have assessed CPC objections to calling an international Meeting in the near future.

In the course of discussions by the Communist Parties on questions related to the convocation of an international Meeting, the question of collective preliminary work was also discussed. It was considered expedient to set up a Drafting Commission on the model of that for the 1960 Meeting, which could prepare the drafts of the main documents for the new Meeting as well as proposals and recommendations on a whole round of questions connected with its sessions. It came out in the course of the preliminary exchange of opinions that while nobody argued against the Drafting Commission in principle, the question of the composition of the Commission might become a new major roadblock on the way to the Meeting. This might play into the hands of those who intend to avoid the international Meeting of the Communists and to use any means to frustrate it. The way out is very simple in the opinion of the fraternal parties: drawing on the experience of the 1960 Meeting, the Drafting Commission should be composed of the representatives of the same 26 parties which successfully coped with the task entrusted to them in October-November 1960.

The experience in preparing for the 1960 Meeting with the aid of a collective international commission was very successful and can serve as a good example. The Drafting Commission was composed of representatives of the Communist Parties of the main regions of the revolutionary movement: the socialist countries, the developed capitalist countries, the newly developing states, the countries fighting for their national independence—that is, the Communist Parties of Australia, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Great Britain, Hungary, DRV, GDR, West Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, PRC, KPDR, Cuba, MPR, Poland, Rumania, Syria, USSR, USA, Finland, France, Czechosloviakia and Japan. This is a very representative membership of the Commission and it might successfully cope with the preparation for the new Meeting.

The CPSU Central Committee suggested the other day that all the above Communuist Parties send their representatives to the Drafting Commission and that this commission get down to work in Moscow on December 15, if this arrangement is acceptable to the fraternal parties. This gives the Drafting Commission sufficient time for preparations. In this intervening period, the Communist Parties whose representatives are to work on the Commission will be able to study, again and again, the materials relating to the discussion proceeding in the international communist movement, to compare various viewpoints and to prepare their suggestions for the beginning of the opinion exchanges with the other participants of the Commission.

It is common knowledge that in 1960 the Drafting Commission

worked rather strenuously for a whole month having come up against the "special" positions of the Chinese and Albanian representatives. This time the Commission will presumably sit for not a shorter, but possibly a longer period of time. This is the reason for the fraternal parties suggesting that the international Meeting be called some time in mid-1965.

The possibility of some party or other failing to send its representatives by the time set should not be ruled out, of course. But should this stand in the Commission's way? Certainly not. Each party is entitled to decide independently whether it should take part in the work of the Commission or the Meeting or not. It is also indisputable that all the other Communist Parties have every right to do all they can to ensure the successful preparation and holding of the Meeting.

The CPSU is for a meeting that would help overcome the existing difficulties and prevent a split. The Chinese proposals lay special emphasis on the fact that under present-day conditions the Meeting can end only in a split of the communist movement, that it will certainly lead to a "quarrel and its participants will walk out without achieving any results." It turns out that those who are actively driving for a split in the communist movement, who ignore and cynically abuse the calls of the fraternal parties to stop subversive activities in the communist movement, are now passing themselves off as the champions of solidarity. Under the plea of reaching "a unanimous concord of the fraternal parties" they declare the Meeting "unlawful" in advance if CPC representatives do not take part in it. Actually these statements testify only to one thing, namely that their authors strive to frustrate the Meeting at all costs, through blackmail and threats of a split. But it is precisely the refusal to take part in the Meeting that indicates the desire to bring about an "official" split.

Certainly if the aim of the Meeting is seen exclusively as condemning somebody, calling somebody insulting names and making irresponsible charges, this will result in the further disunity rather than the stronger unity of the communist movement. For our Party, however, just as for the absolute majority of other Marxist-Leninist Parties the problem of holding a new international Meeting is inseparably linked up with the problem of preserving and strengthening the unity of the world communist movement. Our Party is firmly and unswervingly adhering to, and will exert every effort to uphold a position that it has defined on many occasions—the Meeting of the Communist Parties is not a gathering to "excommunicate" some party or other from the communist movement, to arbitrarily force some country or other out of the world socialist system, that it is not going to be a scene of wrangles and mutual accusation. The CPSU proceeds from the

fact that in the face of the contradictions confronting the communist movement now, it is necessary, above all, to concentrate on elaborating general positions, on bringing out what all the Marxist-Leninist Parties have in common, in finding ways of overcoming the difficulties in our path.

Every Marxist-Leninist Party taking part in the Meeting can frankly and in a business-like way state its point of view on all urgent problems so that its opinion may be taken into consideration in the working out of a common policy and common decisions. At the same time an international Meeting is the most suitable place where responsible representatives of the Communist Parties may hear the opinions of other parties, compare these with their own views and hold collective and creative discussion in an attempt to secure mutual understanding and unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The international Meeting will be convened to discuss collectively the urgent problems of the communist movement to find mutually acceptable solutions and to define common tasks. To demand "unanimity," "unanimous views" prior to convening the Meeting, as a binding condition for calling it, means to deprive the future Meeting of its creative constructive role, thus actually rejecting this tested collective form of activity in the communist movement.

For more than four years, the leaders of the CPC have been importunately asserting that it is they who are the bearers of "truth," that truth is on their side and they have slanderously labelled all those who do not agree with them as "modern revisionists" and "accomplices of imperialism." A legitimate question arises: if truth is on their side, why are they so afraid of the international Meeting? Why do they, far from promoting the earliest convocation of the international forum of Communists where they could state their "truths" and defend them openly in the face of responsible representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties of the world, try to block it in every way possible? Is it not really because they recognize the weakness and fallaciousness of their "truths" and the unsteadiness of their arguments? This, apparently, is why they fear meeting the militant leaders of the world communist movement, tried and tested in the fire of class struggle, whom they slander with such zeal.

In the course of consultations the fraternal parties stated that in their opinion, the starting point for the work of the new Meeting should be the decisions of the previous Meetings—the Declaration and the Statement—which state the general policy of the world communist movement. It goes without saying that a mere confirmation of the vitality and effectiveness of these documents would not exhaust the tasks of the new Meeting. The most important task of the Meeting will apparently be to consider crea-

tively and discuss new problems, to analyze new economic, social and political phenomena and processes, to coordinate appraisals and positions, to enrich and make more concrete, in accordance with them, the general line of the communist movement.

The letter of the CPSU Central Committee of June 15 (published in the No. 10 issue of *Kommunist* and in the July 17 issue of *Pravda*) says that if the international Meeting of Communists proves unable to solve this main task at once, this would not mean a failure, "an official registration" of the split in the communist movement. On the question, which today deeply agitates many people, our Party answers that it firmly believes that even in that case the new Meeting may be of great use if only its participants do not reduce its aims solely to deepening the differences and imposing on it at all costs the will of one Party. Even if we fail to achieve a "unanimous view" at the Meeting, so much desired in words by the Peking leaders, it would be useful in that case, too, for the leaders of the Communist Parties to get together to expound their opinions, to hear the opinions of others, and to discuss jointly the general problems of the communist movement.

It is well known that the incentive for convening the 1960 Meeting was in the first place the desire of the Communist Parties to clarify the differences that came to light at that time because of the separate position of the CPC leaders on a number of principal issues of the day. However, alongside principled criticism of the misleading views of the Chinese and the Albanian representatives supporting them, it proved possible, in the course of the Meeting to elaborate a big positive program of action of the communist movement which was expressed in the Statement. At that time, the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties had the courage to get together and discuss complicated problems frankly, in a comradely and principled way. All Communist Parties, without exception, admitted later that the 1960 Meeting proved very useful and fruitful.

Of course, we should not shut our eyes to the fact that the new international Meeting will take place in an incomparably more complicated situation than the 1960 Meeting. But even should we fail at once to find a common language and work out a unanimous attitude to all questions, there is every ground for reaching agreement at the Meeting that the Communist Parties pledge to take into consideration each other's views, conscientiously collaborate in those fields where common ground and interests are found, abstain in future from any action that may harm the Communist Parties, aggravate their difficulties and gladden only our class enemies.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union goes to the new

international Meeting with the firm belief that there are no, nor can there be any, insurmountable objective obstacles to prevent the Meeting, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, from strengthening the unity of the world communist movement instead of aggravating the differences. Our Party, defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism, inseparably links up the aims and prospects of the Meeting with the task of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the world communist movement, the world socialist system, and bringing nearer the victory of the proletariat on a worldwide scale. It is the deep conviction of our Party that such an approach to the tasks of the Meeting accords with the supreme interests of world communism, proletarian internationalism, with the interests of strengthening the unity of all the progressive, revolutionary forces of today.

CHINESE LEADERS STEP UP PROVOCATIONS

RUDE PRAVO EDITORIAL OF AUGUST 5, 1964

On July 28, 1964, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China sent an abusive letter to the CC of the CPSU, which is a reply to the CPSU Central Committee's letter of June 15. *Rude Pravo* acquainted its reader with the content of the latter on July 16.

In its letter, addressed to all fraternal parties, the CC CPSU stated its position on the principal questions related to the differences existing in the international Communist movement and suggested concrete measures to strengthen the unity of the movement. Primarily it is the question of convening another conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties. The ideological differences that arose in the Communist movement four years ago are becoming increasingly more serious and have now developed into an open conflict. Unless steps are taken, a tragic split may occur, which is bound to harm the further development of the revolutionary movement, the socialist world system, and the broad anti-imperialist struggle. No Marxist-Leninist party can remain indifferent to this prospect, for what is at stake is the destiny of not one or two parties but of our whole movement. Another international meeting to draw up a common platform has become a pressing necessity.

We have already become accustomed to seeing every new "opus" of the Peking leaders outdo the previous one in both its invective and outrageous abuse levelled at fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, and in its content which boils down today to undisguised and vicious political struggle against the international Communist movement and its Marxist-Leninist political line.

To the well-founded letter of the CC CPSU, which says that "it is above all necessary to concentrate efforts on finding that which we have in common, which unites all fraternal parties, on exploring the ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen," which expresses confidence that there are no objective insurmountable obstacles to bringing the situation in the Communist movement back to normal—to this letter which testifies to the great patience displayed by the CPSU, the Chinese leaders reply with unheard-of provocation.

To the views and attitude of the CPSU, which are fully supported by the overwhelming majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the

anti-Communist pamphlet signed, regrettably, by the CC CPC, replies but with new abuse and slander: ". . . you have taken leave of your senses and are talking nonsense." According to the Chinese leaders, the CPSU has "ugly features in colluding with the reactionaries and sabotaging the peoples' revolutionary struggles" and conducts "criminal action." In its official document the CC of the Communist Party of China says the following to the CPSU: "You are falling into a trap of your own making and will end by losing your skin."

Apparently, it is all this that the Chinese splitters consider the "great debate." They pose as "a serious Marxist-Leninist party" which exposes and refutes revisionism. They write: "The revisionist line of your Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses is the root cause of the differences in the present international Communist movement."

The Chinese leaders have long since gone beyond the limits of attacking individual fundamental principles of the Communist movement. They have completely exposed themselves and are conducting systematic attacks against the general line of the international Communist movement as a whole from the positions of the personality cult ideology. Moreover, their attacks have far transcended the bounds of discussion and exchange of views on the current problems of the international revolutionary movement and assumed the character of atrocious lies and slanders which are part and parcel of their tactics of discrediting the Marxist-Leninist parties.

Irate attacks and invective are their only reply to the efforts of the Marxist-Leninist parties to sum up and generalize, at the forthcoming international meeting (the convocation of which is absolutely imperative), the results of the important changes that have taken place in recent years and draw the proper conclusions.

In their letter to the CPSU they write: "In asserting that 'most of the socialist countries are completing an important period of their development and are approaching new heights in the construction of a new society', you actually want to introduce the 'party of the entire people' and the 'state of the whole people', change the proletarian character of the Communist parties, abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat and open floodgates to the restoration of capitalism. In saying that the socialist countries need 'to improve the forms of cooperation and mutual assistance' and 'coordinatic . of political and economic activities', you really want the fraternal countries to obey your baton and become your dependencies or colonies economically, politically and militarily. In claiming that 'there is now much that is new in the forms of organization and the methods' of struggle of the working class of the capitalist countries, you are actually propagating the 'par-

liamentary road' and the theory of 'structural reform', 'peaceful transition' and the liquidation of proletarian revolution."

They go on to say: "In stating that 'the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system has entered its closing stage', you really want to liquidate the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism and old and new colonialism. In reducing the external policy of the socialist countries to that of 'preserving peace and promoting peaceful coexistence', you are actually opposed to struggling against imperialism and to supporting the revolution of the oppressed peoples and nations. In substituting the concept that 'the imperialist reactionaries led by wild men of the U.S. and other imperialist powers' for the concept that 'U.S. imperialism has become an enemy of the peoples of the whole world' as stated in the Statement of 1960, you actually want to ally yourselves with the U.S. ruling clique, whom you call 'wise men', and in partnership with U.S. imperialism to carve up the world and oppose the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of all countries."

Ultimately the CPC leaders write: "What you mean by 'settling the differences', revealing what there is 'in common' and the necessity to 'attend the proposed conference . . . with a constructive program' boils down to one thing: you really want to force the Marxist-Leninist parties to accept the revisionist line peddled by the Twentieth and the Twenty-Second Congresses of the CPSU."

It follows from the actions of the Chinese leaders, from the violent character of their propaganda campaign which they crowned with the above-mentioned letter, that they are now completing their ideological desertion from the international Communist movement and creating a situation to which the latter should give a proper answer. *In the situation of their making, the convocation of an international meeting of representatives of the Communist parties proposed by the CPSU and fully supported by the overwhelming majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, becomes an urgent necessity.* Our Party has clearly defined its attitude on this score. Fully agreeing with the opinion of the Soviet comrades, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia insists on holding, without undue delay, an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties.

The meeting will not be called to denounce anyone or attach abusive labels, but to concentrate on clarifying what we have in common, on searching for ways to overcome the present differences. There is not a single insuperable obstacle to starting preparations for such a meeting.

The Chinese leaders not only obstinately refuse to take part in the proposed meeting, without which the situation in the inter-

national Communist movement cannot be normalized, but also brazenly threaten those who suggest that the meeting should be called: ". . . the day your so-called meeting takes place will be the day you step into your grave." Moreover, they declare an open crusade against the ideological and organizational unity of individual Marxist-Leninist parties and do not conceal their intention to split at all costs the international Communist movement not only ideologically but also organizationally.

The CC CPC writes in its letter: "Contrary to your attitude, the Communist Party of China and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties show great admiration for those Marxist-Leninists who have rebuilt revolutionary parties of the proletariat. It is our unshirkable proletarian internationalist duty to maintain close ties with them and to give firm support to their revolutionary struggle. We did so before, we are doing so now, and, however you may revile us, we will continue to do so in the future and do it more and do it better."

The schemes of the Chinese leaders are perfectly clear. They vehemently oppose the convening of the international meeting in the immediate future, because they want first to change the balance of forces, create in every country, wherever possible, a rival "Communist" party (even if consisting of a membership of only a few dozen turncoats), and thus come to the meeting as a force which will represent, formally, an international movement. Consequently, they insist on a complete (actual and formal) split of the movement as an obligatory prerequisite for convening a meeting. Hence their striving to postpone international talks for at least four or five years, and carry on the open "debate." However, in the shape visualized by them, the debate has nothing in common with a businesslike solution of the pressing problems. Its purpose is only to worsen relations, exacerbate contradictions and revile all those who oppose them. Without the slightest hesitation they in advance call the meeting of the Marxist-Leninist parties a "schismatic meeting."

The Chinese leaders clearly go too far. They orientate themselves solely on a split, on deepening the differences in the Communist ranks. This is the best service they can render to anticommunism. More and more facts provide evidence that the class enemies seek to utilize the disagreements among us. Imperialist reaction, especially in the USA, works to consolidate its positions and to launch an offensive against the revolutionay and democratic movement, to undermine the unity of the socialist countries and increase the danger of war.

However, there is nothing that can deflect the Marxist-Leninist parties from their task—to fight for the unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of creative Marxism-Leninism.

The overwhelming majority of these parties stand for unity, for respect for the common internationalist interests of the world revolutionary movement. Despite the obstacles piled up by the Chinese leaders, there is no doubt that the sound forces in the international Communist movement will continue to be in the overwhelming majority, that they will build their relations on Leninist principles, discuss in common all outstanding issues, respect the specific conditions in which each Party works, and surge ahead in unity in the fight against all enemies of communism.

TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

JUNE 12, 1964 LETTER FROM CENTRAL COMMITTEE, MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party has had an opportunity to examine the numerous printed documents of the Communist Party of China, specifically the letters of the Central Committee of the CPC to the Central Committee of the CPSU of February 20, 27 and 29, and May 7 of this year.

We deeply regret to say that the contents of these documents cannot but evoke the serious concern of all who are loyal and devoted to the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, to the great cause of peace and socialism.

The Mongolian people, being the immediate neighbors of China, followed closely and with feelings of fraternal solidarity the national-liberation struggle of the great Chinese people and rejoiced at the victory of the Chinese revolution and the formation of the Chinese People's Republic. Our people, as the good neighbors and sincere friends of the Chinese people, likewise welcomed the establishment of friendly relations between the MPR and the CPR. We have always earnestly sought to strengthen and develop fraternal friendship and cooperation between our two countries on the basis of the inviolable principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Mongolian people generally have always had the deepest respect for the Communist Party of China which headed the national-liberation struggle of the Chinese people and led the Chinese working people to victory in the anti-imperialist revolution.

In view of this, and believing that it is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party constantly to strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement, the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party would like to give frank and comradely expression to its opinion with regard to the present policy line of the CPC leadership.

We have been greatly distressed to witness the sharp turn which the leadership of your Party, before the eyes of the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and the whole Communist world, has executed in its home and foreign policy in recent years,

departing more and more from the principles of Marxism-Leninism, from the agreed line of the international Communist movement as expressed in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960.

The leadership of the Communist Party of China, taking issue with the world Communist movement on a number of important ideological questions and evoking the censure of the Marxist-Leninist parties, did not heed the friendly appeals of the fraternal parties or draw the proper conclusions from the debate. On the contrary, the leaders of your Party chose the path of deepening and exacerbating the differences with the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and subsequently passed over to outright subversive, disruptive activities in the international Communist movement.

One might have concluded at first that all this was a mistake, that the Chinese comrades had unwittingly strayed from the right path and that their pride and vanity did not allow them to heed the voice of the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. However, as has now become quite clear to all, the disruptive activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China cannot be regarded merely as a mistake or a misapprehension. These actions are the fruit of the considered policy of the CPC leaders, a policy designed to achieve the far-reaching nationalistic aims of assuming hegemony in the world Communist and revolutionary movement and subordinating the Communist and Workers' parties of the world to their *diktat*.

Passing over to practical realization of its exclusive, hegemonistic aims, the CPC leadership concentrated all its efforts on splitting the world socialist community, the international Communist movement and the worldwide democratic organizations.

We have seen how the CPC leaders, operating on a broad front, have launched large-scale subversive activities aimed at splitting the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties; we see how they are knocking together inside the various parties factional groups consisting of renegades, nationalists, unprincipled anti-Party elements and diverse other apostates, attempting at the same time to find theoretical justification for their actions.

In their struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Chinese leaders stop at nothing, resorting to the most unscrupulous methods to achieve their ends.

The CPC leaders regard the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as their most dangerous enemy and are doing everything in their power to undermine its vast international prestige and to discredit the titanic practical activity of the great Party of Lenin, evidently hoping in this way to realize their hegemonistic aims.

The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, like all the other Marxist parties, has always regarded and continues to regard the

CPSU as the tried and tested vanguard of the world Communist movement which has made an invaluable contribution to the elaboration of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and the defense of its purity, to the growth and consolidation of the entire Communist and working-class movement. Our Party holds that the attitude to the glorious Party of Lenin, the most experienced and seasoned contingent of the Communist movement, to the Soviet Union, the first country of socialism, is today the main criterion of loyalty of Communists of all countries to the great doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, to the principles of proletarian internationalism.

By pursuing an adventurist policy and taking advantage of every opportunity to carry on their disruptive and subversive activities, the Chinese leaders are doing incalculable harm to the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries and the ranks of the international Communist movement; they are distracting the attention and the forces of the Communists and of the working class from the struggle against imperialism, creating new obstacles to the victory of the socialist and national-liberation revolutions in the various countries.

The invidious practices of the Chinese leaders and their struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties cannot be qualified otherwise than open betrayal of the cause of the proletarian revolution and the struggle against imperialism, betrayal of the interests of the peoples of the socialist countries, and primarily the interests of the Chinese people themselves and the gravest crime against the world proletariat and the international Communist movement.

We consider it our duty to declare that, unless it is abandoned, the present reactionary, anti-socialist policy of the CPC leaders may not only retard the progress of the great Chinese people to socialism, but under certain conditions can also create a serious threat to their revolutionary gains.

The logic of things might well lead to a situation where China will have no other alternative than to yield to the imperialists in one or another sphere of economic or political activity. And there is no guarantee that the self-imposed isolation of China from the community of socialist countries, the severance of economic and other ties with them and the obvious orientation of the CPC leaders on continued rapprochement with countries of the imperialist camp, will not be fraught with the danger of the gradual surrender of their socialist positions, to the detriment of the fundamental interests of the Chinese people and the common cause of world communism.

It is quite clear that the theory and practices of the Chinese splitters have their roots in a long-standing nationalism bordering

on racialism, in aggressive great-power chauvinism and an unprincipled combination of dogmatism and revisionism.

All the Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, hold that the anti-Marxist, adventurist actions of the CPC leaders constitute at the present time the main danger to the unity of the countries of the socialist community and the ranks of the world Communist movement, the unity and solidarity of all forces standing for peace, national independence and social progress.

Never before has it been so urgently necessary for Marxist-Leninists in all countries to uphold the purity of the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the unity and cohesion of the world socialist system and the international Communist and working-class movement in the name of the triumph of socialism and communism.

Communists in all countries are well aware that the split which the Chinese leaders are striving so insistently to bring about is fraught with the gravest consequences for world communism, for the forces arrayed against imperialism. In the face of this danger all the Marxist-Leninist parties, loyal to the cause of socialism and communism, to the noble struggle of the peace-loving peoples to avert nuclear holocaust, for the happy future for all mankind, gratefully welcome the colossal efforts exerted by the CPSU and fully support its proposals concerning ways and means of overcoming the differences.

For their part, many fraternal parties have given friendly advice to the leadership of the CPC, earnestly exhorting it to think of the disastrous consequences its disruptive and adventurist actions will have, to abandon the erroneous, anti-Marxist line it is pursuing and to rejoin the other Marxist parties in the struggle for our great common goals.

As for the MPRP, in talks with leaders of the CPC and in its official documents, it has stated its attitude with regard to the differences of the CPC leaders with the world Communist movement and their anti-Marxist actions, and has condemned and continues to condemn their attempts to bring pressure to bear in devious ways on our Party and country.

However, the leaders of your Party have not only rejected the constructive proposals made by the CC CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties to end the public debate in the Communist movement, but despite the timely warnings, the counsel and the wishes expressed by the fraternal parties, have deliberately intensified the polemics, using moreover methods which are utterly impermissible in relations between Communist parties.

Anyone who is genuinely anxious to consolidate the ranks of the world Communist movement, cannot remain indifferent to

what is contained in the CC CPC letter to the CC CPSU of May 1, 1964. In that letter the leadership of your Party rejects the proposal of the CPSU to organize a meeting of representatives of the 26 parties this summer, as well as the proposal to convene another meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties in the autumn of 1964, and slanderously alleges that the CPSU in advancing these proposals was "planning to precipitate an open split in the world Communist movement."

We regard your attempt to drag out the meeting of representatives of the fraternal parties indefinitely as evidence of your desire to play for time in order to step up your disruptive and subversive activities which are doing incalculable harm to the entire world revolutionary movement.

The Central Committee of the MPRP therefore considers the CC CPC proposal to postpone the above-mentioned meetings and conferences to be utterly unacceptable.

As for further measures to overcome the differences in the world Communist movement, the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party fully supports the proposal of the CPSU and other fraternal parties to hold a meeting of delegations of the CPSU and the CPC as soon as possible and organize a preparatory conference of representatives of the 26 fraternal parties which comprised the drafting committee of the Moscow Meeting of 1960, and expresses its full agreement with the proposal to call another meeting of all the Communist parties in the nearest future.

In view of this, the Ceneral Committee of our Party calls upon the CC CPC to agree to the above measures, to discuss the differences with the fraternal parties in a comradely spirit as behooves Party members, and seek to overcome the differences in the interests of further consolidating the unity of the mighty socialist community and the world Communist movement.

We cannot conceive of any other outcome than what would be the most expedient and in the best interests of the CPC leadership, namely: to follow the dictates of reason and abandon its present political course in order to return to the only correct road, the road of joint struggle and cooperation with all the Communists of the world. Such a step on the part of the Chinese comrades would be warmly welcomed by all Marxist-Leninist parties; moreover, future generations would deeply appreciate it and would be duly grateful to the Communists of China.

The Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party would like to hope that the leadership of the Communist Party of China will realize its responsibility to the peoples of the socialist countries, and above all to the millions of Chinese people, to the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, and will have

the Leninist courage to admit the erroneousness of their harmful policy, in order to exert every effort for strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries and the ranks of the international Communist movement on the basis of the inviolable principles of Marxism-Leninism in the name of the victory of our common cause—the cause of socialism, communism and world peace.

With comradely greetings,

Central Committee, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party

Ulan Bator, June 12, 1964

STATEMENT* of the CENTRAL COMMITTEE COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY

In its decision of August 27, 1963, on the situation in the world Communist movement the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkey stated its position regarding the views and actions of the leaders of the Communist Party of China which are at variance with the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings.

Our Party welcomed and supported the proposal that an end be put to the public polemic with a view to preventing the dangerous consequences which the policy of the Chinese leaders may have for the world Communist movement, and preparing a suitable climate for resolving the differences. The Chinese leaders replied to this proposal by starting a campaign of slander against the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties that uphold the principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

The Chinese leaders, seeking to restore Trotskyite views and methods, have taken the path of splitting the unity of the world Communist movement. While paying lip service to the Moscow decisions, they have openly come out against these decisions by advancing their own "general line" which runs counter to Marxism-Leninism and which they want to impose on the other fraternal parties. Their letter of June 14, 1963, and also their disruptive and factional activities bear this out.

The Chinese leaders, whose position is evident from their interpretation of the propositions adopted by the Moscow meetings, no longer conceal their fundamental disagreement with the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties as regards interpretation of the general line of the world Communist movement.

The stand taken by the leaders of the Communist Party of China can only isolate the revolutionary, peace-loving and democratic forces of our time from the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples, from the socialist world system and the international working class. No Marxist-Leninist party devoted to proletarian internationalism, no Communist, can accept a policy that ignores the interests of peace and the principles of peaceful coexistence, that seeks to deprive the national-liberation movements in the dependent and colonial countries of the support of the socialist world system and the world Communist movement.

---

*Yeni Cag. No. 3-4, March-April 1964.

The Chinese leaders hasten to widen the split they have caused in the world Communist movement. It is important to take more effective and resolute measures than hitherto to preserve and strengthen unity. We consider it necessary to support the proposal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to hold a new consultative meeting of all the Communist and Workers' parties.

Together with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all the other fraternal parties, the Communist Party of Turkey is prepared resolutely to fight for the unity of the world Communist movement, for the Marxist-Leninist principles of the Declaration and Statement adopted by the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings.

Central Committee, Communist Party of Turkey

LETTER OF PROTEST* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belgium has addressed the following letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and to the editorial board of *Jenminjihpao*:

Dear Comrades,

Jenminjihpao reports that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has recently received a delegation from the Communist Party of Belgium.

You cannot but know that this report is false, that the said delegation did not represent the Communist Party of Belgium.

The Fourteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium, held in April 1963, elected the Party's leading bodies in the presence of the numerous delegations from the various fraternal parties and in accordance with democratic principles. You know that not a single one of the persons received in Peking is a member of any of the leading bodies of the Communist Party of Belgium.

We deplore the fact that the Chinese Communists and working people have been misled regarding our Party positions. We protest against this mystification.

With Communist greetings,

On behalf of the Central Committee of
the Communist Party of Belgium,
ERNEST BURNELLE, Chairman

---

*Drapeau Rouge, July 23, 1964.

RESOLUTION* OF THE FOURTH PLENUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF AKEL (Cyprus)

An enlarged plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of AKEL held on Sunday June 7, discussed the political developments in Cyprus. On the basis of Comrade Papaioannou's report, which was unanimously approved, the following resolution of the CC of AKEL was adopted:

1. FOR LESSENING OF INTERNATIONAL TENSION, FOR PEACE!

The problem of peace and war continues to remain the most burning question for the whole world. The relative easing of international tension which began after the signing of the Moscow Agreement for partial prohibition of nuclear tests, continues. However, the irreconcilability of the warlike imperialist circles prevents new steps being taken for easing international tension.

As a result of these imperialist tactics problems such as disarmament, the signing of a peace treaty with Germany, and others, remain stagnant, while at the same time the aggressive plans for the multiple nuclear force are pushed forward.

In their irreconcilability and warlike plans these imperialist circles are very much encouraged by the negative stand of the Chinese leadership towards the Moscow agreement and their disruptive policy within the international movement for peace and socialism.

The leadership of the CP of China which is more and more running away from Marxism-Leninism, disrupts the international revolutionary anti-imperialist forces, exposing in this way to serious danger the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence of the peoples, and socialism.

Contrary to the policy of the Chinese leadership which is helping imperialism, the CPSU, with its Leninist Central Committee, and its Leninist leader N. S. Khrushchov, applying faithfully and creatively Marxism-Leninism and the policy of 1957 and 1960 Moscow conferences, contributes decisively to the struggle for the defense of peace, for the independence of the peoples, and for winning new millions of men and women to the socialist ideals.

---

*Akel News Letter, June 1964.

Soviet Aid

The aid which the Soviet Union is granting to the national-liberation movements and to the newly-independent countries, constitutes a decisive factor for the liberation of the subjugated countries, and the securing of their independence. It is not after all accidental that the colonial and newly-independent peoples look upon the Soviet Union as the biggest, sincerest, and selfless guardian and ally in their struggle against imperialism.

The imperialists today draw encouragement from the disruptive policy of the Chinese leadership. But the division in the camp of Socialism does not come, as in the case of the imperialist camp, from clashing interests and contradictions. It is basically the result of petty-bourgeois revolutionism, chauvinism, "big-idealism" of the leadership of the CPC.

The unity of the international socialist movement is imperative and sooner or later this unity will be re-established. But to achieve this unity a new conference of the Communist and Workers' parties must be called in the near future.

The struggle for easing international tension and for peace, which is essentially a struggle against nuclear extermination, constitutes the most immediate and imperative task for all peoples.

Mankind has today the possibility to block the road to war and destruction, because the balance of forces definitely weigh on the side of the forces of peace and social progress. Imperialism is not any more in a position to decide by itself and as it likes when to start and when to finish a war. The forces of peace and socialism, headed by the vanguard Soviet Union, are in a position to safeguard world peace.

2. THE STRUGGLE OF THE CYPRIOT PEOPLE FOR FULL INDEPENDENCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION

For the last six months the Cypriot people have faced an unprecedented, evil, criminal imperialist conspiracy, which turns against the territorial integrity and independence of its country.

* * *

Using the Turkish-Cypriot activity as advance guard, the Anglo-American imperialists who are the architects of the London-Zurich agreements, the West German revanchists, and their satellites in Ankara seek partition, NATO occupation, and the use of Cyprus as a base to protect the huge Anglo-American oil monopolies in the Middle East and for other adventurous aims.

This Anglo-American, West German imperialist plan was prepared long ago. The arming and encouragement of the Turkish-Cypriot mutineers, the lightning intervention of the British army in the role of so-called mediator, the activities of Sandys-Ball and all sorts of pressures, exercised on the Cyprus Government and

President Makarios to accept NATO, constitute concrete facts which witness the full guilt of the Anglo-American and West German imperialists in the preparation and execution of the criminal plan for the partition and occupation of Cyprus.

Popular Unity and International Solidarity

The wonderful unity, determination and resistance of the Cypriot people and their Government, the solidarity and support of the fraternal people of Greece, and particularly the vigorous selfless support of the all-powerful vanguard country of socialism, the Soviet Union, and of all the other socialist and uncommitted countries, up until now saved Cyprus from the aggressive imperialist plans of the Anglo-Americans, and their Turkish satellites.

The fact that a numerically small people, such as the Cypriot people manage to resist successfully these imperialist aims, constitutes a classic example, which confirms the correctness of the affirmation that the balance of forces in the world has so changed that it does not allow the imperialists any longer to act as they wish.

In our epoch, the peoples who are struggling for their freedom, no matter how numerically small they may be, have on their side international forces headed by the vanguard Soviet Union which help them to face up to the imperialists successfully.

The "NO" of the Cypriot people and their Government to NATO will go down in history as one of the most brilliant pages of the struggle of the Cypriot people, which will symbolize the unity and determination of the people to block the road to the imperialist aggressors, and to safeguard the honor, dignity, sovereignty and independence of Cyprus.

The Friends and the Enemies of Our People

The people of Cyprus have been taught by their own bitter experiences who are their real friends and supporters, and who are their enemies in the struggle for full independence and self-determination.

The Cypriot people on the whole feel very grateful to the Soviet Union and the other countries which warmly supported their case. They see imperialism, and particularly Anglo-American imperialism, as their bitterest enemy, as it was proved in practice. The recent change in tactics of American imperialism towards the question of Cyprus aims to mislead and split the Cypriot people in order to facilitate the promotion of the well-known NATO solution for the subjugation of Cyprus.

The Peace Force

The people of Cyprus have always wanted a peaceful solution of their problem on the basis of the United Nations' Charter. As

a proof of good will, they accepted the international peace force, which was formed in accordance with the decision of the Security Council, as well as the services of the mediator appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Experience of the last few months has shown that the international peace force did not succeed in contributing decisively towards the restoration of law and order. It was proved that the British troops which constitute a part of the international force, help the mutineers in a scandalous way. Besides, the composition of the international force, in which NATO forces are in the majority, do not inspire any confidence.

The Cypriot people and the armed forces of the State fight for the restoration of law and order, for peaceful conditions and normality. However, the continued supply of arms to the Turkish-Cypriot mutineers and their strengthening with groups of irregular terrorists make this task difficult.

The Situation in the Turkish-Cypriot Sectors

In their effort to prove that peaceful coexistence between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots is impossible and to create a "de facto" situation of partition, the Turkish terrorists forced thousands of families from the villages to go to Turkish sectors of the towns and to certain large Turkish villages, and to live under inhuman conditions.

The discontent within the masses of the Turkish-Cypriot community due to the tragic situation which the policy of their chauvinist extremist leadership has brought them, is indeed great and it is developing more and more every day. From the moment when the Turkish-Cypriots feel safe in their villages and houses, they will disregard terrorism which forced them to live under such inhuman conditions, and return to their homes and their jobs.

Brutalities

The Turkish-Cypriot terrorists use brutal means in order to achieve their aims. However, the Cypriot people are not going to be driven to such uncivilized and brutal acts, which serve inferior and foreign interests.

Certain actions by irresponsible elements in the past have been condemned, and it is imperative that drastic measures should be taken in order to put an end to such actions, which expose Cyprus, and damage its cause.

Anti-imperialist Unity and Discrimination

In the struggle for the destruction of the criminal imperialist plans, in the struggle for full independence and self-determination, the Cypriot people have developed their anti-imperialist con-

science, and have strengthened their unity as never before. The summit of this anti-imperialist unity, organizationally, was the formation of the Coordinating Committee of the 28 Cooperating Organizations. This wonderful unity is the fruit of many years of hard work and struggle, to which our Party has contributed, as well as the mass movement and all the patriots who love Cyprus and want to see her really free, happy and prosperous.

Unfortunately, however, while this patriotic unity and cooperation is today supported by the huge majority of the Cypriot people, certain circles found it correct to apply during the last six months a policy of discrimination, which harms our national-liberation struggle.

Under various pretexts, many Left-wingers were excluded from the police and the National Guard. In some other cases, the Left-wingers were asked to denounce their ideology in order to be enlisted in the National Guard, and in many cases progressives are going on guard without arms!

These discriminations take place despite the fact that official representatives of the Government declare that they are against these practices which expose the Cypriot people and their case to fatal dangers, and they must immediately stop.

The creation of a National Army which was greeted by all as an indication of the determination of the people and the Government to resist up to the last man the aggressive partitioning plans, must put an end to these discriminations.

The New Imperialist Conspiracy

The Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of AKEL considers it its imperative duty to draw the attention of the Cypriot people to the new conspiratorial plans of Anglo-American imperialism, which aim at the subjugation of Cyprus by NATO.

The trips of the NATOists Sticker, Fullbright, Lemnitzer, as well as the recent trip of Ball to Athens and Ankara, pressures of all sorts and blackmail, aim at a NATO solution of the problem of Cyprus, in order to serve imperialist interests and to satisfy the Turkish chauvinist intentions.

The Correct Solution of the Cyprus Problem and Our Tasks

The only correct anti-imperialist solution of our problem which is supported by the huge majority of the Cypriot people and corresponds to their interests and aspirations, is the freedom of Cyprus from all the agreements of London and Zurich, and the complete independence of Cyprus, which will allow the Cypriot people to decide freely their own future on the basis of the principle of

self-determination. The foreign imperialist bases must be abolished, and Cyprus must be demilitarized.

To succeed in such a solution we must fulfill to the maximum the following tasks:

a) To maintain and strengthen even more our home Front, the unity of the people and Government, which is the best guarantee of the success of the struggles of our people. We welcome what has been achieved in the sphere of unity with the formation of the Coordinating Committee of the Cooperating Organizations, and we believe that this unity will be extended for the interest of Cyprus. We shall do whatever we can to overcome all obstacles in the way of achieving universal unity of the people. We shall be vigilant, and in such a way that all undermining activities of the imperialists will be exposed in time, and will be harmless. In their effort to give a solution in their own interests the imperialists will not hesitate to use any kind of subversive and criminal measures. The patriotic vigilance of the people must be strengthened in order to frustrate such criminal plans.

b) We shall contribute with all our forces to the effort for pacification and the restoration of normal conditions. The gunposts of hatred and the "green lines" of partition must fall, in order to restore confidence, security and understanding between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. We shall work in a way that will bring about a healthy anti-imperialist spirit, which sees imperialism as the relentless enemy of the whole Cypriot people.

The restoration of harmonious relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots is not an easy task after what has happened during the last six months. It is not however impossible. Proof of this are the cases of those Turkish Cypriots—few as they may be—who returned to their villages, and had a wholehearted welcome from their Greek co-villagers. In spite of the Turkish-Cypriot terrorists and their imperialist masters who try to prove that peaceful coexistence between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots is impossible, it is imperative that normal, friendly relations between the two communities should be restored, and that Turkish Cypriots such as Ihsan Ali and Dervish Kavazoglou who express the genuine interests of the Turkish-Cypriot community should be encouraged.

c) To give the National Army which is formed under the Conscription Law every support, in order to make it an effective weapon for the defense of Cyprus against any foreign aggression. The National Guard must be—and we believe it will be—a disciplined force, well trained, with a high morale, ready for the defense of the motherland, able to add new brilliant pages of heroism and sacrifice to the history of our people. The termina-

tion of every kind of discrimination will contribute decisively to the effectiveness of the force.

d) The struggle for national independence presupposes as well economic independence. The infiltration of foreign exploitation capital, either in the form of petrol extraction or petrol refining, or in any other form, actually means neo-colonialism and is incompatible with the national-liberation struggle of the Cypriot people. It is preferable to borrow the capital we need for the economic development of Cyprus from wherever it may be offered under the most suitable terms, instead of allowing foreign capital to subjugate us economically.

e) The struggle of the Cypriot people for full independence and self-determination is inseparably connected with the fight for peace and the abolition of the imperialist bases. The liberation of Cyprus is unthinkable with great areas of Cypriot land in the hands of British or any other imperialists for war bases. War bases mean a knife at the heart of the Cypriot people, and a real destruction in case of war. They expose us in the eyes of our friends and neighbors who support our struggle.

Closer Relations With Our Real Friends

f) The best and most sincere guardian of our people has proved to be the Soviet Union. The bonds of Cyprus, the bonds of the Cyprus Government with the Soviet Union must become closer and more friendly. We should ask decisively and secure military and economic aid from the Soviet Union for our defense.

Our relations must become closer and more friendly with the other socialist countries, the U.A.R. and the Afro-Asian countries. These are our natural and real friends and allies. It is they who saved us in the grave moments of our country, and it is they again who will save us and help us gain our full independence and self-determination.

Any reservation about the creation of closer and more friendly relations with all these countries, and particularly with the all-powerful Soviet Union, exposes our people to fatal dangers. Our enemy is NATO. The Soviet Union and the other socialist and neutral countries are our sincere and selfless friends and allies.

g) Our bonds with the people of Greece are traditional and fraternal. The fraternal Greek people stood on our side and will stand till final victory, sleepless guardian and champion of the freedom of Cyprus. The indestructible bonds which are linking us with the Greek people cannot but grow stronger every day, because this is demanded by our common national interests.

Appeal to General Assembly of UNO

h) We must ask the Security Council to remove the British troops from Cyprus, which are a source of irregularity in the

Island, of arming and encouragement of the Turkish-Cypriot terrorist activity.

Having in mind that it is not possible to have from the mediator a solution acceptable to all interested parties, we must appeal to the next General Assembly of the United Nations.

For the success of our appeal a lot of enlightening work is needed to be done in the various countries, and particularly in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, from which we are expecting support for our case. This work must be done in time. The next meeting of the neutral countries will be a good opportunity for achieving enlightenment. This however is not enough. There are many countries to which we must send immediately a delegation in order to enlighten them about our just cause.

i) On our home front, the economic needs and problems of the people must be seen. The abnormal situation of the last six months affected various sections of the people. Whenever we face a problem of money, we must ask for a loan in order to continue productive and other projects, which can give work to the unemployed, and help the peasants and the shop-keepers to face up to their difficulties.

j) To respond adequately to these serious and historic tasks towards the Cypriot people and its cause, AKEL must strengthen and mobilize to the maximum all its forces. It should particularly realize a turn in its organizational policy, which can be raised to the level of the demands of the present conditions and of the struggle for full independence and self-determination.

Cyprus Will Win

The Fourth Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of AKEL declares once more that all the forces of our Party without exception are placed at the service of our country in the struggle for freedom, and that AKEL is ready for every sacrifice.

Cypriot patriots!

Strengthen more and more the columns of the national-liberation front. Be vigilant and with absolute faith and optimism fight for victory. Our struggle is difficult. However, we are not alone. We have powerful allies on whom we can depend.

Imperialism and its satellites shall not pass!

Cyprus will win!

COMBINE ALL FORMS OF POPULAR STRUGGLE

DOCUMENTS OF THE 30TH MEETING OF THE CC, COMMUNIST PARTY OF COLOMBIA

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

Despite the military preparations and provocative actions of the more aggressive sections of Yankee imperialism, world peace has been preserved. Despite the dangerous hotbeds of international conflicts created by the U.S. military intervention in Vietnam and Laos, the frequent provocations in Berlin, and the aggressive actions against Cuba, the facts corroborate the correctness of the thesis of the 81-Party Statement that "the time has come when the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to start a world war can be curbed."

The Moscow partial test-ban treaty has greatly contributed to the struggle for peace and for the consecutive disarmament of the Great Powers. All peace-loving forces should pool their efforts to secure an agreement on the complete prohibition of nuclear tests and of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, which present the most terrible threat to mankind.

The struggle of the oppressed peoples for national liberation continues to grow, facilitated by the economic, social and political successes of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. *The firm solidarity of the socialist countries is decisive for the victorious development of the national-liberation struggle in our time.*

We in Latin America, however, are witnessing an offensive of the monopolies and the imperialist government of the United States aimed at stemming the rise of the democratic movement of the peoples. The blows are directed primarily against the Communist parties, against the patriotic and revolutionary forces. The strategic objective of the new onslaught of the imperialists is to isolate Cuba from the fraternal peoples of the Latin American continent and to prepare a new armed aggression against the socialist and patriotic Cuban revolution.

At present the imperialist government of the United States is displaying a tendency expressed by Under-Secretary of State Mann,

---

Voz Proletaria, July 2, 1964.

who insists on the need to support coups d'etat and thus to stimulate the activities of the most reactionary militarist forces on the continent.

This policy helped to overthrow the democratic government of Goulart in Brazil and set up a fascist military dictatorship which has abolished all democratic freedoms and, establishing a regime of terror, is delivering blows even at the bourgeois forces and their political leaders.

It is now the prime task of the Colombian Communists to voice solidarity with the fraternal peoples suffering from persecution by the military. Our Party must rally the popular forces to demand freedom for the patriots of Venezuela, Ecuador and Brazil. It is also necessary to promote on a bigger scale the movement of solidarity with the struggle of the people of Panama for the annulment of the infamous agreement of 1903 and the withdrawal of North American troops from Panama. Still greater solidarity should be displayed with the glorious Cuban revolution, which is constantly threatened by the counter-revolutionary activities of Yankee imperialism.

HIGH COST OF LIVING AND MASS ACTIONS

Since January 1963 the cost of living in Colombia has grown by 40 per cent, adding to the hardships of the people.

Unemployment has assumed sinister proportions due to shorter hours and the closing of enterprises. Industry cannot absorb the added manpower resulting from population growth and the displacement of peasants caused by the agrarian crisis and ruination.

In 1964 the cost of living has continued to grow and threatens to rise still further as a result of the intended unfreezing of rents and the introduction of a new consumer goods tax.

The constant increase in prices has practically nullified the gains won by certain contingents of the working-class movement. The real wages of most working people have decreased. Many unorganized workers suffer from the growing cost of living unaccompanied by any increase in their incomes.

In accordance with Law No. 1 of 1963, wages are to be readjusted every six months if the price index grows by more than five per cent in that period. But the big industrialists, supported by the government and aided by the leaders of the Colombian Working People's Union and the Colombian Working People's Confederation*, disregard this law, thus trampling underfoot their own legislation.

---

*The **Colombian Working People's Union** is a Catholic trade union organization. The **Colombian Working People's Confederation**, once a center of the working-class movement, acts today as a tool of the big bourgeoisie and U.S. imperialism.—**Ed.**

The government, for its part, continues to engage in crude demagogy. The measures against the high cost of living announced by it are absolutely ineffectual, for *it pursues a policy conforming to the interests of Big Business.* At the same time, the most powerful groups of imperialist and national capital have succeeded in maintaining the same rate of profit growth.

The oligarchy is continuing its offensive against the workers' organizations and does not spare even small and medium businessmen in an attempt to prevent the workers from winning new social gains and to nullify those that have been won. The question has been raised of reducing or freezing wages, abolishing social benefits, cutting down the number of workers and introducing speed-up. At the same time, strikes are prolonged because of the intransigence of the employers, who find support in the brazen anti-labor attitude of the government.

More and more workers of government-run and private enterprises, members of the transport workers' union, seasonal workers and agricultural laborers take part in mass actions and expressions of protest.

For mass actions to be a success there must be all-round consolidation of the independent trade union movement in the struggle for the demands and rights of the working people and for working-class unity, against the disruptive policy of opportunists and stooges of the employers.

Special emphasis should be laid on unity of action of the working people in localities, regions, industries and on the nationwide scale. Based on a platform taking full stock of the interests of the workers and peasants, this united action will help rebuff the employers' onslaught and prevent the government from abolishing freedoms and trade union rights under the pretext of "combating communism."

Unity of action is also indispensable for the success of the forthcoming large-scale actions, such as those of the oil workers in defense of their organizations and for the nationalization of oil, the banana plantation workers against the maneuvers of the United Fruit Company to rob them of guarantees of labor legislation, the merchant marine workers for their rights, and so on.

It is also necessary to make more militant the struggle of the peasants for the seizure of land (thus putting to a test the promises of a land reform), for stable guaranteed prices of farm produce, for the liquidation of profiteers and middlemen, who share responsibility for the soaring prices of foodstuffs in the cities.

All forms of action against the high cost of living, for lower tuition fees and costs of services, for housing, etc., must be in the focus of attention of the Communists who should work to rally

the people in the struggle for decent living conditions. At the same time it is necessary to explain to the masses the oligarchic character of the government and the need to replace it so as to bring about a radical change in the economic and social conditions of the people.

Every support should be given to the students' movement. The students' big actions, such as the strikes in the Barranquilla College and in the Industrial University of Santander, the campaign in defense of secular education and the strike in June, have advanced the students to the front ranks of the fighters against the reactionaries' interference in education and *the penetration of imperialist monopolies into the realm of national culture.* The students are in the van of those who display solidarity with the working-class movement and with the resistance of the peasants to the arbitrary rule of the authorities.

LESSONS OF THE ELECTIONS

In the last elections, in keeping with its policy of using all forms of democratic struggle, our Party strove to take advantage of the few opportunities still surviving under the parity system, in order to expose and undermine it. The Communists came out for open and concrete alliances with the Left circles, without promising unconditional support to any of them.

The Communist Party cherished no illusions concerning the outcome of the elections. On the contrary, it maintained that under the present anti-democratic regime the Colombian people have no chance of winning power or imposing structural changes through elections. *But neither the Communists nor their allies duly stressed that electoral returns unfavorable for the government would accelerate the crisis of the system itself.*

The stand taken by the Communist Party helped to elect progressive-minded MPs representing various groups of the Revolutionary Liberal Movement (RLM). Thus favorable conditions have been created for building a Left parliamentary bloc which can combine opposition in Parliament, the assemblies and municipal councils with different forms of extra-parliamentary struggle.

The RLM retained its positions in Parliament but lost a considerable number of votes—a result of the split caused by wrangles among party leaders, concessions to anti-communism, and acts of collaboration with the government. In order to regain its influence the RLM must restore its unity on the basis of a consistent program and establish collective leadership.

The only political group which has made headway is the People's Nationalist Alliance headed by General Rojas Pinilla. Pinilla's followers launched an active campaign in the course of which they capitalized on the cost-of-living issue and deftly utilized the

possibility of presenting a joint Conservative-Liberal ticket. This was one of the causes of the new split in the Conservative Party.

The Liberals polled fewer votes than the Conservatives, their partners in the "National Front," which was the result of the Liberal leaders' participation in the reactionary, anti-popular policy of the regime. This seriously impaired the positions of Lleras Restrepo, the "alternate" candidate for the presidency.

A noteworthy feature of the March elections is the tremendous number of abstainees, which testifies to the deep discontent of the masses with the system imposed by the oligarchy. This discontent was expressed in a passive form, for there still are no adequate organizational prerequisites and conditions for the struggle to solve the structural crisis of Columbia society.

That is why it is essential for the Communists and other revolutionary forces to elaborate correct slogans and adequate forms of struggle so as to lead the great number of people who abstained from voting out of their political apathy and transform the vast passive discontent into vigorous activity of the masses.

GROWTH OF REACTIONARY FORCES AND THREAT OF A COUP

The oligarchy is more and more brazenly evincing a trend towards regression and betrayal of national sovereignty. This tendency is manifested in the undisguised onslaught of the reactionary and pro-imperialist forces in our country.

The ruling classes are preparing conditions for the establishment of an open terrorist dictatorship directed against the popular movement. They are destroying the legislation they introduced in 1957 and encouraging the military. The country is faced with the threat of a coup d'état by both the military leaders, who are connected with the U.S. military mission, and the more reactionary sectors of the government itself which strive for the complete abolition of the scant democratic freedoms through proclaiming martial law or vesting the executive power with the broadest dictatorial authority.

The government is out to reimpose an order under which the expression of any opinion contrary to the official one is to be regarded as a "crime." It persecutes revolutionary fighters. It is incessantly whipping up the calumniatory anti-communist campaign. It seeks to prohibit the activities of the revolutionary forces in the trade union movement, and tramples upon university autonomy.

This process culminated in the armed offensive against peasants' organizations in Marquetalia. The offensive, which marks the commencement of an extermination campaign planned by Yankee military experts, is designed to suppress by sword and fire the revolu-

tionary peasant areas which are provocatively called "independent republics."

This new stage in the pursuit of the "fire and blood" policy is a component part of a reactionary plan which has been nurtured by the oligarchic regime after the failure of its economic policy and under the pressure of North American monopoly interests closely associated with the Colombian militarists.

· At present a struggle is going on in the ruling camp between sections of the big bourgeoisie, which is ready to submit to imperialist *diktat* and pursue a policy of repressions while maintaining the parity system, and the top brass, who clamor for a military coup ostensibly for the purpose of "renovating" the country but actually to install an even more ruthless dictatorship.

The offensive against Marquetalia and other peasant areas is closely connected with these putschist plans, by which the ultra-Right and adventurist circles, hypocritically talking of "nationalism," hope to gain. As internal contradictions in the ruling camp grow, the danger of a coup aimed at preventing solution of the national crisis by the people is becoming ever more evident.

The Communist Party, which is in the most consistent revolutionary opposition to the regime, systematically exposes the demagogy of the military. It considers that in the present conditions a military dictatorship controlled by the U.S. military mission would be the worst form of regime for our people.

This does not mean that the armed forces as a whole are something homogeneous, a dependable instrument of imperialist interference and oligarchic rule. The soldiers, sailors and policemen are sons of the people. There are honest democrats and patriots among the officers. Quite another matter is the top military command, which has made common cause with the oligarchy and relies for support on the U.S. military mission and which again intends to sacrifice the lives of soldiers, junior officers and policemen in the struggle against their peasant brothers, for the interests of local and foreign exploiters.

PEASANTS' RESISTANCE TO ARMED AGGRESSION

The so-called Operation Marquetalia ushers in a new stage in the policy of violence pursued by the oligarchy and the top military command. The revolutionary peasant areas which have fought back this policy enrage the oligarchy and whet the appetite of the latifundists for the peasants' land. The existence of revolutionary peasant areas in Colombia is regarded by the Yankee monopolists and militarists as a menace to their interests. That was why they ordered a military offensive against the areas they fraudulently call "independent republics."

This offensive is waged in accordance with the "Lasso Plan"

worked out by the U.S. anti-guerrilla warfare experts. Part of this plan envisages "military-civic actions" designed to help win the sympathies of the population with trifling gifts and services, penetrate into the peasant areas with ostensibly peaceful intentions, and occupy positions for attack. Such actions were undertaken in Marquetalia. Now they are planned for El Pato, Guayabero, Riochiquito, Sumapaz, and many other peasant areas, which are to be subdued by force one after another.

The Communist Party has always resolutely fought against the oligarchy's policy of violence. That was why it proclaimed, in 1949, the policy of *self-defense of the masses against violence.* Our Party maintained that guerrilla actions could not be imposed upon the masses artificially, but had to result from their own striving for struggle as the last resort. Our Party has invariably opposed adventurist practices. But the situation that arose following the armed attack on Marquetalia is of an entirely different order. That is why our Party immediately called for the most vigorous solidarity with the peasants who were attacked by government troops.

All past and present experience shows that the army can occupy a locality but will never be able to wipe out the peasants' self-defense organizations which, faced with actions of such character and scope as in Marquetalia, turn into mobile guerrilla detachments.

The government's plan to destroy the peasants' organizations has obviously initiated a new stage in the guerrilla struggle in Colombia.

The Communist Party regards as correct the form of struggle launched by the heroic peasant resistance and calls upon the people to support it effectively by expressing resolute solidarity with it and protesting even more energetically against the crimes of the government.

The guerrilla warfare will grow in proportion to the government's policy of violence itself. This will be a protracted struggle which will be successful if combined with all other forms of mass struggle, with joint actions of all the oppressed sections of Colombian society.

In face of the government's offensive the Communist Party urges all revolutionaries, all Left and popular forces, all Colombian democrats and patriots to act in common. Popular and democratic unity can stop and rout the reactionary offensive and develop into a revolutionary stream which will bring nearer the radical changes so needed by Colombia.

Thus, Colombia is entering the new stage about which the 9th Congress of our Party said the following:

"For some time the revolution can develop peacefully. But vio-

lence and constant persecution by the ruling classes may force the people to take the road of armed struggle which at a certain moment can become the main, though not the only, form of struggle. The development of the revolution in Colombia may lead to a combination of all forms of struggle."

The reactionary government, which assists the rise of militarism and jumps to foreign orders, is intent on crushing the peasant movement. Defense of this movement calls for broader and more active solidarity with the Marquetalia fighters. The alliance of workers and peasants, supported by students and other democrats, must be given effective practical expression.

The policy of self-defense is given priority in our struggle. The Party should concentrate on political work in the countryside and on organizing the self-defense movement everywhere. The peasant resistance, which is essentially of a revolutionary nature, will greatly help to secure the economic and social changes our country needs. But a profound revolutionary solution does not rule out a democratic outcome of the present clash of contradictions for the struggle for democracy is quite compatible with the struggle for revolution.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PARTY UNITY

The facts have shown how correct the Central Committee was when it warned at its 29th meeting that the " 'ultra-Leftism' with its dogmatism and sectarianism represents the main ideological danger to the development of the Communist Party and to the entire revolutionary movement in Colombia."

At this new stage armed struggle is only beginning with the heroic resistance of the peasants of Marquetalia and other regions attacked by government troops. It is the highest though not yet the main form of struggle and has to be combined with various forms of mass action. In the present conditions the revolutionary movement in Colombia cannot achieve positive results without a broad popular movement correctly combining all forms of struggle and utilizing all peaceful and legal opportunities.

The campaign of solidarity with Marquetalia has centered the attention of the nation on this critical problem and helped expose the allegations of official propaganda that the question at issue was merely "mopping up the bandits in the region." But political means failed to stop the armed offensive.

At present the ultra-Leftist trends have acquired an openly anti-Party nature, for their exponents regard the Communist Party as an enemy who has to be combated in the first place, even before combating Yankee imperialism and the ruling oligarchy. There is a wide diversity of these trends, for their supporters vary from liberals anxious to give the Communists dogmatic lessons in

Marxism-Leninism to renegades and persons expelled from the Party for opposition to the basic principles of its policy, for violations of Communist discipline and ethics.

These people, who in fact engage in anti-communist activities, play into the hands of the enemies of the nation and demoralize those who could contribute to the revolutionary struggle. Today some of the "ultra-Leftists," encouraged by the splitting policy of the Peking leaders, are out to formalize an anti-Party alliance. It is only outside support that is maintaining their existence and which enables them to harm the Colombian revolutionary movement with their intrigues, slander, unprincipled squabbles and disruptive activities.

An active ideological struggle must be launched against these groups and trends. In defending the revolutionary organization no compromises with factionalists who subscribe to these tendencies in our own ranks are permissible. Honest but erring or vacillating people should be patiently helped through political and ideological education, combined with securing their active participation in the mass struggle and in carrying out concrete tasks.

At the same time we must combat ideologically and politically the liberal trend in our ranks which may lead to the dissolution of the Party among its allies and to passivity in consolidating and building the Party as the independent vanguard of the working class.

In face of the insidious attacks of the anti-Party groups encouraged by the theses of the Chinese leaders who are out to split our ranks at any cost, the Leninist principles of democratic centralism become even more important than ever before.

Special responsibility for preserving the unity of the Party is shouldered by its leading cadres. That is why they should rule out any conciliatory attitude to the anti-Party groups and their splitting machinations. Party unity based on the Leninist organizational principles is the surest guarantee that the Communists will live up to their historical responsibility, which has especially grown at the new stage of the struggle in Colombia.

ON DIFFERENCES IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia reaffirms the line laid down at the previous CC meetings, which demands a resolute rebuff to the factionalist and splitting activities launched and inspired by the leaders of the Communist Party of China.

The differences between the Chinese leaders and the overwhelming majority of the Communist parties have lately been further aggravated. The Chinese leaders promote in every way the

setting up in different countries of "pocket parties" subservient to them, and openly abandon the basic Leninist principles governing Party life.

The publications distributed of late by the Chinese leaders are characterized by venomous anti-Sovietism echoing capitalist propaganda, by base slander and rude insults against the majority of the Communist parties, which do not accept Peking's "special line" and are therefore branded as "revisionist" and even "traitorous."

These facts compelled the Central Committee of the CPSU to state openly its views on the questions which had been discussed confidentially in the world Communist movement. Of special importance is Comrade Suslov's report at the February meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, which the 30th meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia recommends that all Party members study.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia considers that the split in the world Communist movement, which the Chinese leaders are trying to justify by pseudo-theoretical theses while encouraging it in every way in practice, serves the interests of the imperialist aggressive forces and facilitates their offensive against the revolutionary movement in Colombia and other countries. This bears out the correctness of the statement that "today the Chinese leaders are trying to achieve what imperialist reaction has failed to do."

In conclusion the 30th meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Colombia declares once again its support for the proposal for the earliest possible convocation of an international meeting of the Communist parties. Such a meeting should clarify and reaffirm the basic ideological positions of the Communist movement defined in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, expose and condemn the disruptive and destructive activity of factionalists in the Communist parties which refuse to submit to *diktat*, and lay a firm foundation for restoring the unity of the world Communist movement.

MESSAGE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF VENEZUELA TO THE PEOPLE OF VENEZUELA (Abridged)

Venezuelans!

The meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela held in conditions of the strictest secrecy to discuss the situation in the country, to examine the past period and to search for the best ways of carrying on the popular struggle, has shown that our Party has consolidated its ranks, reaffirmed its fighting resolve, its unswerving fidelity to the cause of revolution and its faith in victory.

In the present Message, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela informs the workers, peasants, youth, students, patriotically-minded intellectuals, progressive employers and other forces in the revolutionary and democratic camp of its most important conclusions.

I. THE FACTS CONFIRM THE CORRECTNESS OF OUR ASSESSMENTS

The present political developments confirm our Party's assessments of the situation in the country, especially those contained in the Manifesto of the Political Bureau, issued after the new President took over office, viz.:

1) The activity of the Leoni government, which was set up by fraudulent and corrupt methods, shows that in the final analysis it is merely continuing the policy of the previous government. It is the instrument with which the North American imperialists and their Creole partners are seeking to retain and strengthen their positions.

Certain circles and some politicians from the government camp and the ruling Party of Democratic Action, wishing to weaken the resistance to the new government when it took over office and to mitigate the difficulties experienced by the ruling party, talked a great deal about changing the official policy. Certain steps were indeed taken to create the impression that the policy of the new government was different from that of its predecessor. The representatives of the Social Christian Party (COPEI)* were dropped from the government for this purpose. But the change in the composition of the new government did not appreciably affect its general line. The circles mentioned above were concerned only

---

*The COPEI is the party of the big bourgeoisie, landlords and the Catholic hierarchy.—Ed.

with superficial changes, especially as regards the policy of repression and certain other questions of lesser importance.

Opposed to these circles are groups which are against even purely formal changes. Behind the government and exerting pressure on it in hundreds of ways are the ruling classes whose support of the government so far has been only at the price of the latter's submission and concessions.

Hence, as the revolutionary forces predicted, the advent to power of the new government has brought no radical change in policy. Nor can there be any changes so long as the forces which are now running the government remain in the saddle.

The key positions in the Leoni government continue to be held by representatives of the big bourgeoisie. The dominant trend of economic policy is toward intensifying the colonization of the country, implementing the plans of North American imperialism and its Creole partners. The prisons are still full; among those detained are members of parliament sent to jail by the Betancourt dictatorship. As in previous years, the machine of repression is in motion. At times it is less crude and brutal in its methods, but it is always directed against the people, and particularly against the students. Witness the recent events in San Cristobal and Merida. The conditions of the masses are steadily worsening, partly as a result of the currency reform carried out by Betancourt with the approval of the new President. The National Congress, which stands on the Right, plans to approve proposals legalizing the repressions, the discrimination against non-government mass organizations, and other undemocratic measures, including a reform of the criminal code, regulation of civil rights and a law on political parties.

2) The "accord" and "harmony" established after December 1, 1963, between the ruling groups and the newly-baked legal opposition have been disrupted. The contradictions signalized by our Party and caused by the clash of interests between the forces making a bid for stronger positions in the government are sharpening. After the collapse of this coalition, the Democratic Action Party and sections of the big bourgeoisie continue to press for the reinstatement in the government of the representatives of the Social Christian Party. The COPEI is speculating on its opposition posture and the support it is receiving from these quarters. It is anxious to get into the government, but is out to capture positions that would ensure it a dominant role.

The country is thus again faced with the possibility of a new political crisis of the kind it has experienced in the recent past. The leadership of the popular movement as well as the masses must be on the alert, they must act boldly and resolutely to advance the revolutionary process in our country.

II. STRUGGLE FOR A DEMOCRATIC AND PATRIOTIC GOVERNMENT IS THE MAIN TASK OF THE VENEZUELAN PATRIOTS

The Betancourt government was one of those the imperialists and the ruling classes use as a means of consolidating their dominion. There is every indication that the Leoni government is following the same line, and our people must cherish no illusions to the contrary. It will continue the policy that has already brought our country to chaos, dependence and backwardness.

For many years our people have been ruled by a succession of dictatorships and governments of so-called "representative democracy," yet nothing has essentially changed. Both types of government preserved the domination of the imperialists, especially North American imperialists, who are connected with the reactionary Creole classes—the latifundists, importers, big comprador bourgeoisie. These classes alternated as the dominant element in the various governments, lending a semblance of difference to each. A similar tendency is to be observed under the Leoni regime.

What Venezuela needs is a change in economic and political structure. This is the only way to produce a radical solution for the major national problems. It is necessary to abolish the domination of the imperialists and their partners, and not merely to ensure a change of cliques, individuals or methods. The popular forces of Venezuela must take the destiny of the country into their own hands.

This, however, cannot be done under the Leoni government. Hence the CC of the Venezuelan Communist Party calls upon the masses and all patriotic forces to carry on the fight for a democratic and patriotic government capable of solving the problems of national liberation, implementing a far-reaching agrarian reform and ensuring the consistent democratization of the country.

The slogan of struggle for such a government is the banner around which the working class and all the more politically-conscious sections of our people are rallying.

III. THE CHOICE OF THE PEACEFUL OR NON-PEACEFUL ROAD DEPENDS ON THE RULING CLASSES AND THE GOVERNMENT, NOT ON THE REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

It is impossible to set up a democratic and patriotic government and liberate and transform Venezuela without a determined struggle against the Leoni government. Such is the task facing the workers, peasants, students, progressives from among the bourgeoisie, and nationalist-minded intellectuals. This task calls for an all-out effort and application of all forms of struggle.

Which way to choose for the victory of the national-liberation movement. This is the cardinal question confronting the masses

and their vanguard. Our Party sincerely and firmly declares to the people, its allies and friends:

Under the Betancourt government the revolutionary forces and the vanguard detachments of the mass movement had to take recourse to armed struggle. Initially it was self-defense against the attacks and repressions the government had launched some time after coming to office. Later on, when persecutions, arrests, tortures, dispersal of demonstrations by force of arms, strafing of whole residential sections, raids on trade union offices and educational establishments, liquidation of political rights, denial of recognition to the National Congress, and, lastly, the policy of abolishing democracy had become the main line of government policy, armed struggle was launched on a broader scale. The facts show that the policy of the government and the ruling classes which take their orders from North American imperialism was not an accidental or temporary phenomenon. It has become clear that they resorted and will continue to resort to the most ruthless violence to stem the rise of the democratic and patriotic movement, especially of its vanguard forces. Before the Venezuelan revolutionaries first took up arms the government had repeatedly used them, carrying out Betancourt's criminal order "shoot first and then ask questions."

At a time when the liberation and transformation of Venezuela has become a pressing necessity which is realized by ever broader sections of the people, the ruling classes and their government seek to prevent the peaceful victory of the forces of national liberation. The past and present experience of many Latin American countries resembles in many respects our own and is highly instructive.

Thus, armed struggle in our country is not the result of an arbitrary decision of the revolutionary forces, which are known to have used only peaceful forms of struggle for a certain period. Armed struggle conformed to an historical necessity, as has been the case in other countries which won their liberation with the help of arms, a necessity which arose principally because of the policy of the ruling classes and their agents controlling the government.

The situation in which armed struggle started has remained virtually unchanged. Some spokesmen of the government and persons closely associated with it have been holding forth on a new policy. But there are no indications of a change. The ruling groups go on imposing their interests and line just as they did under the Betancourt regime. Unlawful arrests of thousands of Venezuelans, persecution of staunch patriots, discrimination against non-government mass organizations continue as before, and so does the policy of further subordinating the country to imperialist

interests. Moreover, repressions have been stepped up considerably of late.

Our Central Committee declares solemnly to the masses and the public of our country that neither the Communists nor other forces active in the National Liberation Front worship violence. We would like to proceed to the invariable goals of the patriotic cause along a peaceful road. On a number of occasions we have given proof of our consistent adherence to this stand. During the armed struggle against the Betancourt government our Party and its allies took part in the talks aimed at securing the pacification of the country. In several instances the armed forces of national liberation voluntarily agreed to a ceasefire. After December 1 the hostilities were suspended, which was erroneously interpreted by our enemies as evidence of our weakness and not as an initiative designed to show our readiness not to rule out the possibility of the peaceful road.

The Communists again state for all the country to hear that if general amnesty is announced, if civil rights and the right of the outlawed parties to regain their legal status are fully restored, if the officers imprisoned or banished from the country for their nationalist views are allowed to return to the armed forces and have all their rights restored, political struggle in the country may proceed along peaceful lines. In this case the revolutionary forces will resolutely adhere to the peaceful road, confident of the support of the overwhelming majority of the people.

The CC of the Communist Party of Venezuela maintains that the Leoni government and the forces supporting it are responsible to history for peace in Venezuela. If they continue, in the main, the line of the previous government and persist in their policy of persecuting thousands upon thousands of Venezuelans, the revolutionary forces of the country will have no other choice but to resort to violence.

At present the CC of the CPV calls upon the masses to make wide use of legal forms of struggle, step up to the utmost the activities of their organizations, fight resolutely for the basic economic demands, for political rights, for general amnesty and an end to repressions, for the complete legalization of the outlawed parties.

If, however, the situation in the country remains unchanged and the Leoni government continues the policy of its predecessor, the masses and their vanguard forces will be compelled to use those forms of struggle which, as recent experience has shown, are necessary to stamp out the counter-revolutionary violence of the enemies of national liberation.

For this reason the Central Committee of the CPV urges the masses and all revolutionary fighters to carry on active prepara-

tions, mobilize all their forces and be ready for resolute and effective participation in actions with the use of higher forms of struggle when necessitated by developments.

IV. UNITY OF REVOLUTIONARIES, UNITY OF DEMOCRATS IS ESSENTIAL FOR VICTORY

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela reaffirms its policy of unity, which it has pursued consistently over many years.

Our Party reaffirms its view that the struggle for the liberation and transformation of Venezuela is not an exclusive right of certain forces or groups, but a cause for all those who are sincerely interested in achieving this goal. That is why the Communist Party stresses the need for the utmost consolidation of the National Liberation Front. It calls upon the progressive sections of the population to join its ranks. Our Party is convinced that the policy of the Front and the growth of its struggle will turn it into a center uniting all patriotic forces of the country.

Considerable forces of opposition which support democratic slogans and fight under the banner of nationalism are active in the political arena of the country. They do not fully share the line of the National Liberation Front. Our Party will adopt a friendly attitude to these forces. It declares its intention to march side by side with them and to promote unity of action for the common aims: release of political prisoners, satisfaction of the basic demands of the masses, opposition to concessions to foreign monopolies. It is a firm belief of our Party that in the course of the common struggle the contacts between the NLF and these forces will be extended, that they will be taking a more active part in the struggle for national liberation.

In conclusion, the Communist Party of Venezuela declares its striving for agreement with all organizations and individuals ready to make any positive step in the struggle for concrete democratic aims, such as amnesty or respect for civil liberties.

V. DEMOCRATIC AND PATRIOTIC FORCES WILL TRIUMPH

While declaring its intention to wage a determined struggle against the Leoni government, the Communist Party and the other revolutionary forces do not ignore the blows delivered at them, the difficulties experienced at present, or the obstacles that have to be overcome.

The CC of the Communist Party has thoroughly discussed the past activities and analyzed the mistakes and weaknesses. Its conclusions will help the Party members. We also hope that they will help the fraternal organizations to fight more effectively in the future.

The revolutionaries have made mistakes in their struggle, but they have also scored inestimable successes. They have awakened the consciousness of large sections of the people. They have won influential vanguards of the masses over to the side of the most complex forms of struggle. They have created, on the basis of the armed forces of national liberation, the embryo of a people's army. Last but not least, they have put the struggle for power in the interests of the people on a firm foundation and made it a feature of Venezuelan political reality.

The democratic and patriotic forces are confronted with a difficult situation. But this is a temporary phenomenon. A drawn-out and strenuous struggle lies ahead, but the prospect of victory has already opened up before them.

Firstly, because they champion the cause of the vast majority of the people. In the course of the struggle considerable popular support will be won by these forces.

Secondly, because the profound changes advocated by the democratic and patriotic forces are badly needed by our country.

Finally, because these forces have had the courage to indicate the prospect to our people and resolutely and courageously started along the road to the realization of this prospect.

The democratic and patriotic forces constitute today a veritable center of attraction for the more politically-conscious sections of the people which have learned a lesson of the perfidy and inconsistency of certain leaders. That is why the masses are joining resolutely in the struggle headed by these forces. As this process develops victory is becoming ever more assured and drawing nearer.

Venezuelans!

Being convinced of the great importance of the cause of national liberation and the inevitability of its victory, let us redouble our efforts, stop at no sacrifices, and devote ourselves to the struggle with ever greater energy and vigor.

The Communists will spare neither efforts nor even their lives to carry out the tasks facing them.

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Venezuela

May 1964

PARTY ACTIVITIES

Questions of Arab unity, the national-liberation movement of the Arab peoples and the present situation in Syria were discussed by the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party at a meeting held in June. The Syrian Communists denounced the splitting activities of the CPC leaders in the world Communist movement and approved the proposal to convene a world conference of the Communist and Workers' parties.

★ ★ ★

The 4th meeting of the CC AKEL, held on June 7, discussed the situation in Cyprus and some problems of the international situation.

★ ★ ★

On June 7 a meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Martinique thoroughly discussed the situation in the world Communist movement and expressed itself in favor of the earliest possible convocation of a conference of the Communist and Workers' parties.

★ ★ ★

At plenary meeting sessions on June 22 and 24 the CC of the Communist Party of Ceylon discussed the question of the Communists' attitude to the coalition government.

★ ★ ★

The Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of Australia took place in Sydney on June 12-15. The report was delivered by General Secretary L. Sharkey. The congress approved the Party Program, endorsed changes in the Party Rules, elected the leading bodies of the Party, and adopted resolutions on domestic and international questions.

★ ★ ★

The Polish United Workers' Party held its Sixth Congress in Warsaw on June 15-20. The report on the activities of the Central Committee and on the directives for the development of the Polish People's Republic in 1966-70 was delivered by W. Gomulka, First Secretary of the CC.

★ ★ ★

The 30th meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Colombia, held on June 27-29, resolutely denounced the factionalist activities of the CPC leaders and supported the proposal for a conference of the Communist parties. The meeting adopted resolutions on the situation in the country and on a number of international problems.

Between June 22 and July 1, a delegation of the Communist Party of Chile paid a friendship visit to Australia on the invitation of the Australian Communists and familiarized itself with some aspects of the activities of the CPA. Community of views on international problems and the struggle for the unity of Communists was revealed at a friendly exchange of opinions between representatives of the two parties, who resolutely condemned the stand and splitting work of the CPC leadership and favored the convening of a conference of the Communist and Workers' parties.

★ ★ ★

Two questions were discussed on June 25 and 26 at the 9th meeting of the CC of the Korean Party of Labor: establishment of the union of agricultural workers and improvement of the work of the trade unions.

★ ★ ★

At the end of June a delegation of the Communist Party of Austria led by General Secretary F. Fuernberg visited Yugoslavia. Problems of the present international situation and of the world working-class movement were discussed in the course of talks in the CC of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

★ ★ ★

The 9th meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Peru, held at the end of June and beginning of July, condemned the dogmatic and nationalist concepts and disruptive activity of the CPC leaders and favored an earliest international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties. It was stressed at the meeting that the bellicose neo-colonialists and imperialists and also the reactionary counter-revolutionary oligarchy in Peru widely employ and take advantage of the anti-Leninist theses of the Chinese leaders.

★ ★ ★

A friendly visit was paid to Hungary on July 1-3 by a delegation of the CC of the Rumanian Workers' Party. Representatives of the central committees of the HSWP and the RWP discussed problems of relations between the two parties and their countries, the world Communist and working-class movement, and the international situation.

★ ★ ★

Paul de Groot, Chairman of the CC of the Communist Party of the Netherlands, delivered a report on the situation in the world Communist movement to the meeting of the CC CPN, held on July 4 and 5. CC Secretary J. Geerligs informed the meeting about the work of the CC and local Party organizations after the Twenty-First Congress of the Party.

★ ★ ★

CC Chairman Aidit and other Party leaders spoke at the con-

ference of the Communist Party of Indonesia, held on July 4-7. The conference adopted resolutions on national, international and Party problems. Its decisions were approved by the 3rd meeting of the CC CPI.

★ ★ ★

At the beginning of June a delegation of the Communist Party of Sweden left for the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and the GDR to familiarize itself with the practice of socialist construction. Shortly before a delegation of the CPS had visited Yugoslavia to acquaint itself with the activities of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav trade unions.

★ ★ ★

Talks between delegations of the Communist parties of Belgium and Bulgaria took place in Sofia on July 6 and 7. The delegations resolutely condemned the activities of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and their slanderous attacks on the Communist and Workers' parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism. They stressed that both the history and the present activities of the CPSU constitute an inexhaustible source of knowledge and experience for the Communists of all lands, and agreed on the need for a new conference of the Communist and Workers' parties to preserve and strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement.

★ ★ ★

At a meeting held on July 6 and 7 the Presidium of the CC of the Yugoslav League of Communists considered draft amendments to and changes in the YLC Rules and decided to publish them in the press for a countrywide discussion. The CC Presidium also discussed questions pertaining to the preparations for the Eighth Congress of the YLC.

★ ★ ★

A delegation of the Rumanian Workers' Party paid a friendly visit to the Soviet Union between July 6 and 14. It had several meetings with a delegation of the CPSU Central Committee, in the course of which questions of Soviet-Rumanian relations, development of contacts between the CPSU and the RWP, problems of cooperation between socialist countries, the situation in the world Communist and working-class movement, and questions of the struggle for peace were discussed. Members of the RWP delegation met with N. S. Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC CPSU.

★ ★ ★

In the course of a two weeks' stay in the Soviet Union a delegation of activists of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany toured the country, familiarizing itself with the work of CPSU organizations at chemical plants and construction projects. The delegation was received by P. N. Demichev, CC CPSU Secretary and

Chairman of the CC CPSU bureau for the chemical and light industries, who told the comrades from the GDR about the work done by Party organizations to carry out the decisions of the December (1963) meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. On July 9 the delegation of the SUPG returned to Berlin.

★ ★ ★

Talks between delegations of the Communist parties of Itaiy and Belgium took place in Italy on July 7-11. The delegations exchanged opinions on problems of the world Communist movement and the struggle for its unity and discussed the tasks facing the working class of the capitalist countries of Europe, specifically the six EEC states, in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. The delegations also exchanged views on the political and economic position of their countries and the activities of their parties.

★ ★ ★

On July 8 the leadership of the French Communist Party received Mohammed Harmel, Secretary of the Tunisian Communist Party. The French Communists asked Mohammed Harmel to convey fraternal greetings to the Communists of Tunisia and reaffirmed the importance of most effective solidarity.

★ ★ ★

A delegation of the Syrian Communist Party headed by General Secretary Khaled Bagdash visited the Soviet Union on the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation was received by CC CPSU Secretary B. N. Ponomaryov. In the course of a cordial friendly talk opinions were exchanged on problems of mutual interest. The leaders of the SCP noted the outstanding importance of N. S. Khrushchov's visit to the UAR for strengthening the Arab national-liberation movement. Complete unanimity of views of the two parties on the situation in the world Communist movement was put on record in the course of the talk. The representatives of the two parties denounced the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders and expressed themselves in favor of convening a conference of representatives of the Communist parties.

★ ★ ★

A report on the situation in the world Communist movement was made by CC Secretary D. Nemes at an enlarged meeting of the CC of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party held on July 10. The meeting also considered problems of foreign policy and current domestic and economic problems.

★ ★ ★

At a session held in London in mid-July the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain discussed the question of the preparations for the general election.

A delegation of French Communist Party officials led by Roland Leroy, alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC FCP, stayed in the Soviet Union from June 29 till July 15. It attended the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met with Soviet working people and held talks in the CC CPSU and Party and Government organs. The French comrades were received by CC CPSU Secretaries B. N. Ponomaryov and V. N. Titov. The meetings and talks showed the complete unanimity of views of the Soviet and French Communists on all cardinal problems of today.

★ ★ ★

At a meeting held on July 13-15 the CC of the Communist Party of Japan heard the report of the CC Presidium on the results of the activities of the Party in the period of the spring struggles and discussed some questions of ideological work.

★ ★ ★

The meeting of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party to commemorate Maurice Thorez, held on July 17, decided to announce the Thorez enrolment to the Party, to last till the end of next year.

★ ★ ★

In the middle of July a meeting between B. N. Ponomaryov, Secretary of the CC CPSU, and Jean Blume and Marc Drumeaux, Secretaries of the CC of the Communist Party of Belgium, took place in the CC CPSU. The exchange of opinions on questions of the international Communist and working-class movement demonstrated anew the complete agreement of views of the two parties.

★ ★ ★

An atmosphere of cordiality and fraternal friendship prevailed at the meeting between B. N. Ponomaryov, Secretary of the CC CPSU, and Iraqi Communist leaders Anwar Moustapha, member of the Political Bureau of the CC, and Jabbar Hussein, member of the CC, who are staying in the Soviet Union as guests of the CPSU Central Committee.

★ ★ ★

Preparations for the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of India were discussed by the Central Secretariat at a session in Delhi on July 22 and 23.

★ ★ ★

A group of activists of the Communist Party of Sweden headed by CPS Board members Gunvor Ryding and Knut Tell stayed in the Soviet Union from July 10 through 24. The Swedish Communists visited Moscow and Leningrad and familiarized themselves with the work of Party and trade union organizations, the life of the Soviet people and their achievements in the building of communism.

Between July 14 and 23 a group of CPSU workers visited the GDR, studying the experience of the SUPG in directing the work of light industry, trade and public service establishments.

★ ★ ★

A delegation of workers of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party headed by F. Orosz, First Secretary of the Szabolcs-Szatmar Regional Committee of the HSWP, visited the Soviet Union from July 9 through 20 on the invitation of the CC CPSU. The Hungarian comrades familiarized themselves with the experience of the CPSU in directing agriculture.

★ ★ ★

A meeting of the CC of the Italian Communist Party completed its work at the end of July. At its first sessions, held on June 24-26, the CC heard the report of Deputy General Secretary L. Longo "On the Independent Activity and Unity of the Working-Class Movement in the Struggle for the Policy of Reforms and Democratic Planning in Italy." Then the meeting was adjourned in connection with the government crisis in the country. On July 22 the meeting reassembled and heard the speech of Pietro Ingrao, member of the ICP leadership, who analyzed the causes of the government crisis.

★ ★ ★

A delegation of the Communist Party of Australia headed by R. Dixon, Chairman of the CC, visited Indonesia on June 22-24. The delegation had a friendly meeting with Aidit, Lucman and Njoto, leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia, in the course of which opinions were exchanged on the situation in Southeast Asia, problems of the world Communist movement and the struggle of the Communists in Australia and Indonesia. The Australian Communists declared their solidarity with the struggle of the people of North Kalimantan for national independence and of the people of Indonesia against Malaysia, and against the British and American imperialists.

★ ★ ★

Reporting on the internal political situation to the meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Austria on July 23, CC Secretary F. Fuernberg dealt in detail with the question of the electoral reform in the country and stated the CPA's attitude to this question. The meeting instructed the Political Bureau of the CC CPA to work out and publish the demands of the CPA as regards the state budget for 1965.

★ ★ ★

On July 27, N. V. Podgorny, member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CC CPSU, paid a friendly visit to the Rumanian People's Republic, where he had a meeting with the First Secretary of the CC of the Rumanian Workers' Party, G. Gheorghiu-Dej. The meeting, which passed in a cordial and comradely at-

mosphere, was attended by CC RWP Political Bureau members G. Apostol, E. Bodnaras and N. Ceausescu, as well as USSR Ambassador I. K. Zhegalin. On July 28, N. V. Podgorny returned to the Soviet Union.

★ ★ ★

A delegation of the French Communist Party led by Pierre Juquin, alternate member of the CC FCP, spent twelve days in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic familiarizing itself with problems of public education, science and culture. On July 30 the delegation left for home.

★ ★ ★

At the end of July a meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Israel heard the report of General Secretary S. Mikunis on the political situation in the country and the role of the CPI. The resolution of the meeting deals with the main problems of today and defines the tasks facing the Party. In the concluding part of the resolution the meeting noted, among other things, that "the splitting activities of the CC CPC cause harm to the Communist movement." The resolution points out that "the CPI supports the initiative of the CC CPSU regarding a new conference of the Communist and Workers' parties and the immediate convening of the drafting committee of representatives of the 26 Communist and Workers' parties to prepare the conference."

★ ★ ★

A delegation of active women members of the Communist Party of Australia spent a month and a half in the Soviet Union on the invitation of the CC CPSU. The delegation toured the Soviet Union, familiarizing itself with the achievements of Soviet people in communist construction and the participation of women in Party activities, state administration and the economic and political life of the country. The delegates had numerous meetings with representatives of Party, government and public organizations, workers in industry and agriculture, and collective farmers. On August 2 the delegation left for home.

★ ★ ★

A conference of representatives of the Communist parties of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland with the participation of an observer from the United Socialist Party of Iceland was held in Helsinki on August 7 and 8. The conference discussed world political problems and the situation in the world Communist movement, as well as questions of cooperation of the working classes of these countries. The communique of the conference points out:

"It was noted at the conference that the constantly growing might of the socialist countries, the policy of peaceful coexistence and the struggle of the peoples of the world against war have created

prerequisites for preserving universal peace. The struggle for peace is most important among the tasks for the accomplishment of which all the trends of the world working-class movement, especially the Communists and Social Democrats, should act in common.

"The participants in the conference noted with satisfaction that the working-class movement of the Nordic countries opposed racial discrimination in South Africa and condemned the colonial policy of Spain and Portugal. It is necessary that the working-class movement in the Nordic countries should come out jointly against the neo-colonialism of the United States, Britain, France and West Germany in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"The participants in the conference noted with profound gratification that the visit of the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, N S. Khrushchov, to Denmark, Norway and Sweden had promoted friendly relations between the Scandinavian countries and the Soviet Union and was a major contribution to the policy of peaceful coexistence.

"There was an exchange of opinions on the situation in the world Communist movement. The delegates to the conference put on record the identity of views of their parties as regards the policy of peaceful coexistence, the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, and as regards the debated ideological issues. They stressed that all the Communist parties are duty bound to work for the restoration of unity."

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

20

Included in this Issue

GUS HALL'S APPEAL:
THE ELEVENTH HOUR,
DEFEAT THE NEW FASC(ST THREAT

BUILDING OF COMMUNISM IN USSR
GREAT INTERNATIONAL MISSION
OF SOVIET PEOPLE
—Boris Ponomaryov

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD
MARXIST
REVIEW
PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 20

contents

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MEETING A PRESSING NECESSITY

Statement of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Argentina **5**

FOR UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AGAINST FACTIONAL ACTIVITIES OF CPC LEADERS

Statement of the Central Committee, Dominican People's Socialist Party **11**

GUS HALL'S APPEAL: THE ELEVENTH HOUR DEFEAT THE NEW FASCIST THREAT 14

LETTER OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY TO THE CPSU 28

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEES OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GERMANY AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY 32

BUILDING OF COMMUNISM IN THE USSR — GREAT INTERNATIONAL MISSION OF SOVIET PEOPLE

Boris Ponomaryov 37

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
September 24, 1964

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MEETING A PRESSING NECESSITY

STATEMENT* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF ARGENTINA

Having familiarized itself with the June 15, 1964, letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, sent in reply to the CPC letter of May 7, 1964, the Central Committee of our Party voices its full agreement with the political content of the letter of the CC, CPSU and the concrete proposals of the Soviet comrades concerning the convocation of a preparatory meeting and an international conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties to discuss the ideological and political differences of the CPC leader with the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties with a view to create the conditions for overcoming these differences and putting an end to the factionalist activities of the Chinese leaders and their myrmidons in the world Communist and working-class movement.

In connection with the latest exchange of letters between the CC, CPSU and the CC, CPC the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina declares once again that the need for an international conference is now greater than ever before. As regards the date for such a meeting, the CC, CPA believes that, in view of the situation, it should be convened without delay. As far as the organizational arrangements are concerned, we believe that these can and should be made by the CPSU, as was the case with the 1960 Meeting. However, in view of the fact that it is now essential for the other parties to shoulder a greater share of the responsibility, our Party is prepared to do its share.

An international meeting is necessary not only to examine the differences between the Chinese leaders' position and the general line of the world Communist and working-class movement worked out at the 1957 and 1960 meetings, but also to bring this line into conformity with the changed international situation, and to coordinate the policy and tactics of the Communist parties accordingly.

---

*Nuestra Palabra, July 21, 1964.

I

Our Party's standpoint on the ideological, political and tactical differences was stated at its 12th Congress, in several resolutions of the Central Committee, in Comrade Codovilla's pamphlet *The Attitude of the Marxist-Leninists Towards the Trotskyite Splitters from the CPC,* as well as in *Nuestra Palabra,* organ of the CC, and the theoretical and political journal *Nueva Era.*

These problems were thoroughly examined in the main documents of the CPSU, the Open Letter of July 14, 1963, and Comrade Suslov's report at the CC, CPSU meeting on February 14, 1964, which our Party published in large editions. Therefore we do not consider it necessary to return in this statement to the questions at issue.

Using "defense" of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine as a cover, the Chinese leaders headed by Mao Tse-tung, who pose as "staunch champions" of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, are continuing their pernicious activities aimed at replacing this doctrine with alien ideas borrowed from the arsenal of bourgeois nationalism, such as the idea of a "third world" or "intermediate zone" in which they include, along with the People's Republic of China, also Japan, West Germany, France and other imperialist states.

II

In its letters of November 29, 1963, and March 7, 1964, to the CC, CPC, the CPSU made a number of constructive proposals that could be accepted as the basis for overcoming the ideological and political differences between the Chinese leaders, on the one hand, and the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, on the other. These letters proposed ending the public polemic and starting preparations for a meeting to be convened at a suitable date to preserve the unity of the Communist and working-class movement. However, the Chinese leaders rejected these proposals and persisted in opposing the convocation of such a meeting, clearly with the object of continuing the public polemic and stepping up their disruptive activities.

In their previously published documents the Chinese leaders had agreed to hold a preliminary meeting to prepare the international conference, seeking, however, to dictate what parties should take part in the meeting.

It is noteworthy that the Chinese leaders who pose as the sole defenders of the colonial and dependent countries, propose to exclude from the preparatory committee the Communist parties of Argentina and Brazil, which took an active part in the preparation of the 1960 Meeting. Thus, they want to deprive Latin America as a whole of representation in this committee.

At present the CPC leaders openly declare that it is their intention to continue the polemic indefinitely, demanding that the CPSU leadership publish all documents and correspondence with the CPC and other parties and that the meeting be postponed for four or five years, or not held at all. The CPC leaders completely disregard the fact that the present world situation makes it imperative for the Communist and working-class movement in all countries to cement solidarity in carrying out the political and tactical line jointly elaborated by the Communist parties.

A year after the publication of the Open Letter of the CC, CPSU to all Communists of the Soviet Union, the Chinese leaders declare that "the Chinese press has not yet fully replied to your open letter." In this way they again demonstrate their striving to turn the international Communist movement into a debating society so as to facilitate their factionalist and splitting activity and to weaken the struggle for peace, democracy, national liberation, socialism and communism.

Last February, in reply to the concrete proposals of the CPSU, the Chinese leaders declared that talks between the two parties could start in October 1964, and a preparatory meeting of 17 parties (instead of the 26 parties that took part in the preparatory committee of the 1960 Meeting) be held next year. The international meeting would thus have been postponed till the end of next year or 1966. Our Party declared in its resolution of April 18 that the Chinese leaders were taking recourse to "dilatory tactics in order to gain time and to try to set up factions in Communist parties, and to establish parallel organizations in every country with the object of splitting the world Communist movement."

Less than two months later, without even trying to substantiate their proposal, the Chinese leaders declared that bilateral CPSU-CPC talks could be conducted only in May 1965 or at a still later date, and that the international meeting should take place in four or five years from now, "when all preparations have been completed," or should not be held at all.

III

Early convocation of the meeting is urged by all the Communist and Workers' parties with the exception of the CPC and the Albanian Party of Labor, which maintain, in an attempt to justify their stand, that if the meeting fails to reach agreement the world Communist movement wil split. They would like to make it appear that they are opposed to the meeting for the sake of the unity of the world Communist movement. But would the holding of the meeting really endanger unity? Certainly not, if the Chinese leaders were not intent on destroying unity at all

costs. What does present a constant thread to unity is the disruptive work of the Chinese leaders in the ranks of the Communist and Workers' parties.

The proposals made by the Soviet comrades are aimed precisely at overcoming the present critical situation and creating a situation in which a split can be averted and cooperation strengthened between all the fraternal parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. It is perfectly clear that if the Chinese leaders were really interested in strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement they would not refuse to discuss the differences at a meeting.

The Chinese leaders are out to preserve the present state of affairs so as to gain time for continuing their disruptive policy. They openly support in a number of countries splinter groups which oppose the policy formulated by the leading bodies of the parties of these countries, do not recognize their tried and tested leaders, and set up self-styled "communist parties."

One of the reasons why the Marxist-Leninist parties propose that a conference be held in the near future is the need to put an end to factionalism in the world Communist and working-class movement and to outline the perspectives of joint struggle against the common enemy and above all against imperialism and the threat of a world war.

Clearly, the Chinese leaders' policy is causing grave harm to the world Communist movement. It is also clear, however, that if they do not abandon their subversive policy in good time, they will inevitably suffer a resounding fiasco. Their efforts will be frustrated by the unity of the Marxist-Leninists of the whole world.

IV

The Chinese leaders not only openly urge the setting up of factions with a view to forming rival parties. As can be seen from their provocative activities at sessions of the World Peace Council, the Afro-Asian Solidarty Committee in Algiers, the Executive Committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the congress of the International Federation of Democratic Lawyers in Budapest, the CPC leaders are stepping up their splitting activities in international mass organizations as well.

Had the Chinese leaders really wanted an honest discussion of the ideological, political and tactical disagreements in order to work out common viewpoints and to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement, they would not have taken recourse to such methods, impermissible in relations between Communists, as distortion of facts, misinterpretation of the views of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, slander and invective, intrigues

and venomous attacks the like of which the Communist movement has not seen since the days of Trotskyism.

Marxist-Leninists the world over cannot but feel indignant at the activities of the Chinese leaders, who, instead of helping to strengthen all forces fighting against imperialism, concentrate their fire on the glorious CPSU, which has done so much for the international Communist movement, on its First Secretary, Comrade Khrushchov, on the Party founded and fostered by Lenin and on the Soviet Government. The CPC leaders outrageously accuse them of "betraying" Cuba during the Caribbean crisis, of "disregard" for the interests of the peoples, allegedly displayed in the signing of the tripartite Moscow test-ban treaty, of "striving with every fibre of their being," as the Chinese leaders write in their May 7 letter to the CC, CPSU, "to unite with North-American imperialism for struggle against the national-liberation movement and the proletarian revolution."

This attitude is particularly outrageous in view of the fact that life, the entire trend of world events, bears out the correctness of the CPSU's consistent Marxist-Leninist policy in defense of the freedom and independence of the peoples, of democracy, peace and socialism.

V

Unity of the Communist and working-class movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism for which the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties are working, is all the more necessary since the international situation is becoming more and more favorable to the struggle for the realization of the historic tasks set before the Communist and woking-class movement by the 1960 Meeting: the building of socialism and communism in the countries of the socialist world camp; elimination of the danger of world thermonuclear war; implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with differing political and social systems; complete liquidation of the imperialist colonial system; abolition of monopoly rule in the capitalist countries with a view to building socialism in the future.

This is testified to by the deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system; the aggravation of contradictions between imperialists; the irrepressible growth of the national-liberation movement in Asian, African and Latin American countries; the growth of anti-monopoly, democratic movements everywhere as well as of the world peace movement, and many other developments. At the same time, Marxism-Leninism is gaining ground among the peoples, and the socialist world camp headed by the mighty Soviet Union is growing ever stronger.

This enrages the rulers of the imperialist and capitalist states,

who resort to ever more reactionary methods in their struggle against the working-class and popular movement, and step up preparation of a new war.

In these conditions splitting activities bring grist to the mill of imperialism and all the reactionary forces of the world.

Hence it is more necessary than ever to convene an international meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties in order to uphold the unity of the Communist movement on the basis of the immortal principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Ruenos Aires, July 21, 1964.

FOR UNITY OF WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, AGAINST FACTIONAL ACTIVITIES OF CPC LEADERS

STATEMENT* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, DOMINICAN PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST PARTY

The Central Committee of the People's Socialist Party has once again discussed the situation that has arisen in the world Communist movement as a result of the factional activities the leaders of the Communist Party of China openly conduct today in violation of the principles governing relations between Communist and Workers' parties.

The feverish splitting activities of the CPC leaders are not limited to the world Communist movement, but affect the international working-class movement, the struggle for peace, the youth and women's movements, the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism.

The CPC leaders spearhead their attacks chiefly against the Party of Lenin—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—combining their erroneous subjective appraisal of the international situation and dogmatic application of Marxism-Leninism with violent anti-Soviet slander and invective in no way different from those which the Trotskyites and other renegades from the revolutionary movement have used over many years.

In their blind rage the CPC leaders have gone to the length of accusing the CPSU of "making a deal with imperialism," of "restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union." Losing all sense and reaching the extremes of absurdity, they hurl such accusations at a party which destroyed capitalism in its country many years ago, built socialism against tremendous odds, and is marching ahead along the road of communism.

The CPC leaders' factional activities have practically no limits. In Europe, the USA, Asia, Africa and Latin America the revolutionary movement has to deal with their criminal attempts to split Communist parties.

Employing the aid of the least stable, vacillating elements in the Communist parties in some cases, and of renegates such as Trotskyites, in others, the CPC leaders have set up in Brazil, Belgium, Peru, India and some other countries small splinter

*El Popular, July 22, 1964

groups which they describe as "genuine Communist parties" as sole "true Marxist-Leninists." Thus imperialism, which has been long trying to split and destroy the Communist parties, has received inestimable assistance from where it has been least expected. "Genuine" and "true Marxist-Leninists" are extending a hand to the deadliest enemies of peace, democracy and socialism!

International democratic organizations are frequently used by Chinese delegates as a forum for expounding their differences with the world Communist movement. The CPC leaders are out to ensure the preponderance of their "special" line in these organizations.

It is a matter of record that they are trying to counterpose the European socialist countries to the developing countries of Asia and Africa, the working-class movement in the developed countries to the national-liberation movement, and the latter to the peace movement, using for this purpose even racialist argumentation which runs counter to Marxist-Leninist principles.

The CPC leaders have clearly gone over from opposing the world Communist movement on cardinal issues of strategy and tactics to open factional activities. Having failed to impose their general line, which boils down to a nationalist, adventurist and ultra-Left deviation, on the world Communist movement, they are trying to replace the Communist parties in all countries with Trotskyite groups in order to build a rival "Communist movement" under their control.

It is the prime duty of all Communist parties, big and small alike, to preserve unity based on Marxist-Leninist theory, on joint struggle against capitalist exploitation, for socialism and communism. The Communist parties should resolve differences in views on problems of common interest through friendly exchange of opinions, constructive discussion, and thorough examination of disputed issues. Those who encroach on the supreme interests of the unity of the world Communist movement bring grist to the imperialists' mill and gravely harm the struggle of the peoples for peace, democracy and socialism.

Disruptive work, impudent interference in the internal affairs of other parties, and recourse to methods violating the principles accepted in relations between fraternal parties are impermissible, and no party can remain indifferent to them.

In view of the aforesaid, the Central Committee of the People's Socialist Party resolutely denounces the splitting activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China and repudiates their campaign of provocations and slander against the CPSU and other fraternal parties.

The Central Committee supports the proposal for the earliest possible convocation of a meeting of the Communist and Work-

ers' parties in order to consider the new situation and strengthen the indestructible unity of the world Communist movement.

Santo Domingo, July 17, 1964.

GUS HALL'S APPEAL: THE ELEVENTH HOUR DEFEAT THE NEW FASCIST THREAT

Following are excerpts from a speech made by Gus Hall, Communist spokesman, to a meeting in New York of more than 100 leaders.*

It is now an inescapable reality: The United States is face to face with a most serious reactionary challenge, a grave confrontation with a force that imperils the very existence of our democratic institutions.

The nation is face to face with an ugly force that threatens to wipe out all the gains of our people and to wipe out the world by nuclear devastation.

The warning flags against the danger of fascism must be hoisted anew.

The overall task before all progressives, the entire Left, including the Communists, is to set a course for the crucial three months ahead.

In the calculations of the theories and the science of space, the element of time has emerged as one of the central factors.

In a political struggle, as in space, time is a basic material element. If Communists and other progressives are to be effective in influencing our political surroundings, we must raise the element of time to a higher status in our calculations.

CROSSROADS

In this sense the next three months are just a 90-day period of time. They are a 90-day time-period packed with the political potency of many years duration of other times. It is a time period of special quality; it is a political crossroads.

It is very important to understand the qualitative essence of this short period of time.

It is not going to be a period for the incubation of ideas. It is not the planting season for political trends.

The very essence of this time-period is political confrontation, political decision, political mobilization, mass organization, bold initiative creative and imaginative mass propaganda. It is a moment when mass trends and political currents come to the surface and can explode into mass political movements and strug-

---

*The Worker, August 2, 1964

gles. The period of incubation is over; the moment of mass political action is at hand. This is the moment that separates the empty talkers from those who give leadership, the seat-warmers from the initiators, organizers and mobilizers.

The key words in the above sentence is "they can explode into mass movements and struggles." They can—if they get leadership. We must be clear as to the potential of the moment—if there is leadership. On the other hand, if these mass trends that are surfacing do not get leadership, if they cannot find the path to crystallization, they can wither and flounder in frustration and into passivity. Or worse, they can become victims to extreme reactionary demagogy.

So, 1964 is a political crossroads election. Our nation can take a path that will lead it to a swing in either direction. We have at present, simultaneously, a very grave challenge from the forces of reaction, as well as the potential for the emergence of a broad people's democratic upsurge that can bring about a smashing defeat of the forces of the ultra-Right. Through these elections our country can take the step that can lead it to reaction and towards fascism, and on the other hand it can defeat the ultra-Right challenge in such a way, and create such mass movements, actions, and new political alignments that the nation will take a path to greater democracy, peace and economic security.

Such is the qualitative essence of the next 90-day period of time.

The 1964 elections are so crucial and critical because they now reflect a new level of political polarization.

The issues are sharply drawn. The forces are fast lining up. In such a sharp confrontation on issues so broad that they affect every American, issues that will decide the direction and the political nature of our Nation, issues of peace or war, democracy or fascism, civil rights or Jim Crow—in such a confrontation there can be no neutrals.

Inaction in the name of neutrality, or abstention and boycott in the name of protest will aid the opposite of the intended protest. Any progressive force demobilized in 1964 under whatever pretext means inadvertent support for the most reactionary candidates. It is a political line that backfires, unless one is ready to accept the infantile and dangerous outlook of "the worse, the better."

So all forces in one way or another are going to have their say about the outcome of this confrontation. There is no escaping the confrontation. All groups and all forces will have to react to it.

What is the nature of this reactionary challenge?

THREE STREAMS

It is the coalescing of three poisonous and polluted reactionary streams. It is the polarization of these reactionary formations into an evil reactionary alliance that now threatens to ride to power through the 1964 elections. In this confrontation, the ultra-Right danger emerges as a far graver threat than ever before.

The Dixiecrats, the KKK and the White Citizens Councils are an old racist base of reaction. Since the Civil War these forces have polluted the thinking and the bloodstream of our country. They have become even more desperate and violent. Cowardly murder has become the main weapon of this scum in their fanatical crazed attempt to halt the march to Freedom Now for Negro Americans and return the South to slavery. They are now making forays into the North to make contact with their ideological kinfolk, the Birchites, other crusaders of reaction and backward bigotry.

Their weapons are terror, murder and provocation. The aim of the provocation is to heighten racial tensions, to create confusion and violence. The aim of the provocation is to create splits and divisions between Negro and white Americans and in the civil rights movement. The aim of the confusion, divisions, and the tensions is for them to become the vehicles by which to ride to political power. The people of the U.S. must now raise their guard against provocations. If the provocateur is in a police uniform, that only increases the danger.

Mississippi has become a front line in the struggle against the rising danger of fascism in America. The struggle in that state is a critical battle to save U.S. democracy.

As goes Mississippi, so goes the Civil Rights law, and so goes U.S. democracy.

If the Federal law and the U.S. Constitution cannot be enforced in that state, then the state bigots are deciding whether to enforce them or not. If Americans who help bring democracy and the right to vote to the citizens of that state, can be jailed, brutally beaten, and murdered without getting any protection from Federal authorities who are supposed to enforce these laws, then this becomes the lawless hoodlum precedent for all states.

This is one of the ugly streams of reaction now joining with other forces.

To understand the nature of the other two streams, it is necessary to go back ten or fifteen years.

The adjustment of policy to fit the changed status of U.S. imperialism from that of an unchallenged pirate to being only one of many centers of power has been a painful process indeed. The forces of reaction have refused to accept this reality. They have

taken the setbacks and frustrations of U.S. imperialism and turned them into ideological instruments, to build reactionary centers of nationalism, jingoism and anti-communism, into centers of hysteria, of war propaganda, centers of racism and for the propagation of fascism. They have deliberately and demagogically made the world's resistance to U.S. big business, imperialist policies of aggression appear as if they were rebuffs and setbacks, for the people of the U.S.

This demagogic appeal to jingoism was sounded by Sen. Dirksen in his nominating speech for Goldwater. He spoke of Cuba, Ghana and Panama with imperialist, chauvinistic arrogance. With his phrase, "too long have we heard the bugle of retreat," Dirksen sounded more like the bugler of the Light Brigade. If the people follow this bugler of death, the poem will have to be recast to read—"Into the valley of nuclear death rode civilization."

The Goldwater jingoism seeks to implant in the minds of the unknowing the idea that by boldly using our nuclear stockpile, the U.S. could again rule the world, that a world not ruled by the U.S. is not worth saving. Their slogan is, "Coexistence means death."

It is this campaign, based on the myths of the past, that is the ideological and political demagogy used to build the other two polluted streams, now joined in the new fascist threat.

One stream includes the fanatical fascist groups, such as the Birchites, the anti-Communist crusades, the groups around Hargis, Schwartz, Gen Walker and William Buckley. These groups are the training formation for storm troopers. Often they are staffed by former FBI agents and retired armed forces brass. These well-dressed men with dark glasses were all over the Republican Party convention.

The third of these streams is the resurgence of virulent McCarthyism within the political parties. This is especially so within the councils of the Republican Party. One would make a fundamental error to see these people as the old Taft Conservatives. This is McCarthyism with muscle added—this is McCarthyism with a conscious fascist ideology. The elements from all three streams have now captured the Republican Party. The convention delegates only reflected the control of the party machine. It is a case of the most successful infiltration in history.

For some six years, these ultra-Right forces have combed the swamps, gathered all the dregs and placed them into controlling positions within the Republican machine. Of course the infiltration was made easy because there was no resistance.

The takeover is complete. The ultra-Rght demanded and got

terms of unconditional surrender. The takeover was the result of a well executed campaign.

The Republican Party is now transformed. It is now an instrument of extreme reaction. It can become the instrument of fascism. We regret that our analysis of two years ago has turned into a prophecy.

The GOP has dropped even its fig leaf of appealing to labor and the Negro voter.

THE ULTRA-RIGHT

These forces and the Birchites are now the ultra-Right hub around which the reactionary control is built. We can expect the local Republican Party headquarters more and more to become the centers of extreme reaction in all of the communities. The danger of this challenge is further heightened because of the ability of this evil coalition to get less conservative Republicans to run interference for it.

Most likely there will be some Republicans who will not go along. They will work to save the Republican Party by defeating Goldwater and the other ultra-Right candidates. This is apparently the course of Jackie Robinson and other Republicans who place their nation and people above a loyalty to a party captured by reaction.

This, then, completes the three streams that make up the mainstream of malignant reaction. It is the merging of these streams that creates the new danger from the venomous ultra-Right.

The confrontation is with the ugliest force in our history. That ugly cabal is further supported by powerful forces within the Pentagon, the CIA and the FBI. It is now receiving hundreds of millions of dollars from important segments of big business. They now have the respectability of a presidential candidate of one of the two parties and the machinery of a national party in their hands.

They have a core of trained fanatics, who campaign night and day. The California primaries again proves that a general campaign of speeches and handshakes, even when conducted on TV is no match for a well-organized house-to-house campaign.

The American people must be convinced about the special nature of this evil coalition. It is not just the coming together for the purposes of the elections. It is not just another Taft or an Ike. It is not even just a revival of McCarthyism.

Here, there is the merging of ideological currents, of reactionary centers with some mass base. The hope of electoral victory is based on racism, jingoism and anti-communism.

The racism of white supremacy is now mixed with the anti-

democratic currents of fascism. The "nuclear war mania" is mixed with jingoism, the anti-labor neurosis is now mixed with anti-Semitism, with anti-Mexican-Amercian, anti-Puerto Rican and anti-Italian, and general anti-foreign born bigotry. All this is superimposed on a Hitler-like big lie campaign of anti-communism.

It is not just a polarization of groups for elections—it is a polarization of reactionary ideological currents. The aim is political domination—state power. It is not only a combined quality; it is a new fascist-like quality that has emerged from the coalescence of three different ideological reactionary currents.

Further, on what is at stake: The confrontation is with suicidal political insanity.

NAZI GENERALS

What other interpretation is it possible to give to Goldwater's often stated policy of "total victory." This Dr. Strangelove-like madness is now a plank in the Republican Party platform. It states, "there can be no peace, there can be no security until this goal is won." And further it states, "We will take the cold war offensive on all fronts." What they are saying is—if elected we will declare war for total victory.

A policy of so-called "total victory" is a policy of total nuclear war. It will not result in total victory, or victory of any kind—it will only result in total annihilation.

What other possible interpretation can one give to Goldwater's policy of "total victory" and then giving the Pentagon and the field commander the right to use nuclear weapons when they so desire? The Nazi generals in command posts in NATO are specifically included in this lunacy. This is now a feature of the Republican Party platform. It is an extension of the dangerous Administration policy of building a NATO surface fleet with nuclear weapons.

What other interpretation can one give to Goldwater's outlook of "either we destroy the socialist countries or they will destroy us?"

Policies based on myths lead to insane-sounding concepts. But when such concepts become the guiding policies of a nation, it is a crisis for all of humanity. For such a policy the UN would be an obstacle. Since today it is almost impossible to turn the UN into an instrument of imperialist war, the Republican Party now proposes to destroy it.

This explains Goldwater's intimate relations with the revenge-seeking Nazi dregs of West Germany—his obvious fascination with the fanatical past and present of Hitlerism. As an American why else should he be so enraptured with the study of why the fascists of Germany lost as well as how Germany came to power?

Goldwater's statement of wanting less Federal government is also a fraud. He does not want to turn over the powers of government to the people: he wants to reduce the Federal government by turning its functions over to the military brass. He wants to cut the Federal budget by cutting down the expenditures for social security—by starving the civilian departments and turning the money over to the military brass.

The Republican Party's platform was shaped so it now conforms with Goldwater's votes against the Civil Rights Law, with his votes against the minimum effort bill against poverty, and against Federal aid to education. That platform expresses his opposition to the whole system of social security, unemployment insurance, old age benefits, veterans benefits, against hot lunches to school children of depressed areas, against the food stamp plan.

The convention reflects Goldwater's disdain and opposition to the trade union movement. It mirrored his support of union-busting, wage-cutting, scab-herding "Right-to-Work" laws.

CYNICAL PROPOSAL

There is a fascist-like cynicism in the Goldwater-Republican Party plan to turn over the supervision of civil rights to the local sheriffs who were almost without exceptions members of the KKK or White Citizens Councils. The three murdered civil rights workers, we might recall were in the hands of local sheriffs.

There is a fanatical fascist-like cynicism in his plan to turn over the decision to use or not use nuclear weapons over to the field commander.

It is necessary for every American to take a good hard look at the full implications of this new threat.

Whether all of the participants fully know it or not—this type of coalition has its own logic of development. This one can develop only in a reactionary direction. The logic of its direction, the weight of its propelling inner forces, can only lead towards fascism.

Its appeal is to the section and to the ideological level of people who can be engulfed in the demagogy of fascism. It gets its financial support from those sections of big business who have always supported fascist-oriented movements.

As is the case with fascism, this evil coalition appeals to the most backward sentiments, to racism, jingoism and national hatreds.

As we said earlier, it is a confrontation with the ugliest, the most violent, the most virulent and malignant organized force in our history.

Before we answer the very unpleasant question: Can this evil coalition win, we must assess what it has already won.

The nomination of Goldwater in the California primaries was a major victory for the ultra-Right. Los Angeles County was the first real beachhead in the operation of this reactionary force. The votes for Wallace in Wisconsin, Indiana and Maryland were victories for this evil force.

The capture of the national machinery of the Republican Party is a further victory for the ultra-Right.

The capture of the Republican Party convention and the presidential nomination is another victory for these forces. But some may say, "the progressives are not in the Republican Party. How can you designate these developments within a conservative bourgeois party as defeats for the forces of progress?"

It is true the forces of progress are not within the Republican Party, but the issues in this confrontation are not those that divide the Left, and the progressives from the rest of the political spectrum.

When the issues are as broad as war or peace, democracy or fascism, civil rights or slavery and Jim Crow, and when the ultra-Right wins on this kind of issue in a statewide primary or at the national convention of a major party—then they must be viewed as serious setbacks. These defeats for the forces of modernization within the Republican Party must serve as a warning to the forces of progress and peace everywhere.

As unpleasant and as impossible as the thought may seem, we must entertain the question: Is it possible for this evil coalition to win the Presidential election? By now we all possess enough sageness and sagacity never to say "it can't happen here." We must say in all candor—it does not have to happen, but it most definitely can. At this moment the most dangerous mood is smug complacency. It is this false complacency that is the obstacle to a people's movement. This is always the forerunner to defeat.

Even a close defeat for Goldwater would not be a serious setback to the forces of reaction. There are forces in this coalition who consider it a victory to have Goldwater run and go down to defeat; they prefer defeat rather than have some other candidate who would increase the Republican chances of winning. To be able to put on a nationwide three-month drive for their reactionary ideas is a victory for them.

A narrow Goldwater defeat would leave this alliance intact. They would remain a powerful force—pushing the whole political spectrum to the right. They would continue to have the machinery of the Republican Party at their disposal.

NO STOPPING SHORT

Therefore the aim of the people's democratic forces can be nothing short of a smashing defeat for this ultra-Right reaction.

But Goldwater's defeat is not automatic. When there is no crystallized broad opposition, when the country is in the midst of adjusting to new world relations and to very deep-going domestic changes, extreme demagogy can be a very powerful influence.

To take for granted the ultra-Right defeat would be the greatest political folly—it would be an unforgiveable political crime.

So the decisive question of the moment becomes. "Is there a smashing defeat for the reactionary forces in the 1964 political cards?"

Anyone who has studied the American scene can come to only one conclusion. It is not only possible to meet the challenge, but also to deliver such a crushing blow as to send this ugly alliance into generations of paralysis.

To achieve this historic victory the key factor is the quick emergence of a broad people's democratic movement, a people's upsurge that understands the dangerous nature of the challenge, a movement that can resist and expose the reactionary demagogy, a people's movement that will move from the defensive to the offensive against the foe, a people's movement that will set the standards for politicians and programs, a movement that will itself create the political climate for the campaign.

Appeasement or retreat before this challenge would be a pathway to disaster. Any ideas of pacification of these reactionary ultra-Right forces by feeding them with concessions at the expense of the people's interests must be rebuffed.

The Civil Rights law must be energetically implemented. The war on poverty must get off the ground.

The steps to ease world tensions, towards world peace must be vigorously sought for.

Only a fighting people's movement can block all attempts to appease or to sell out the interests of the people.

Is it realistic to expect such a movement to emerge? I think it is very realistic.

What are the factors that make a people's democratic victory possible?

First, while there has been a coalescing of the forces of reaction, and while these forces have moved to the Right, there has been no such trend amongst the broad masses. In fact the mass trends are moving in the opposite direction.

The emergence of such a people's democratic movement will be a further development of these mass currents. The democratic movement can swim these currents, while the ultra-Right fascist coalition will have to swim against the mass currents.

CAPITALISTS SPLIT

Second, there is a serious split in the ranks of the capitalist class on these issues. Some of the large newspapers and serious columnists reflect this deep concern. Their concern is about the self-interests of U.S. capitalism. However, their concern about the self-interests of U.S. capitalism and the concern of the people for their own self-interests coincide at certain major points. There are people in the business world who for their own reasons do not think a nuclear war policy is to their best self-interest. This idea coincides with what millions believe. The parallel self-interest of the masses and of sections of the capitalist class adds greatly to the strength of a broad people's movement. This will help to give the middle class elements confidence in a democratic victory.

Third, the people of the U.S. still have fresh in their minds the horrors of Hitler and the hysteria of McCarthyism. The Negro people and the Civil Rights movement are showing a very high degree of political consciousness. They show the lessons learned in struggle. The action of the NAACP convention in condemning Goldwater and the marches in San Francisco are indicative of the level of their participation in this political upsurge.

It also now appears that labor will be united, at least along parallel lines, in this campaign. There is a new alertness in the ranks of labor about this challenge to their specific self-interests. These developments add up to a possibility of a speedy crystalization of the needed Labor-Negro alliance.

There is not only the polarization of reaction. There is also a trend of the democratic and progressive currents toward coalition. This trend is a reflex to the reactionary coalition which jeopardizes the social gains of the various elements among the people and tends to merge the various popular currents into a massive movement against reaction.

If all of these positive factors are present—what then is missing to make them into a living movement? What is it that must be added to complete the picture?

What is needed is "initiative." To meet this challenge of reaction, what is needed is 10,000 people's initiators to initiate 100,000 movements, actions, conferences, meetings, committees, petitions, marches. What is needed are initiators, mobilizers and organizers. What is needed are a hundred thousand committees to defeat the ultra-Right.

And this brings us up to the usual knotty question. Where does the Left fit into this picture? What should the Americans who are against capitalism and for socialism do? For some sections

of the Left this remains the main source for disunity. This same question comes up again and again.

Briefly it can be summed up as follows: should the Left start from the premise that there are no differences between the candidates or the two old parties, and therefore ignore and boycott all that goes on within and around these parties, and conclude that it must only have its own candidates? This has been and remains the essence of the policy of some groups on the Left. Each election year they promise something better for the next election.

We think such a policy is self-defeating. It isolates the Left from the masses who are moving into the electoral arena. We are for independent political action. But we do not believe it possible to conduct such activities in isolation or in a political vacuum. We are for independent political action that is independent of the bourgeois political machines, but we are not for independence from the voters and masses around those machines.

WITH THE MASSES

We are for independence from capitalist class policies, but we are not for independence from the broad issues of reforms that the masses see in their own self-interests. We can finally declare for complete independent political action only when the masses through their experiences are ready to do so. We can contribute to their experience and stimulate independence only by being with them in the current, decisive political struggles.

When the issues are as sharply drawn as they are in the 1964 elections, it is a political crime for anyone on the Left to advocate abstention or boycott.

The Left must play an indispensable part as initiators in this election. The Left must help turn the mass currents and the mass moods into mass movements and mass struggles against the ultra-Right. The Left cannot make this indispensable contribution of being the initiative force if it remains isolated.

Why is it so difficult for some on the Left to understand this tactic? We do not hesitate to take part in the Civil Rights struggle on its own reformist level. We do not say we are going to set up our own "civil rights through socialism" movement. We do not hesitate to take part in the trade union movement on its own reformist level. We do not say we are going to set up our own "trade unions, shorter hours, high-wages-through-socialism" movement. Why is it that we do not see any contradictions between our work in these mass movements and our advocacy for socialism?

Why should we not do likewise in the field of elections? It is only another arena of struggle. The same people, the same work-

ers, are involved. And these are the same workers and the same people who will be in any serious struggles toward socialism. Why is it that we should take note of the level of struggle in the Civil Rights movement and the trade unions, but refuse to do so in the field of electoral struggles? With the present confrontation, with the ultra-Right-fascist forces in control of the Republican Party, in view of Goldwater's policies of war and reaction—with his votes against civil rights, against labor and the poor—how in the name of common sense, of practical politics, or in the name of your abstract concepts of good and bad—can you continue ostrich-like policies flowing from the outdated concepts that there are no differences between the two parties? How can you continue to ignore the ultra-Right threat?

We are not suggesting that the Left become an electoral arm of the Democratic Party. We are for the Left to become the initiators of the broad movements against the ultra-Right and expose specific sections of their program on civil rights, against ending poverty, etc.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

If the Left can unite its ranks and become the initiators of the broad people's electoral movements against the ultra-Right, a number of things will happen:

1. The enemy of all progress will receive a crushing blow.
2. A broad people's democratic movement will become a permanent factor in the political life of the country.
3. The Left will gain a new status, new following, with a new political posture in the country.

It is a law of political development that masses will only learn through the process of their experience in struggle. They can move much faster; they can avoid many unnecessary deadends if we of the Left are with them.

As there is a logic in the direction an ultra-Right current travels, there is also a sense of its own logic that a progressive movement takes. Therefore, is it not clear there is no other path through which the Left can fight for its goals than as a part of the broad people's struggles? These movements are not ready to move on the advanced terms set by the Left. They will reach such advanced positions only step by step.

The struggle for socialism is a logical continuation of the struggle for democracy, for peace, for economic security. The very same people who now fight for reforms, who express their electoral voice through the two parties, are the people who because of their experiences will say, "Let's go one step further — a step to socialism." What sense would it make for us to separate ourselves from these people?

Without this kind of an approach the Left becomes boxed in. It is isolated and so its own electoral efforts remain at a minimum level. It is not a factor in the political life of the country. Only a Left that can initiate and give leadership to a broad political spectrum can be a meaningful political force.

Finally, there are some on the Left who seemingly keep a revolutionary stiff upper lip. They firmly say their position is based on the concept of no differences in the two old parties. But when you scratch the surface of this dogmatic veneer, it becomes clear that their position is not based on this dogmatic principle—but rather they feel they can continue to sound revolutionary because they believe the people are going to defeat reaction. This is the worst type of self-deception, the worst kind of opportunism. It is political scavengerism.

Where do the Communists fit?

Our analysis convinces us that the greatest danger comes from the rise of the new ultra-Right-Goldwater alliance.

However, we have very serious differences with the Johnson Administration. We have been critical and sharply condemn the Administration policy of imperialist aggression in South East Asia. We have always sharply condemned the policy of aggression against the Republic of Cuba. The Administration program against poverty is completely inadequate. As soon as the economic boom hits a snag, this will become very obvious.

Because of the undemocratic laws both federal and state, and because of the harassment of people who would have to sign our electoral petitions, we are still unable to run candidates for President and Vice-President. These are difficulties not of our making.

However, we are not going to permit these problems to paralyze us. We are going to do all we can to build the broad people's movement against the ultra-Right.

Our Party will join with all democratic forces to defeat the ultra-Right Goldwater coalition, while at the same time we will not endorse the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party.

We are going to join in the fight for any candidate who stands with the people on the issues of this confrontation. Wherever possible we are going to run local Communist candidates.

The campaign of Comrade Bill Taylor for Supervisor in Los Angeles County is a clear demonstration of the possibility for such candidates. This increased the influence of our Party and added a necessary feature to the image of our Party.

We are going to make our contribution in clarifying of issues, of deepening the understanding of the basic issues.

We are Communists, and we are also a part of the political

Left. So we will work to unite the Left, and with it become a part of the force of initiators.

We are Communists, and we are also a part of the progressive trend.

We are Communists and we are fighters for the broad issues of democracy and peace and so we are also a part of democratic America. And so we are going to work with all of the forces who make up the legions of the broad people's democratic movement against the ultra-Right fascist conspiracy.

LETTER OF FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY TO COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

In a foreward to the text* of the letter *l'Humanite* writes:

On July 30, 1964, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sent a letter to the Central Committee of the French Communist Party regarding the convocation of an international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties.

In that letter, stating that the absolute majority of the parties have expressed themselves in favor of this conference, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union makes two concrete proposals:

1. The conference should be convened in mid-1965.

2. It should be prepared by a committee composed of representatives of the 26 parties, whose collective work contributed to the success of the 1960 Meeting. The committee should start its work in Moscow on December 15, 1964.

These proposals correspond to the views which have been repeatedly expressed by our Party. Indeed, the important changes that have taken place in the world in the past four years necessitate the convening of a new conference of the Marxist-Leninist parties. This conference becomes especially urgent in view of the dogmatic, adventurist and nationalist policy the leaders of the Communist Party of China pursue in the world Communist and working-class movement, resorting to factionalist and splitting activities.

Already now the position of the CPC leaders is creating difficulties for the socialist camp and the national-liberation movement. This is especially dangerous today when the imperialist forces are intensifying their aggressive actions, as evidenced by the events in South-East Asia, Cyprus, Cuba and the Congo.

The leaders of the Communist Party of China maintain that the international meeting should be held not earlier than four or five years from now or perhaps should not be held at all. This attitude clearly reveals their desire to reject a collective consultation of all Communist parties and proceed with activities pernicious to the entire movement, thus damaging the anti-imperialist struggle.

Insisting on convening an international meeting in the nearest future the French Communist Party expresses concern for the preservation of unity of the world Communist and working-class

---

*L'Humanite, August 14, 1964

movement. Unity is absolutely essential if the struggle against imperialism, for national independence and for peace is to be waged in the most favorable conditions.

The 17th Congress of the French Communist Party warned against "the splitting activities of the Chinese leaders, who, by disuniting the forces of peace and socialism, are doing grave harm to the entire movement and facilitate the activities of imperialism." It found it necessary "to adopt all decisions conforming to the defense of the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement" and favored "the earliest possible convening of a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world."

The purpose of the meeting is not to excommunicate any party from the Communist movement or exclude any country from the socialist world system. The most important thing is to try to work out common positions and emphasize what unites the Marxist-Leninist parties, searching for ways and means of overcoming the difficulties.

The Central Committee of the French Communist Party replied to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its letter of August 6, 1964, supporting the proposal to convene a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties as well as the conditions of holding it. Below we print the text of this letter.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Dear Comrades,

We have received your letter of July 30 regarding the holding of an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties and studied it with great interest.

The situation that has developed in the world Communist and working-class movement is very alarming, indeed. On several occasions in the past four years our Party has stated its position in connection with the differences that have arisen—first in confidential documents and then publicly. We do not find it necessary to state it again.

In order to help overcome these difficulties, our Party expressed itself, in a CC resolution of October 1963, in favor of convening at the most suitable date a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world. The political resolution adopted by the 17th Congress of our Party last May stated that "it is necessary to reaffirm, with due regard for the changes that have taken place lately, the general line of the world Communist movement laid down in 1957 and 1960, and take all measures conducive to preserving unity." In view of this the Party came out for "convening at the earliest possible date a meeting of the

Communist and Workers' parties of the whole world."

For us the question of the meeting is intrinsically bound up with the problem of pressing and strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement.

The serious difficulties that have arisen in the world Communist and working-class movement in recent years have been aggravated to such an extent that they may hamper the development of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces all over the world. Clearly, this can only benefit imperialist reaction, first and foremost in the United States, where it is becoming ever more belligerent, which increases the danger of war.

We, therefore, consider that all the Communist and Workers' parties should explore ways of surmounting the difficulties. This can only be done at a general meeting of the parties. Far from believing that it should "excommunicate" anyone, we hold that it must strengthen the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement.

We realize full well that this, considering the depth of the differences, is an extremely difficult task.

It is perfectly clear that the Communist and Workers' parties the world over are waging their struggles in a wide diversity of conditions, that their history and their experience also differ considerably.

It is equally obvious, however, that the interests of the struggle against imperialism and for the triumph of socialism require that it should be conducted on the basis of principles common to the entire Communist and working-class movement. Consequently, agreement must be reached on the main aims and the chief aspects of the tactics of the struggle. This was the reason for the holding of the 1957 and 1960 meetings. This is the reason why we come out again for a meeting, which is to be convened by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in accordance with a decision adopted at the 1957 Conference.

The changes that have taken place, the new problems that have arisen, and the differences that have appeared in the assessment of the international situation and in the interpretation of jointly elaborated theses, should, in our view, be discussed so as to find out what is common for the entire movement, on the basis of the fundamental principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

To object to such a meeting means, in our opinion, to deny the need for a united front against the imperialist forces, to perpetuate a situation which can become further aggravated and do incalculable harm to the cause of socialism.

Fully agreeing with your proposals, we reaffirm our wish that the conference be held at the earliest possible date, and consider,

as you do, that it is time to start preparatory work. We shall add that, in so far as the majority of the parties have expressed themselves in favor of the meeting, we also are for holding this meeting, which we consider necessary even if complete accord is not reached at it.

Since the question of the composition of the preparatory committee has become the subject of a new debate, we propose that this committee be composed of the same 26 parties which prepared the 1960 Conference, namely, the parties of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, the FRG, the GDR, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan India, Indonesia, Italy, Korea, Mongolia, the People's Republic of China, Poland, Rumania, Syria the USA the USSR and Vietnam.

As far as we are concerned, we agree to send our delegation to this committee to Moscow by December 15, as you suggest. The delegation will consist of Comrades Raymond Guyot, Roland Leroy and Jean Kanapa. After that it would be possible to proceed to the organization of the meeting itself, which could take place early next summer.

Please accept, dear comrades, our fraternal greetings.

For the Central Committee of the French Communist Party,
WALDECK ROCHET,
General Secretary.

August 6, 1964

JOINT STATEMENT* OF SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY AND COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY

On August 17, 1956, the Communist Party of Germany was outlawed. The initiators of the ban wanted to deprive the West German working class of leadership, to exclude it as an independent force from the political life of the Federal Republic of Germany. They could not and cannot achieve this end, for in our time the destiny of the nation is inseparable from the historical task and role of the working class.

In the period of preparation for the First World War the Kaiser's police brutally persecuted the leaders of the German workers. In the period of preparation for the Second World War Nazi terror against Communists signalled the beginning of the persecution of Social Democrats, all democrats and peace supporters.

It has always been workers from whom war exacted the heaviest sacrifices. It has invariably been their lot to build a new life on the ruins. Today the working class of West Germany is again faced with the danger of losing everything.

In 1951, after launching the remilitarization of West Germany, the Adenauer government again raised the question of banning thhe Communist Party. It succeeded in securing the ban several days after the introduction of conscription, immediately before the publication of its plans for arming the Bundeswehr with atomic weapons.

Thus the Bonn government entered upon the path that had already twice led Germany to catastrophe.

Just as Hitler did, it is trying to marshal all reactionary forces under its banners of the anti-communist crusade. But even the governments of its NATO allies do not follow suit. With regard to banning the Communist Party the FRG government is in an infamous alliance with the most sinister reactionaries of our time—the fascist dictators Franco and Salazar—and with the aggresive enemies of peace and freedom in the United States—the spirit of McCarthy and Goldwater.

However, peace and not brinkmanship is the hope of mankind. It is being realized in the struggle of the world Communist movement against the danger of atomic death, for peaceful coexistence

---

*Neues Deutchland, August 16, 1964

and disarmament. The fight for peace is the cornerstone of the policy of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Communist Party of Germany. The essence of the doctrine of peace of the German Democratic Republic is the following: recognition of the existing borders; recognition of the equality of both German states and normalization of relations between them; normalization of relations between them; normalization of relations of all countries with the two German states. The building of socialism in the German Democratic Republic and its policy for peace, against militarism and revanchism in the FRG, serve the great common cause of ensuring that never again will war be unleased on German soil, that all Germany will become a land of peace.

A new contribution to peace was made by the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance concluded between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union. It is of tremendous importance for people in both the GDR and the FRG that the Treaty deals a blow at the West German revenge-seekers, guarantees the integrity of the first peace-loving state in German history, adds to its international prestige, and contributes to the consolidation of peace and security in Europe.

Today the determination to fight against war, for peace is growing in Germany in new, more favorable conditions. It is absurd for the rulers of Federal Germany to seek to strangle the ideas of peace and social progress, the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin today, when these ideas, thanks to the rallying of the working class in the Socialist Unity Party, have started their triumphant march also on German soil, in the GDR.

The Socialist Unity Party and the Communist Party are closely united owing to the identity of their Marxist-Leninist world outlook. They are at one in their struggle against German imperialism, which represents today the gravest danger to peace in Europe. The Socialist Unity Party and the Communist Party are united in their striving to secure a lasting peace and a happy future for the German nation in a single socialist fatherland. In this they see the historical mission of the entire German working class.

Aware of their duty to the German working-class movement, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany declare:

Attitudes differing in spirit have taken shape towards the ban on the Communist Party. Those who steer towards war, atomic armament of the Bundeswehr and restoration of neo-Nazism and revanchism, want to retain the ban in force. Those who want a new policy in the FRG conforming to the interests of the people

of West Germany and the entire nation, should, regardless of party and political disagreements and differences in world outlook, demand the restoration of the legal status of the Communist Party of Germany in the interests of peace and democracy, for the sake of burying the past and ensuring social progress and the nation's future.

LEGALIZATION OF THE CPG WILL STRENGTHEN PEACE

The lifting of the ban on the CPG would be of paramount importance for preserving the right of the German people to self-determination and enhancing the effectiveness of their struggle against atomic armament in any form, for the disarmament of the FRG on its own initiative. This is essential because the Communist Party is the decisive force fighting against the Hitler generals' craving for atomic weapons, against the revival of the spirit of militarism and revanchism.

Already now, in conditions of illegality, the CPG is working hard to draw the working class and all peace-loving people into the active struggle for peace and security, against the arms race and for disarmament. Restoration of the legal status of the CPG would fortify the resistance to the neo-fascist and militarist adventurers who in the Bundeswehr educate the youth in the spirit of yesterday so as to force them to take up arms tomorrow, who are out to unleash a fratricidal war against the GDR and lead our people to destruction in atomic war. Therefore the legalization of the CPG is an indispensable part of the right of the people to democratic self-determination, an essential condition for the security of every citizen of the FRG.

REUNIFICATION IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT A LEGAL COMMUNIST PARTY

The ban on the Communist Party intensified the cold war and deepened the gulf between the two German states. The Communist Party is firmly convinced that the solution of the national problem of our people is impossible without the participation of the German Democratic Republic and cannot be directed against it. The Party comes out for renunciation of the use of force and for talks bewteen the two German states.

Therefore the Central Committees of the SUPG and the CPG declare most resolutely that lifting the ban on the Communist Party would substantially promote improvement of the political climate and relaxation of tension in Germany.

A legal Communist Party will become a formidable force for rapprochement and mutual understanding between all German workers' organizations, for the unity of action of the Federation of German Trade Unions (FRG) and the Federation of Free Ger-

man Trade Unions (GDR), for joint actions by the Socialist Unity Party, the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party. This will help ensure the superiority of the West German working class over the forces of militarism and monopoly capital and lead the whole of Germany onto the path of peace, democracy and socialism.

A LEGAL COMMUNIST PARTY WILL STRENGTHEN THE WEST GERMAN WORKING CLASS

Lifting the ban on the Communist Party is indispensable for the working class and its trade unions to be able to exert proper influence on the political, economic and social life of the country.

In the years since the outlawing of the Communist Party West German monopoly capitalists, including their representatives Flick, Siemens, IG Farbenindustrie and Deutsche Bank, have netted colossal profits thanks to intensified exploitation. Almost 10,000 marks have been squeezed out of the budget of every family for military needs since 1956 with the help of the arms expenditures, which have more than trebled in that period, and the increased tariffs and taxes. The government, at the same time, claims it has no money to remedy the disastrous situation in public education and social maintenance of old and sick people.

A legal Communist Party would provide a fresh impetus to the struggle of the trade unions against the monopolies, for trade union rights in production and state affairs, for the factory and office workers' right to have decisive say, for an active policy of wages, against arms expenditures, growing prices and the danger of inflation.

Abolition of the ban on the Communist Party would help the Social Democrats to pursue an independent policy aimed at leading Social Democracy from the trenches of the cold war and ridding it of alliance with the Christian Democratic Party and the Christian Social Union. Restoration of the legal status of the Communist Party would facilitate joint Social Democrat-Communist actions against the Bonn rulers. This would also lead to the defeat of the Christian Democratic Party and the Christian Social Union in parliamentary elections, by which the Social Democrats, the Communists, the working class and the people in general would benefit in equal measure.

A LEGAL COMMUNIST PARTY WILL DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE

True to the traditions of struggle against fascist tyranny, the Communist Party sees it as its supreme duty constantly to defend the rights of the people. It is always ready to fight for the fundamental laws, for the rights of the workers, for the right to strike

and form unions, for the freedom of opinion and of the press, for the rights of the legislative bodies of the lands and communities.

The ban on the Communist Party is a weapon in the hands of the ultra-reactionaries, who use it to cover up the emasculation of guaranteed constitutional freedoms and legal principles and who already today, in peacetime, want to impose a war regime on the people with the help of emergency laws. Thus the question of lifting the ban on the Communist Party becomes the touchstone for the effectiveness of civil rights, for the observance of the fundamental laws. A legal Communist Party would strengthen the forces fighting against neo-Nazism, for clearing the state, the economy, judiciary and the army from fascist criminals, and contribute to extending freedom and democracy for the people.

Thus life itself proves the need for a legal Communist Party. Freedom of action for Communists will be a guarantee that the people of West Germany will always have an alternative to the hopeless policy of the monopolists and militarists both at enterprises and in parliaments. This will make it possible to chart the road to a peaceful and democratic order supported by the people and to the socialist transformation of society which will for ever ensure peace and prosperity to the people. At the time of the transition from capitalism to socialism the future belongs to the Communists.

The Central Committees of the SUPG and the CPG greet all members and supporters of the Communist Party who defy the terror and persecution in West Germany in their courageous defense of the cause of peace, democracy and social progress. They greet all working people of the GDR, who, by their selfless efforts to build socialism, are rendering effective assistance to the struggle of the Communist Party and all peace-loving forces in West Germany.

The Central Committees of the SUPG and the CPG call upon the working class, all democratic and peace-loving forces in the Federal Republic of Germany and the world public to work for freedom to all victims of the cold war and of the political "justice," which exercises thought control in the FRG, to demand that the Erhard government lift the ban on the Communist Party of Germany.

BUILDING OF COMMUNISM IN THE USSR GREAT INTERNATIONAL MISSION OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

Boris Ponomaryov

SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

The logic of the Chinese leaders' ideological and political struggle against the world Communist movement has been drawing them into the quagmire of anti-Marxist policy and ideology and leading them further away from the underlying principles of scientific communism. Having begun with attacking some tactical propositions of the world Communist movement, they have come to opposing their own political course to the entire general line adopted by all the fraternal parties. An open dispute with the fraternal parties on the vital issues of the strategy of the world revolutionary process did not satisfy them. They challenged the very goals of the Communist movement. Actually, the Chinese revisionists are mutilating the theory to make it fit the opportunist needs of their splitting policy, of their narrow factionalist interests.

Elaboration of the world's first program for the building of communism is a major contribution of our Party and its Central Committee, headed by the outstanding Marxist-Leninist N. S. Khrushchov, to revolutionary theory. The Program of the CPSU is a document of great ideological and political significance. Development of a concrete scientific plan for the building of communist society is in itself a telling ideological and political blow at the old world. Each step towards the realization of the Program of the CPSU revolutionizes the peoples of the capitalist countries and of the entire non-socialist world, undermines the foundations of imperialism and brings closer the world-wide triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Solving the problem of building communism, immensely important theoretically and politically, the CPSU, guided by the

---

*A report at the June 1964 session of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee and the social sciences institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The theme of the session was "The Struggle of the CPSU for the Purity of Marxism-Leninism". The report is reprinted wih some additions. (**Kommunist,** No. 11, 1964.)

great Marxist-Leninist teaching and proceeding from a scientific analysis of the actual possibilities for the transition to communism, has worked out such methods and ways of its development which fully correspond to the present-day conditions inside the USSR and internationally. By adopting the new Program the CPSU expressed the interests of the Soviet people; it also proceeded from its internationalist duty to the world's working-class and liberation movement. The CPSU understands internationalism as an advance of the USSR towards communism, development of the material, moral and political power of our society and, hence, provision of greater possibilities for curbing imperialism and helping our allies in the joint struggle for peace and socialism throughout the world.

The delegations of the fraternal parties present at the 22nd Congress unanimously approved the Program of our Party. Speaking at the Congress, representatives of these parties described the Program of the CPSU as the Communist Manifesto of our epoch and the building of communism in the USSR, as a heroic effort influencing the entire course of world history. The significance of the Program of the CPSU was also emphasized by the delegation of the Communist Party of China headed by Comrade Chou En-lai. From the rostrum of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU he delivered a greeting from the CPC Central Committee signed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung which said in part: "The new Program which the present Congress of your Party is to adopt puts forward a stupendous plan for the Soviet people's building of communism. We are sure that the Soviet people led by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will score still greater victories in the struggle for the building of communism."

Within less than three years the Chinese leaders performed a complete volte-face. Today they barefacedly declare that the CPSU Program is aimed "against the revolution of peoples" and "for the preservation and restoration of capitalism" *(Jenminjihpao,* September 6, 1963).

Paradoxically, those posing as the "most revolutionary of revolutionaries" have gone to the length of denying the possibility and necessity of building communist society in the Soviet Union. For example, J. Grippa, leader of the Belgian splinter group, expressed as follows his Peking inspirers' tenets at the Higher Party School of the CPC Central Committee on June 10: "In the period when imperialism still exists and socialism has by no means been realized completely, the contention that the building of communism is possible in any single country is not only fallacious theoretically, but is also a demagogical trick. . . ." *(Jenminjihpao,* June 12, 1964). The same attitude was expressed in China by V. G. Wilcox, Secretary of the Communist Party of

New Zealand, who supports the Chinese splitters.

The Chinese leaders indulge in monstrous allegations in their harangues against the possibility of building communism in the USSR and other socialist countries. A case in point is their absurd contention that not only is the building of communism out of the question in the USSR, but a "struggle ought to be waged there against the restoration of capitalism." The Chinese leaders are certainly breaking all records of ideological and political degradation.

Cooped up in the gloomy little world of their sterile formulae which camouflage their insatiable nationalistic ambitions, the Peking leaders have lost all sense of reality. They are slandering our Soviet way of life. They want to convince Soviet people, free masters of their free land, that they are being exploited and that their hopes for a communist future are in vain.

To build or not to build communism is not a moot question for our people: they are building communism and they are giving as much time and energy as they can to this activity. Nor do our people question their attitude to the CPSU: This is their party, the party of the whole people, and they regard its guidance as a guarantee of their victorious advance towards communism. Only political pygmies can expect our people to abandon the pursuit of the aims set by the Program of the CPSU.

The building of communism is the main goal of each Communist Party. This is its motto, its creed. Without this goal there is no Communist Party. Therefore to declare, as the Chinese leaders do, that the Program for building communism in the USSR is an obstacle to the world revolutionary process means to distort Marxism-Leninism and to set at nought the development of the liberation movement of mankind.

TRANSITION FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM—NATURAL OUTCOME OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

The question of the possibility of starting or completing the building of communism in a country which has accomplished the building of socialism involves the fundamental principles of scientific communism.

The enemies of our Party's course of building communism cannot but know that their views can be traced back to Trotskyism which denied the possibility of building socialism in our country. Therefore they are at great pains to dissociate themselves from their "direct antecedent," while being bogged deeper and deeper by Trotskyite ideology.

The enemies of our Program argue that in questioning the possibility of building communism they are guided by entirely different considerations than those which guided Trotskyites when

they denied the possibility of socialism winning in one country. They refer, they say, not to the possibility of building socialism in one country, but to that of building communism as long as imperialism exists. However, the meaning of this concept is the same: it is aimed at ideologically disarming the fighters for communism, for building communist society first in the USSR.

Communist construction in the USSR has two aspects: internal and international. To justify their stand, the enemies of the CPSU Program lay emphasis on its international aspect. Sometimes they declare that "internally, the countries of the socialist camp have everything they need for socialism and communism, but as long as imperialism exists in the world it is impossible to build a communist society." This approach gives them away. To have all the conditions for the building of communism but leave them unused, i.e., arrest progress artificially, would be nothing less than failure by the CPSU to do its duty to the Soviet people and the international working-class movement.

The stand taken by the opponents of our Party's Program betrays their lack of faith in the international and internal possibilities of the socialist countries. Let us consider their main arguments.

Argument No. 1. Communism cannot be built while imperialism exists.

There are no grounds for this contention. The critics do not believe in the creative power of Soviet people and of the socialist system they have built. Communist society can only be created by developing the productive forces on a vast scale so that consumer goods could be produced in abundance and the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" be realized. The significance of the CPSU Program lies precisely in the fact that it provides for the building of the economic basis of communism and regards it as the main economic goal of our Party. Each figure in the Program has been substantiated scientifically.

Argument No. 2. Because of the danger from imperialism, the socialist countries must strengthen the state as much as possible as a "main weapon in the struggle for crushing imperialism on the global scale" and this is an obstacle to the building of communism.

Of course, imperialism, is a danger, and the socialist countries must be vigilant and put much time and effort into their defense. However, this is no insurmountable obstacle to the building of communism. Surely, the advance to communism, accompanied by the growth of economic, political and hence defense power, strengthens the socialist country with respect to the capitalist world. Only dogmatists can ignore the obvious fact that the

development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people has multiplied the power of Soviet society because its social basis has extended.

Finally, argument No. 3. The policy of the building of communism contradicts the principle of internationalism.

Actually, the building of communism aids the revolutionary development in the capitalist countries. Realizing the communist ideals under the leadership of the CPSU, Soviet people demonstrate in practice the advantages of the new society and thus contribute to an increasing extent to the struggle of the international working class for socialism.

The above argument of the opponents of the CPSU Program show that their thinking is permeated with Trotskyism. Far from proving the impossibility of building communism in one country or in several countries while imperialism still exsts, these arguments are a mere rehash of Trotsky's arguments.

The Trostkyites contended that it was impossible to build socialism in one country because, surrounded as it was by capitalism, Russia would inevitably, on account of its economic backwardness, be integrated into the capitalist world system of economy and would succumb to the laws of capitalism. Confusing up internal and international conditions for building socialism, the Trotskyites claimed that the threat of military intervention made the victory of socialism problematic, and that the Russian proletariat would not be able to build socialism without the support of the victorious proletariat of the more advanced countries. The Trotskyites declared that to work for the victory of socialism in one country meant to betray proletarian internationalism and show "national narrow-mindedness" and that the proletarian state must be used as the main tool for the "export of the revolution," i.e., for bringing it to other countries on bayonets.

The point of departure for the opponents of our Program is a revision of Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. They ignore the essential characteristics of the world revolutionary process today.

Not content with challenging the building of communism in our country, the Chinese press has ventured on open revision of Lenin's theory of the building of socialism. An article published in *Jenminjihpao* on July 14, 1964 says the following word for word: "It (the victory of socialism—**B.P.**) can be fully attained in five or ten generations or even in a longer time."

In other words, the Chinese leaders' theory does not merely postulate that socialism cannot triumph all over the world in our epoch: it contends that it cannot triumph in any one country or any group of countries in our epoch. This is again consonant with the stand Trotsky held. He always spoke of the need for "not

a year, nor ten years, nor even twenty years, but for several decades to build complete socialist society." He maintained that the world revolutionary proletariat had much more chances to win power in 10, 20 or 30 years than the Soviet working class to build socialism within the same time.

The Chinese ideologists follow Trotsky's footsteps and perhaps even go a little further. They repeat that even now an overwhelming majority of the world population is prepared for the socialist revolution. At the same time, despite the fact that socialism has been built in the USSR and there has emerged a socialist world system, they declare both at home and abroad that our generation and the next one are not destined to see the realization of socialist ideals.

According to the Chinese press, 200, 300 or more years will be needed to build socialism. Thus like some religious doctrines, the Chinese press promises a good life in the indefinite future. What must the present and future generations in the socialist countries work for if the realization of socialist ideals is postponed for centuries? Obviously, this defeatism can do anything but inspire the fighters for socialism. What is the point of discussing the building of communism if the complete victory of even socialism is impossible in the foreseeable future? It is this theory of "Sinified Marxism," i.e., Maoism, that some are attempting to substitute for Leninism.

This "theory" is calculated to demobilize generations of revolutionaries and spread disbelief in the victory of socialism. This is tantamount to direct rejection of the goals of the Communist movement.

Millions all over the world have been rallying to the banners of socialism, but the Chinese theorists try to persuade them that there is no hope of attaining the final goals of their struggle. Obviously, the prospects the Chinese theorists are advancing cannot inspire the Chinese people either.

The CPC leaders' entire concept is false to the core, for it contradicts both revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice, and completely ignores the most obvious and irrefutable facts of the current historical period.

Neither Marx nor Lenin thought it possible to fix the exact date for the world socialist revolution. They, however, never shifted the accomplishment of this task onto the shoulders of future generations.

After the overthrow of capitalist power Lenin spoke in specific terms about the historical dates for the transition to socialism. Addressing the Third Congress of the Young Communist League in 1920 he said: "The generation which is now about fifty years old cannot expect to see the communist society. This generation

will die out before then. But the generation which is now fifteen years old will see the communist society, and will itself build this society. And it must realize that the whole purpose of its life is to build this society" (*Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 31, p. 274).

The Program of the CPSU is a natural sequel to Lenin's theory on the possibility of building socialism first in one country. This theory was an outstanding factor in the history of the world revolutionary movement. Similarly, the CPSU's conclusion on the possibility of building communism in the USSR is of fundamental significance for the further development of world socialism.

Naturally the solution of this problem differs from that concerning the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country. Socialism is the result of the revolutionary struggle of the wide sections of the population living under capitalism, and prerequisites for socialism usually develop in the framework of capitalism. Victory of communism first in one country or several countries largely depends on the possibilities of socialist society itself, on its ability to attain, while developing *on its own basis* and not on the basis inherited from capitalism, such principles and ideals for which there are no prerequisites whatsoever in bourgeois society.

The question "who will win" — capitalism or socialism — is settled during the building of socialism, in conditions of class struggle assuming quite sharp forms sometimes. The building of communism proceeds in conditions of society's socio-political and ideological unity when the aims pursued by the Communist Party have no class opponents inside the country. The Soviet people were building socialism when imperialism still dominated in the international arena and the danger of restoring capitalism from outside still existed. Transition to communism takes place when the correlation of world forces has changed decisively in favor of socialism.

The possibility of building communism in the USSR has been thoroughly substantiated in the Program of the CPSU and confirmed by the Soviet people's practical activity over the years.

Socialism and communism are not different socio-economic formations, but two phases of the same formation. Between these two phases there is no barrier to be scaled in one leap. Communism grows organically from socialism. To build the material and technical basis of communism, it is necessary to develop adequately the productive forces in the framework of socialist society. To arrive at a single socialist form of ownership, it is necessary to advance both state and cooperative forms of ownership which will merge at a certain stage. To realize the principle of distribution "according to one's needs," it is necessary to realize consistently the principle of distribution "according to one's

work." For the state to wither away, it is necessary to develop the socialist state and ensure it a broader social base, increasing the participation of the working people in administration. In other words, building communism does not mean abandoning socialist principles, but, on the contrary, their consistent realization. The essence of the matter is that *as regards both the economic basis and the superstructure, communism follows and must follow from every step taken to strengthen and develop socialism.*

Immediately after the Great October Revolution of 1917 Lenin said: ". . . when introducing socialist changes we must clearly envisage the aim to which these changes will in the long run lead, namely, the creation of a communist society, which in addition to expropriating the factories, mills, land and means of production and establishing strict accounting and control of production and distribution of products, will realize the principle: 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs'." *(Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. 27, p. 103.) If we arrive at socialism, Lenin emphasized, we shall ultimately arrive at communism.

Thus the building of communism is the next stage in the development of socialist society. It is this dialectics of the transition from the lower phase of communism to its higher phase that the opponents of the CPSU Program ignore. They do not want to be consistent, and having recognized the possibility of building complete socialist society, they do not want to admit the possibility of its development into communist society.

That a country which has built socialism should pass over to the building of communism is an objectively necessary process. For the Soviet people this is an urgent task, for it has been put forward by the requirements inherent in the development of Soviet socialist society as well as the international class struggle against the capitalist world system. To listen to the opponents of the CPSU Program, the progress of Soviet society has to be arrested. What would be the outcome? The development of the productive forces would have to be checked artificially. The advantages of the new social system would remain unused and the forces of socialism be weakened. The foundations of the Soviet people's welfare and the Soviet Union's mission of providing protection and economic support to world socialism would be undermined. Who would stand to gain by this? Only the enemies of socialism.

Naturally, the objective need for the transition from socialism to communism does not mean that this is a spontaneous process. On the contrary, it requires the Party's great effort in the theoretical, political, organizational and educational spheres. All the

creative forces of the people must be drawn upon for this purpose, and this is what the CPSU is doing.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU, the elimination of the consequences of the Stalin cult, and the Soviet Union's economic and political progress enabled our Party to proceed, fully in accordance with the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, to posing the question of building communism in the USSR, i.e., to specifying the concrete ways, forms, methods and rates of the advance and transition to this, higher phase of communism.

Our Party had to substantiate theoretically and ensure practically the program for building communism in three main directions: creation of the material and technical basis of communism, development of new social relations, and communist education of all citizens of the future society. For the first time in history the CPSU has made a comprehensive analysis of the dialectical interdependence of these components of communist society and presented an elaborate description of them in the Program. All this work expresses scientifically the actual processes in our society, the main trends of its development, and the prospects for progress towards communism.

"The main economic task of the Party and the Soviet people is to create the material and technical basis of communism within two decades," the Program of the CPSU states.

There are some who interpret the fact that this task has been termed the main one as "modern economism" because, they say, "economics and not politics has been proclaimed the decisive factor."

The opponents of our Program suggest a standard formula: "politics is a more important factor than economics," regardless of the conditions of place and time. This is an anti-Leninist approach. The critics have heard that at the inception of the CPSU, at the end of the 19th century, there was a trend called "Economism" in the working-class movement in Russia. The trend laid emphasis on the economic rather than the political struggle of the working class and Lenin defeated this trend ideologically. It should be borne in mind, however, that this took place three quarters of a century ago, when the working class was not in power.

In the relationship of economic and political factors Lenin differentiated between the period before the proletariat's advent to power and the period after it. It is just because the working class does not own the means of production and because its main goal is complete economic liberation and elimination of the system of exploitation of man by man that the political task—the working class' advent to power— should be given priority under capitalism. The matter must be viewed in a different light after this task

has been accomplished. In the first variant of the article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" Lenin indicated: ". . . The basis, the essence itself of Soviet power, just as the essence of the transition from capitalist to socialist society, is the fact that political aims have a subordinate place with respect to economic aims." (*Kommunist*, No. 14, 1962, p. 5.)

The opponents of the CPSU Program have invented a casuistic antithesis of politics versus economics, forgetting their dialectical interaction. If a policy has no economic foundation it is doomed to failure. Conversely, no drastic economic changes are possible if not supported by a definite policy. Lenin's propositions that "politics is a concentrated expression of economics" and that "politics must have priority over economics" *(Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 278) demonstrate the *role* of politics as a means of attainment of socio-economic aims. But the *content* of politics is determined by the corresponding stage of development and varies from stage to stage. Under socialism the priority given to economic aims is *also* politics based on Marxist-Leninist teaching and determined by the nature of this system and its development. Neglect of economic problems or an arbitrary handling of them is, in turn, an anti-Leninist, voluntarist and adventurist policy.

The Chinese leaders have furnished striking examples of this kind of politics. It would not be amiss to note that the opponents of the CPSU Program contradict themselves when they expound their "theory" that the building of communism is impossible in the Soviet Union. It is common knowledge that the hotheads in the CPC leadership once intended to skip socialism and leap into communism at one go, in defiance of the economic laws. A decision adopted by the CPC Central Committee on August 29, 1958 stated: "Evidently, the realization of communism in our country is not something remote. We must make a vigorous use of people's communes and through them find a concrete way of transition to communism." In December 1958, a plenary meeting of the CPC Central Committee put forward the slogan: "We must not mark time at the stage of socialism!"

Today the Chinese leaders are attacking the program for building communism in our country which has been developing along the lines of socialism for 47 years, while their supporters suggest that the problem of building communism cannot even be raised until imperialism has been defeated throughout the world.

When setting the aim of building the material and technical basis of communism, the CPSU proceeded not only from general theoretical propositions, but also from a specific analysis of the present stage of the Soviet economy and the world productive forces.

Like the building of socialism, the building of communism i

the USSR takes place in the conditions of a severe struggle against the capitalist world system. A scientific and technical revolution is in progress. We are living in the age of nuclear power, electronics, automation, development of artificial materials with preset properties, the age of exploration of outer space. Automation, mechanization and chemicalization have led to serious changes in the economy of capitalism. We cannot ignore these processes either in theory or in practice. The CPSU had to chart the general course of development for the Soviet Union's productive forces, and in particular their technical progress, taking into account the processes at work in the capitalist countries. The Program of the CPSU solved this first priority problem and oriented Soviet society on attaining the highest technical standard and higher indices in all sections of the economy.

The Program of the CPSU presents a concrete scientific plan for overall electrification, chemicalization, integrated mechanization in industry, mining, agriculture, contruction, transport, and municipal services, as well as large-scale automation of production. The figures and time-limts specified in this plan are universally known. The pseudo-theorists who advance the thesis on the impossibility of building communism in the USSR should have first tried to prove that either this plan is unfeasible or that its realization would not mean an advance towards communism. But this they do not venture to do.

Development of productive forces is not a purely quantitative growth or simply a technical process of production; it is a social process. Productive forces cannot develop outside a certain social framework. They give rise to new processes in social and political life. Under the conditions of the USSR this means an advance towards communism. Such is the objective law of development. It is this solely scientific Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the laws of social development that guided the CPSU in defining the building of the material and technical basis of communism as the main economic task. This solution of thc problem is a scientifically substantiated expression of the objectively mature conditions and needs of the socio-economic development of the USSR.

The Chinese ideologists fanatically repeat (see, for example, *Jenminjiphao* of July 14) that throughout the existence of socialist society the "class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is in progress, the question 'who will win' in the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads is still open, and the danger of capitalist restoration exists." They suggest that "in socialist society class contradiction persists, class struggle does not disappear even after the complete socialist transformation of ownership of the means of production." In other words: owner-

ship can be transformed into socialist ownership but the bourgeoisie as a class remains and even revives.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the building of socialism means the disappearance of exploiting classes and hence the creation of a society in which there are neither exploiting nor exploited classes. The Chinese ideologists have put forward another concept, contradicting Marxism-Leninsm and postulating the perpetuation of antagonistic classes for centuries after the capitalist system has been overthrown.

The Peking theorists fail to notice how they get entangled in their own formulae. If the question "who will win" remains open under socialism, then what is the difference between the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and the period of victorious and fully developed socialist society growing into communist society? If the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat continues *throughout the period* of socialist society, then any premise for the *complete* victory of socialism is ruled out. For the complete victory of socialism implies the complete disappearance of exploiting classes. And if the *completion* of the the socialist transformation of ownership of the means of production does not lead to the disappearance of the bourgeoisie as a class, how in general can the bourgeoisie be made to disappear.

To prove that the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is still in progress in Soviet society, the Peking theorists draw on the reports of criminal cases. More than that. They deliberately misrepresent the facts reported by the Soviet press about the struggle waged by Party organizations, state institutions and all working people against embezzlers and profiteers, giving the impression that the CPSU supports the "new bourgeois elements." The dust and refuse still to be found in some nooks of our new social edifice are thus passed off as its foundation. Truly those who speculate in politics are worse than the black market speculators!

It is well known that capitalist survivals in the minds of men persist longer than capitalist survivals in economic life. The classics of Marxism-Leninism predicted this. Relying on nation-wide support, the CPSU and the Soviet Government are fighting relentlessly these survivals of capitalism, exposing money-grubbers and embezzlers, and purifying our society from scum and filth. This open and uncompromising struggle testifies to the soundness and strength of our system.

Following the victory of socialism the Soviet people and their Communist Party faced the problem: How should the social system be further developed? Perhaps, production and other social relations should be frozen and maintained in the shape they took after the victory of socialism? That would have meant preserva-

tion of two separate forms of socialist ownership, and of essential differences between the state and cooperative sections of production, between workers and farmers, between urban and rural localities, between mental and manual labor. A certain economic inequality still exists under socialism. Should this inequality be conserved and no attempt made to overcome it as suitable objective conditions arise? It is sufficient to raise this problem to see how absurd this "solution" is. Social relations must advance as productive forces develop. This development itself leads to the gradual elimination of social and economic differences between workers and farmers as well as all other differences and inequalities. The law on pensions and grants to members of collective farms, adopted at the last session of the Supreme Soviet, provides conclusive evidence of gradual elimination of the differences between workers and collective farmers.

The Chinese leaders assert that in the USSR there is an increasing "difference in incomes between an extremely insignificant section on the one hand, and the workers, peasants and rank-and-file intelligentsia, on the other." These assertions are refuted, perhaps more forcefully than they would be by many theoretical arguments, by the fact that their publication in Peking coincided with the session of of the Supreme Soviet which decided to raise wages and salaries of more than 18 million persons, or one-fourth of the country's factory and office employees, by 21 percent on the average. To this should be added the earlier measures as a result of which the average wages and salaries in the key branches of the national economy increased by 13 to 25 percent in the last five years. As N.S. Khrushchov noted in his report at the session, the policy of raising wages and salaries, and above all those of the lower income brackets, is being steadily pursued in our country in order to narrow the gap in remuneration for different sections of employees.

"The adopted trend in raising wages and salaries is in full accord with our socialist system," said N. S. Khrushchov, "As the economy develops, national wealth grows and the differences in skills and efficiencies decrease, the difference in the pay of high- and comparatively low-paid categories of working people will steadily decrease. Gradually, this difference will become more and more insignificant. This follows from the Marxist-Leninist teaching and from the targets which the Party Program has set for the improvement of the distribution of material values."

In the matter of the distribution of material values the Chinese ideologists display the same ignorance of the ABC of scientific communism as on the issues of development of production and class relations in socialist society. For example, they are against the principle of material incentives, regarding it as a principle

inherent in capitalist relations alone. May 25, the magazine *Hungchi* again came out against this Leninist principle: "If the proletarian revolutionary spirit has been lost, if personal material well-being and high wages are the only stimuli; if the bourgeois concepts of so-called 'liberty, equality, fraternity, and humanism' are made much of, and with their aid the proletarian ideology is corrupted and the popular masses paralyzed, socialism cannot indeed be built and the building of communism is out of the question altogether."

Lenin taught us to build a new society so that the revolutionary enthusiasm of its builders could be supported by consistent adherence to the principle of material incentives, while the Chinese press is opposing socialist mentality to economic stimulation. The authors of these articles do not want to understand that under socialism payment according to the quality and quantity of labor is a concrete manifestation of the principle of material incentives, and that this method of distribution is necessary not only economically, but also educationally, for it links up social and personal interests, fosters a new attitude toward labor among the workers, peasants and office employees, and brings home to them the advantages of the socialist system.

Soviet experience has demonstrated the correctness of Lenin's propositions. In our country workers and peasants have been displaying enthusiasm in labor, but it would have been impossible to make the vast progress that has been made in the economy if only ethical impulses had been draw upon. What a boon for imperialist propaganda had the living standards in the countries building socialism and communism been frozen. How then could the Communists in the capitalist countries, including the Asian countries, have called on the working people to fight for a better life?

From the writings of the opponents of the CPSU Program it follows that our Party has no right to set the task of building communism, the attainment of which implies the improvement of the Soviet people's welfare, at a time when millions of people in the world have a very low living standard. If these views are carried to their logical end, the conclusion would be that internationalism means halting the advance to communism, slowing down the growth of popular consumption in the USSR and transferring the surplus product obtained as a result of growth of labor productivity to those who have entered upon the path of socialism later or have not yet been freed from capitalist oppression.

The petty-bourgeois nature of the position adopted by the opponents of the CPSU Program could hardly be more strikingly revealed. This is not proletarian internationalism, but aggressive equalization, the philosophy of a petty proprietor based on the

principle: "I have not yet got what you have, give it to me, even if it undermines the common cause." Describing this feature of the petty proprietor, Lenin wrote: " . . . He is willing enough to finish off the bourgeoisie — but not as a socialist who would, having broken the resistance of the bourgeoisie, begins the building of the socialist economy on the principles of firm labor discipline, in the framework of a rigorous organization and with proper control and account. His aim is to get as much for himself as possible, and to use the fruits of the victory for himself and his own purposes, sharing no interests of the state or the interests of the class of working people as a whole." (*Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 261-262.)

If we had taken the Chinese theorists' advice and had not embarked on the building of communism in the USSR, but had instead begun to divide what we have, we would have fettered the internal potential in the countries of socialism and in the countries which have liberated themselves from colonialism, and would have arrested the general development of the socialist world system as well as of the anti-imperialist states. All this would have benefited imperialism alone.

The building of socialism is the creative work of each country's population. Socialism cannot be introduced from outside at the expense of the labor of the nations which have entered upon the path of socialism earlier, just as it cannot be brought from outside by bayonets. In each country there is only one highway leading to the triumph of socialism, and this is the constructive labors of its working people and their determination to build socialism by their own labor and struggle. The experience and assistance of the first socialist countries can only act as a powerful accelerator in the development of socialist construction.

At its forums the international Communist movement has expressed unambiguously its opinion on the main principles of the building of socialism and communism and the combination of the international and national tasks of the Communist parties of the socialist countries. Those attacking the Program of the CPSU pose as guardians of the principles of the Declaration and Statement, but are actually revising their clear propositions. As the Statement indicates:

"In developing industrial and agricultural production in their countries at a high rate in keeping with the possibilities they have, the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries consider it their internationalist duty to make full use of all the advantages of the socialist system and the international resources of every country to carry out, by joint effort and as speedily as possible, the historic task of surpassing the capitalist world system in overall industrial and agricultural production

and then outstrip the economically most developed capitalist countries in *per capita* output and in the standard of living." To carry out this task, "strict observance of the Leninist principles of providing material incentives and moral stimuli to work for the good of society" is necessary, the statement point out.

This international document of Communists of all countries indicates that the material basis for the transition of socialist countries to communism implies a high level of production "without which it is impossible to provide the abundance of consumer goods required by a communist society." The Statement emphasizes that "on this basis it is necessary to develop communist social relations, vigorously promote the political consciousness of the people and educate the members of the new, communist society."

The 1960 Meeting defined the international significance of the building of communism. "In blazing the trail to communism, the peoples of the socialist countries are creating the prototype of a new society for all mankind. The working people of the capitalist world are following the constructive efforts of the builders of socialism and communism with keen interest. This makes the Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries accountable to the international working-class movement for the successful building of socialism and communism."

The program for the building of a communist society in the USSR was drawn up in line with these propositions of the international Communist movement. The Peking leaders and their supporters are breaking with the conclusions and assessments made at the world Communist forums. Speaking at the Party School of the Kwantung Provincial Committee of the CPC, Secretary General of the National Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand V. Wilcox went to the length of slandering our people's selfless work, alleging that the CPSU intends to "move to communism on the shoulders of the socialist world, of the peoples and Communist parties of other countries." (*Jenminjiphao*, March 17, 1964.)

Such pronouncements are rarely met with even among the avowed anti-Communists and dyed-in-the-wool revisionists. A worse insult to our people and our Party can hardly be imagined.

We have no doubt that these utterances reflect neither the thought nor the feelings of the class-conscious workers in New Zealand who know very well how selflessly our people have been supporting all the revolutionary forces of today.

The opponents of our Program are coming out against both the principle of material incentives and the goal of the CPSU to carry out the principle of distribution "according to one's needs." All this is tied up into a whole system of petty-bourgeois conceptions of socialism and communism. Marx and Engels ridiculed as

grotesque the description of socialism according to which everyone would strive to produce for society as much as he can and consume as little as possible. They wrote in this connection: "What a splendid example of regimented communism! You have everything here: common dining rooms and common bedrooms, evaluators and offices prescribing education, production, consumption —in short, all social activity . . ." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 18, p. 114). "Regimented Communism:" how aptly this describes the "left-wing" revisionists of today!

Under socialism consumption also stimulates the development of production. To give up the prospect of a gradual transition to the communist principle of distribution and consumption would under socialism mean above all to retard the development of productive forces, which would weaken the economic power of the Soviet Union and, indeed, of the entire socialist system. Without growing consumption it is impossible to ensure a rapid growth of production and its steady improvement — it is impossible to ensure the all-round development of the main productive force: man. This does not mean that within a matter of days it will be possible to declare the "introduction" of the principle of distribution "according to one's needs."

The CPSU handles this problem in its Program and practical activity with all the seriousness it deserves. The Program of the CPSU is to be fulfilled in 20 years, i.e., in a time by the end of which our society will "come close" to the realization of this principle. The Program of the CPSU indicates that the "construction of communist society will be fully completed in the subsequent period." Hence the introduction of the communist principle: "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" is envisaged in the Soviet Union for a period beyond these 20 years. Of course, the Soviet people would welcome an earlier attainment of this aim.

The Chinese press and its echoes assert that the Soviet people's determination to surpass the United States of America in *per capita* production may lead to our country's bourgeois degeneration. The enemies of the CPSU Program are obviously ignoring or falsifying the constructive ideas of the Program about the development of the economic basis of communism, and the corresponding system of Communist production and distribution relations. They ignore Lenin's thesis that the new system triumphs over the old one owing to a more vigorous development of productive forces.

The CPSU Program offers a clear-cut answers as to the basis on which the welfare of society and of each member of society will be improved. It indicates that Soviet people's living standards will rise not only due to a greater range of the good things

of life in personal use and greater remuneration for work, but also largely due to the growth of public funds. This form of distribution characteristic of communism will ensure the most sensible, rational and complete satisfaction of people's material and spiritual needs. Thus the Program provides a scientifically sound solution of the problem of a correct combination of social and personal interests.

Finally, the enemies of the Program oppose the third general trend of the struggle for communism: in the sphere of the political and ideological superstructure. They attack the creative and scientific propositions about the state of the whole people and the Party of the whole people. Of course, what really matters here is, not the pseudotheoretical sophistry of these attacks, but the workings behind them.

The Chinese leaders are against the Leninist methods of building socialism and communism and against the Leninist attitude to the masses. Challenging the course set forth in the CPSU Program for the development of socialist democracy and the transformation of socialist statehood into communist self-government, the Chinese theorists are at great pains to impose upon our country and the other socialist countries their own practice of giving orders to the masses, their attitude to the population as to a "clean sheet of paper" on which any "pattern" can be traced. It is well known what this means in practice. At the time of the establishment of "backyard metallurgy" in China during the "big leap" period from 60 to 70 million persons were mobilized in towns and villages. Members of the "people's communes" were made to live in barracks and formed into platoons, battalions and regiments. After the 9th "Plenary" Meeting of the CPC Central Committee in January 1961 over 20 million persons were forced to re-settle from towns to villages as a result of the "adjustment" of the "big leap" policy. These are the sort of "patterns" that are traced by ruling the masses by command.

Here the Chinese leaders see eye to eye with Trotsky. This is, for example, what he said in 1920: "The working masses . . . should be transferred from place to place, commissioned and ordered just like soldiers." Trotsky declared the opinion that forced labor is unproductive to be an "old bourgeois axiom which has become a prejudice."

The Program and practical activity of the Party are effective because each step in the development towards communism weakens and undermines the objective factors conducive to preserving or encouraging private-ownership mentality. On the basis of its Program the CPSU has intensified the struggle against embezzlers, profiteers, etc. Large-scale work is in progress to educate all Soviet people in the communist ethical principles put forward in

the Program. This historically vital process has been proceeding quite successfully.

Let us turn to the international aspect of the problem under consideration. Can communism be built in one country or a group of advanced socialist countries or in all socialist countries with capitalist countries still existing? Does it follow from the nature of communism that it cannot triumph in one country or a group of countries, but can only triumph all over the world at once, and that the existence of the imperialist system along with the system of socialism rules out the transition of the socialist countries form socialism to communism?

It is quite true that Marxist-Leninist theory regards communism as a social system which will comprise all continents, all countries, all nations without exception. But from this it does not follow that the worldwide triumph of communism, the establishment of the completely developed communist mode of production on a worldwide scale cannot or must not be preceded by the gradual establishment of this mode of production in particular countries in particular parts of the world. On the contrary: owing to the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism, the time of advent of the socialist revolution differs from country to country and hence the building of socialist society is completed at different times as well. As a result, some countries proceed to the building of communism earlier, others somewhat later.

The development of the socialist countries in the world system of socialism and the utilization of the basic laws and advantages of this system enable them to reduce the period of building socialism and open up before them the prospect for a more or less simultaneous transition to communism in the same historical epoch.

The operation of the law bringing the socio-economic levels of development of socialist countries closer together by no means hampers the development of those countries which are currently at a higher level. The evening-out process tends to the highest level and not to the average or lowest level. Arresting the economic development of some countries in order to wait until others catch up with them would mean missing the possibilities latent in each socialist country for ensuring the general advance and hence hampering the development of the world system of socialism and causing its general stagnation.

Another point is also noteworthy: the rate and level of development of a country largely depend on the correctness of the policy adopted. The outcome of the Chinese leaders' neglect of the economic laws of socialism is known to everybody. As a result of the "big leap" and "people's communes" policy China was

hurled back to the level attained by the time the "line of the three banners" was proclaimed and indeed many achievements in the building of socialism in vidence before 1958 were impaired or reduced to nought.

Violent disproportions became evident in the Chinese industry and especially a grave lag of coal mining and mining in general, wood-working and chemicals. The departure from the socialist methods of industrial management and violation of the proper standards of production and technology everywhere disrupted economic life and lowered the technical, economic and qualitative indicators of the performance of industrial enterprises.

The "experiments" made during the "big leap" sharply slowed down the rate of building of socialism in China and nullified the earlier progress made in many branches of the national economy. This policy damaged the entire socialist system

Obviously, the general progress of the world system of socialism requires that each socialist country show a regular optimum rate of development and thus share to the best advantage in the general economic advance of the system as a whole, as its economic potential increases. From this it follows that the building of communism is an objective necessity for the socialist countries which had achieved socialism earlier than the others.

There is no doubt that the existence of imperialist countries and hence antagonistic contradictions between the system of socialism and that of capitalism will inevitably demand expending a considerable part of the resources of the socialist countries to curb imperialism's aggressive leanings. This may, of course, affect the pace of building communism. It is likewise obvious that capitalism will keep trying to infiltrate the socialist countries, and the struggle against these pernicious influences will also call for additional effort. However, all this does not rule out the possibility either of building communism or of carrying it to successful completion.

To deny this possibility means to doubt that socialism can overcome the difficulties presented by the existence of imperialism in a certain part of the world, to ignore the fact that socialism has become a decisive factor of social development, and to disregard the prospects of progress for the entire world system of socialism.

A number of socialist countries have set themselves the programmatic task of completing the building of socialist society. Before long they will be facing the same problems as those confronting our country today. Should they curb their development, to suit the pseudo-revolutionary neo-Trotskyite doctrines, until the world revolution has triumphed? Certainly not!

The building of socialism and communism requires that each socialist country combine its efforts to strengthen and develop its national economy with efforts to consolidate and extend economic cooperation within the framework of the entire socialist community. As the Program of our Party states, the CPSU "regards communist construction in the Soviet Union as a component of the building of communist society by the peoples of the entire socialist world system" and will do everything in its power "to support all the peoples of the socialist community in the construction of socialism and communism." The Soviet Union verifies by its own experience the correctness of unexplored paths of social development, discloses difficulties, finds way and means of surmounting them, tests the forms and methods of building communism and shows to the peoples of other socialist countries their bright future.

At the same time, the Soviet people working to build communism have the support of the other revolutionary forces of today. And if we are now able to set out sights on building the communist society in the USSR, this is thanks not only to the victories scored by our own people, but also to the changes which have taken place on the international scene, and to the liberation struggle of all nations.

The opponents of the CPSU Program stubbornly refuse to see these important international changes and they reduce the problem of international factors to the existence of imperialism alone. They claim that communism cannot be built "under the present conditions, in a world in which imperialism exists." Why? Their answer is: since peace is the main prerequisite for building the communist society and since both peace and war are possible today, the building of communism is out of the question. In other words, the Chinese leaders rule out the alternative of peace. The whole concept of the Chinese splitters shows that they do not believe either in the possibility of strengthening peace or in the possibility of building communism.

From the pronouncements of the authors of the defeatist theory of "two possibilities," it is clear that they regard the fight for peace and the building of communist society in the USSR as two isolated processes. They fail to understand the simple truth that the realization of the program for the building of communism is a contribution to peace and international security, and that progress in building communism is a major guarantee of the growth of the might of the socialist country, its international strength and prestige, as well as its influence on the course of international events in the interests of peace and socialism.

The missile-nuclear shield protecting the peaceful labor of the

peoples of the socialist countries is a direct result of the expansion of the material and technical base of socialism. To stop the advance of the productive forces of the USSR in the building of the communist society means to weaken the defense potential of the socialist camp. One can rant about combating U.S. imperialism, but if Soviet rockets, tanks, planes, thermonuclear and other modern weapons are allowed to be inferior to those controlled by the imperialists, the cause of socialism and peace will suffer. *The building of communism in the USSR is the Soviet people's decisive contribution to the struggle against imperialism and for the prevention of world war.*

The Program of the CPSU and its policy take full account of the fact that the soil f or aggressive wars in the modern world exists inasmuch as imperialism still exists. However, the CPSU is firmly convinced that today there are no forces strong enough to crush the socialist camp. If the imperialist maniacs should venture to unleash a war against the USSR they will be destroyed in its flames. But a war would do grievous harm to the socialist camp as well.

The Program of the CPSU has proclaimed for all the world to hear: " . . . since the danger of war coming from the imperialist camp persists, and since complete and general disarmament has not been achieved, the CPSU considers it necessary to maintain the defensive power of the Soviet state and the combat preparedness of its Armed Forces at a level ensuring the decisive and complete defeat of any enemy who dares to encroach upon the Soviet Union."

By fulfilling the Program of the CPSU, the Soviet people are strengthening the nuclear shield protecting the entire socialist camp. We are forced to divert considerable material resources for defense, to allocate a part of material production for this purpose, and to maintain permanent armed forces. The Soviet Union shoulders the main burden of protecting the world system of socialism. This is a manifestation of proletarian internationalism in practice.

By working vigorously for peace and raising the prestige of socialism, the Soviet Union, the socialist countries are enhancing its appeal among broad sections of the population in the capitalist countries. The struggle for peace is one of the ways of curbing militarism, of fighting against the export of counter-revolution, and a powerful means of weakening the positions of the bellicose circles of monopoly capital. At the same time the struggle for peace furnishes favorable conditions for the building of socialism in all countries of the socialist community and for the development of the countries that have liberated themselves for colonialism along the road of social progress.

BUILDING OF COMMUNISM AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The policy mapped out by the CPSU Program, the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings and the policy put forward by the Chinese pseudo-theorists clash on another major issue of our time: the development of the world revolutionary movement.

The policy of the international Communist movement is aimed at:

—Building communism in the USSR and socialism in the other socialist countries;

—developing the class struggle in the capitalist countries and building up a political army of socialist revolution so that the working class and the popular masses in the various countries might rise to join the revolutionary struggle for socialism as the prerequisities and conditions for this mature in these countries;

—eliminating the remnants of the colonial system, helping the national-liberation revolutions to win, and contributing in every way to the advance of the national states along the road of social progress;

—fighting resolutely against the designs of the aggressive imperialist circles to start a thermonuclear world war, and working vigorously for the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The Chinese leaders' policy of drawing Communist parties into adventurism has nothing in common with the development of the world revolutionary movement and pursues narrow nationalistic and hegemonistic aims. The limited stock-in-trade of the Chinese pseudo-theorists include three tunes on which they are constantly harping: "the absolute majority of the world's population, 90 percent of it, is ripe for revolution;" it is necessary to start armed uprising everywhere; it is necessary to prompt revolutions from outside by raising international tensions even at the risk of precipitating world war. These ultra-revolutionary slogans merely conceal the real policy and practices of the Chinese theorists which are aimed at dividing all revolutionary forces, fanning nationalist prejudices and entering into unprincipled alliances with forces alien or even inimical to socalism. This policy is essentially anti-revolutionary and all the more dangerous for being clothed in revolutionary phraseology. The advocates of this policy brush aside one important fact directly connected with the operation of the law of uneven capitalist development, namely that socialist revolutions mature and triumph at different times in different countries. Thus, the world socialist revolution is regarded, contrary to Lenin, not as an epoch of movement differing in time and heterogenous in social content, but as a single, simultaneous

process. Obviously, this does not correspond to the actual course of the developing world revolution.

Lenin's theory of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, and its corollary concerning different countries passing to socialism at different times, were epoch-making factors in the history of the working-class movement; they gave rise to a whole system of strategic and tactical propositions in the theory of the socialist revolution, and posed many cardinal questions which could not have arisen in Marx' and Engels' time. It fell to Lenin to answer these questions.

Let us take some of the more important of these questions:

The first question that arose was: what is the interdependence between the building of socialism in one country and the revolutionary process in other countries? Lenin answered that the internationalist duty of the working class of the world's first socialist country was to do all in its power in its own country to support the revolution in other countries, and that it is precisely by its *economic policy* that it exercises its main influence on the development of the world revolution. According to Lenin, the sum and substance of this economic policy is, on the domestic plane, to build socialism, and internationally, to *overtake and outstrip the economically most developed capitalist countries.* Naturally, this approach gave rise to a new form of internationalist aid from the victorious working class to the proletariat of the capitalist countris, viz., the revolutionizing force of the example of the first socialist country in the world.

Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution led to the question: on what basis should the state relations between the socialist country and the capitalist country rest? Answering this question, Lenin put forward the principles of *peaceful coexistence* of countries with differing social systems.

The changes that have taken place in international life, the complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR, the establishment of a world system of socialist states, the disintegration of the colonial empires of imperialism, the development and successes of the working-class movement in the imperialist countries, and the advent of thermonuclear weapons posed new questions and tied them up with the vital issues of the international working-class movement today.

Modern Marxist-Leninist thought had to answer the following questions:

—Can communism be built first in one country of victorious socialism when imperialism still dominates in part of the world?

—What is, specifically, the international duty of the countries completing the building of socialism?

—How are the problems of the economic competition between

socialism and capitalism modified and shaped under the new conditions?

—What are the ways of intensifying the revolutionary influence of the socialist countries' example on the class struggle in the capitalist countries?

—On what principles must the relations with the countries liberating themselves from colonial oppression be based?

—Is it possible to prevent world war, furthermore, to create conditions for banishing war from the life of society for the entire period preceding the complete victory of communism on earth?

When answering these questions, the world Communist movement drew on Lenin's theory of the world revolutionary movement, applying it creatively to the conditions of the contemproary epoch.

As indicated above, Lenin's theory on the possibility of socialism winning at first in one country led to the posing and solution of a whole series of other cardinal problems. The possibility of communism being built by the countries of victorious socialism is, correspondingly, the pivotal question in the contemporary theory of revolutionary development.

What is the connection between the building of communism and the world revolutionary movement? Speaking in general terms, the building of communism in the USSR, as the supreme manifestation of proletarian internationalism, strengthens the revolutionary movement throughout the world, increases the numbers of fighters for socialism in the capitalist countries and the countries that have liberated themselves from colonialism, and hastens the maturing of the revolutionary situation in these countries. Thus, the building of communism in the USSR is a major part of the development of the world revolutionary movement and of the struggle for the victory of socialism throughout the world.

On the other hand, the unflagging struggle waged by our comrades abroad is of great help in the building of communism in the USSR. The revolutionary activity of Marxist-Leninists of all countries weakens the imperialist forces, frustrates their subversive and anti-Soviet designs and contributes to the spread of sympathy among working people everywhere for the first country of socialism. Soviet Communists highly appreciate and carefully study the contribution made by Marxist-Leninists of other countries of the theory of scientific communism. Based on the versatile experience of their struggle, this contribution enriches our knowledge of the ways, forms and methods of the working people's struggle for the victory of socialism in the various countries.

The CPSU believes that each revolutionary contingent holds a place of its own in the general anti-imperialist front. The CPSU sees it as its duty to increase at a cumulative rate the preponder-

ance of forces in international life in favor of socialism and use this preponderance for the benefit of the revolutionary liberation movements.

Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that the world historic power of the international working class lies in its numerical strength, its organization and unity, and its class consciousness. This was always true and it holds good today. Moreover, the advent to power of any detachment of the international proletariat signifies a qualitative growth in the aggregate force of the world working-class movement. The conquest of power by the working class ushers in a new stage in its organization, consciousness and association with all the working people and exploited masses. Once in power, the working class can transform the entire economy of its country along socialist lines and advance the productive forces. As a result, a new powerful factor is added to such factors as the numerical strength, organization and class consciousness of the proletariat: the material might of the socialist state.

The Soviet Union accounts for more than half of the industrial potential of the socialist camp and a decisive part of its military power. A great responsibility devolves on our Party, and it meets its international obligations with honour.

The Chinese press is going all-out to slander the CPSU and belittle the international role of the Soviet Union. This has logically led to the Chinese press denying the role and significance of the world system of socialism in the world revolutionary movement, for it is a well-known fact that the USSR is the strongest country of the socialist camp.

The Moscow Declaration of 1957 pointed out that today world social development is determined by the course and outcome of the competition between the two systems. Its main sphere is that of economic activity, for it is in this sphere that the material preponderance of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism comes into play.

The enemies of the CPSU program have gone to the length of declaring that the goal it sets the Soviet people of supressing the most developed capitalist country, the USA, in *per capita* production amounts to nothing more or less than "discrediting socialism and communism," that the advantages of socialism have already been proven, and that the economic competition is pointless. However, quite recently the Chinese leaders took a solemn pledge to overtake and outstrip Great Britain within a short time, while the Soviet Union is overtaking the United States. True, they have not required to this pledge since their "big leaps" which wrought such serious damage to the country's economy.

The economic competition of the two systems passes through

several stages. First, the working class in power proves in practice and not only in theory that it is perfectly capable of running the ceremony without the bourgeoisie and against it. In this way it demonstrates that the new form of ownership is historically justified, viable and effective. This is the first great victory in the economic competition of the two systems. Then the new social system demonstrates its superiority over capitalism by showing a higher rate of economic development, thus proving that socialism ensure greater scope for the development of the productive forces that it is the more dynamic social system and that, the initial levels of material production being equal, it has more to offer the people. This is another major victory for the socialist countries in the economic competition with capitalism. However, the economic competition cannot halt at this stage. Lenin pointed out that a higher productivity of labor compared with campitalism is the main factor for the victory of the new socialist system. To overtake and outstrip the advanced capitalist countries in *per capita* output is a revolutionary task of first-rate importance. The Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries are equal to this task today.

In the economic competition of the two systems the socialist countries do not, of course, face identical problems. Those who embarked on the path of socialism later and inherited a more backward economy face different problems than those who started socialist development earlier and have a more developed economy.

The fact that the economic competition is between two world social systems and not between one socialist country and the capitalist world is of immense importance. Of course, the No. 1 task is to achieve absolute superiority in production over the capitalist world system. This is the common concern of all the socialist countries. Still, the major part of this task is shouldered by the Soviet Union. Hence, the CPSU Program in charting the course of communist construction proceeds from the proposition that the socialist system will win the economic competition, this revealing the international class character of this plan.

Economic competition is an objective law stemming from the very fact of the existence of the two systems. This law cannot be replaced. It will operate regardless of anyone's will or wish. However, any attempt to ignore this law can only damage the cause of socialism and the world revolutionary process.

The economic competition of the two systems is a factor of the influence of socialism on the processes at work in the capitalist world, including the development of class struggle.

How does this factor operate?

Formerly, before the socialist revolutions, the defects and contradictions in the bourgeois system were the only objective factors

revolutionizing the masses. Today cardinally new and powerful factors have come into play: growth of the economic and political might of socialism and of the revolutionary force of the socialist countries' positive example. The example of the socialist countries is exercising an increasing influence on the minds of the people over the world.

However, the socialist countries will exercise an even greater influence on the revolutionary process when they have surpassed capitalism in *per capita* industrial output and demonstrated to the working class of even the most developed capitalist countries that socialism means an incomparably better life in every respect. Thus accomplishment of the task to overtake and outstript the most developed capitalist countries in *per capita* output is bound to accelerate revolutionary processes in the citadels of imperialism.

Economic competition between the two systems becomes especially important in connection with the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism. The many countries that have won political independence have to decide what path of development to follow. This depends of course primarily on the relation of class forces inside the countries concerned. But who will deny that it also largely depends on such a form of the international class struggle as economic competition between the two systems? It is through economic competition that socialism has engaged capitalism in a battle being fought that is on its own ground to a certain extent.

The emergent nations are eager to learn from the experience of the more developed countries. Socialist ideas are spreading even where there is no developed working-class movement; nationalized ownership is being established in economically backward countries, economic planning is being introduced, cooperatives are being developed, etc. Would all this have been competition with capitalism?

The Soviet people who have had their share of difficulties and hardships, are showing a high standard of internationalism and fraternal solidarity towards the countries that have recently won their independence, are giving them part of the wealth accumulated by their own labor. The attempts by the Chinese press to slander and belittle the significance of Soviet economic aid is an insult to our country's working people. Under the pretext that there still are countries with a lower level of economic development the aiders and abettors of the Chinese press would want to deprive our people of the right to build communism. They do not want to accept the fact that the more rapid a socialist country's progress the greater its possibilities for assistance, including economic assistance, to other nations. Surely, twenty years ago the Soviet Union could not have helped the UAR in the building of the

Aswan Dam, or India in the construction of the Bhilai iron and steel works. Nor could it have helped Cuba, Algeria and many other countries it is helping today. The character and scale of the Soviet Union's economic aid to the newly emergent countries depend on its basic economic and technological development.

It is a well-known fact that in no country can revolution triumph without the development of the class struggle of the proletariat and the working people. Today, however, the class struggle in any given country is linked, as never before, with the correlation of forces on the world arena. Cuba and Algeria provide the latest examples in this respect. Could the socialist revolution in Cuba and the national-liberation revolution in Algeria have been victorious without the struggle of the people of these countries? Hardly. No one except the Cubans themselves could have carried out the heroic struggle against the home and U.S. reactionaries. No one except the Algerians themselves could have fought for their freedom and steered their country along the road of radical social reforms. But it is impossible to conceive of the development of Cuba or Algeria in their present form without the existence of the Soviet Union and the socialist world system, without support from the socialist countries and the international working class.

The might of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries influences the development of the world revolutionary movement if only by preventing the export of counter-revolution. No one can deny that the Soviet Union aided effectively the struggle of the working class and all working people for the establishment of socialism in the People's Democracies, including China. The most outstanding leaders of the contemporary liberation movement of all continents refer to the Soviet Union's assistance with gratitude and admiration.

The Chinese propagandists and their supporters allege that our Party is "restraining" revolutionary movement abroad, that it proposes "temporizing" until complete victory is achieved in the economic competition of the two systems. This is a deliberate distortion of the CPSU's stand.

On the contrary, we have no intention of "temporizing" until socialism triumphs throughout the world; we believe it to be our duty to move towards communism, for we realize that this accelerates the world revolutionary process. We believe that the growth of revolutionary movement abroad, far from hampering the building of communism in the USSR, changes favorably the international balance of forces and hence furthers the cause of peace and our people's creative labor. But we see what is behind the words "restraining" and "temporizing" used by the Chinese leaders to camouflage their policy of "spurring" revolution form

outside. This is not Marxism but adventurism, pure and simple.

The Russian Narodniks also once posed as "impatient revolutionaries." One of them, Pyotr Tkachev, wrote that a genuine revolutionary "recognizes the people to be always ready for revolution," that "we cannot and will not wait" and that a genuine revolutionary "has the right to call the people to revolution at any time." This is how Engels answered him:

"We in the European West would put an end to all this childishness by simply answering: if your people are ready for revolution at any time . . . and if you cannot possibly wait any longer why are you bothering us with your chatter and why the dickens don't you get down to business?" (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. 18, p. 524.)

The Chinese leaders are aggravating the errors of the Blanqui-type Narodnik by taking upon themselves to judge of the readiness of the working class of different capitalist countries for revolution at any moment, without knowing either the situation in the countries concerned or the opinion of the working class and its communist vanguard who are to accomplish this revolution.

The question of revolution in a country just as the question of the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism is not decided either in Moscow or Peking. It is decided by the working class and working people of the country concerned; no one from outside can push them towards revolution or push them off the path of revolutionary struggle.

The "Left-wing" theorists' stand is especially harmful today since the vast mass of the peasantry of the East have entered the arena of world history. They are being drawn into the great process of settling accounts with imperialism and home reactionaries. They are breaking with the ideology of slavery, meekness and obedience, and this is a great purifying process. But their political aim is far from clear to them as yet and sometimes they express their protest against age-long backwardness, economic inequalities and vestiges of colonialism in the impatient urge of solve their own and indeed world problems at one stroke. Against this background one of the worst crimes of the Chinese press and its yes-men is their attempt to wrest the anti-imperialist peasant masses of the East from their alliance with the socialist world system and the Soviet Union and set these powerful forces against one another.

The history of our Party and of world communism shows that florid petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionism conceals nothing but liquidation with respect to the working-class parties. This is another manifestation of the objective meaning of the Chinese leaders' and their supporters' tenets.

Imperialism is known to be out to "renovate" its stand and

strengthen its influence in the emergent nations under the guise of various "alliances for progress," neo-colonialist plans and programs and by flirting with national-reformist groups and the comprador bourgeoisie in these countries. And while this goes on, the Chinese splitters are slandering the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to compromise them in Asia, Africa and Latin America, i.e., to make the people of these countries distrustful of the great bulwark of their struggle against imperialism and the main guarantee of peace, freedom, independence and security. This is nothing but sheer liquidationism.

It is perfectly obvious that the Chinese theorists' concepts (about the possibility of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, embourgeoisement, etc.) can only discourage the army of fighters against capitalism instead of inspiring them, can only disarm them instead of equipping them for their battles.

The Chinese concepts underestimate the real possibilities for the building of communist society where the necessary prerequisites have been created for this by the historic struggle of people over half a century. At the same time these concepts overestimate the possibilities of imperialism to hamper the great cause of the building of communism. Both concepts are essentially liquidationist.

The subversive activities of the Chinese leaders and their supporters are doing grave harm not only to the Communist parties in power in their countries, but even to a greater extent, to those fraternal parties which are working under the difficult conditions of capitalism. These activities are aimed at discrediting socialism among wide sections of the population; they weaken the influence of the socialist countries on social processes and humper using the new ways and means in the struggle for peace, national independence and socialism.

When Communists aim already in our time to deliver mankind forever from the nightmare of a new world war, they put forward realistic socio-political prerequisites for the solution of this problem. The complete victory of the socialist world system over the capitalist world system in the economic competition, combined with the extension of the peace zone and new victories of the working-class and national-liberation movements, will create the absolute superiority of the forces of socalism and peace. At the same time a vigorous and decisive struggle of all peace forces can compel the imperialists to accept an agreement on complete disarmament. In this sphere of the struggle for peace, the purpose of socialism and communism dovetail with the national interests of each nation and all mankind.

The building of communism in the USSR is of world historic significance because:

first, not only in theory but already in practice it reveals the

trend of world social development, shows that capitalism is historically doomed, shows the invincible power of the new system and advances mankind towards the realization of the communist ideal;

second, it increases the over-all material and political power of the socialist camp and of the world revolutionary movement;

third, it decisively contributes to the attainment of the absolute superiority of socialism over capitalism in material production and ensures the complete victory of socialism over capitalism in the economic competition of the two systems;

fourth, it strengthens the defense capacity of the entire socialist camp, increases the Soviet Union's international prestige and multiplies the forces of peace in the struggle against the forces of imperialism and war;

fifth, it shows the ways of further development to the other socialist countries, enables them to use the experience of the building of communism already tested in the USSR, and gives them a glimpse of their own future;

sixth, it enhances the appeal of the socialist countries' example, contributes to the spread of the ideas of socialism and communism and their triumph in the minds of people and provides decisive evidence for exposing anti-communism, this pernicious ideology of modern imperialism;

seventh, it mutiplies the possibilities for rendering all-round aid to the nations fighting for national liberation, the nations who have discarded colonialist oppression and all peoples fighting for their social progress, and creates favorable conditions for preventing the imperialist powers' export of counter-revolution and neo-colonialism.

We are living in a remarkable age, the age of the profound transformation and renovation of the entire social and political structure of our planet, when a worldwide socialist society is being born in pain and joy, when hundreds of millions of people of all continents are throwing off age-long oppression and are making history themselves, when communism is knocking at every door.

It is an age not only of great social battles but also of great ideological battles. In this sphere, the sphere of ideas, the battle does not cease for a moment. The field of battle has obviously widened. It is no longer the province of individual theorists and scientists. The field of these battles is the world at large, their audience is mankind, and their participants are all the political detachments of today: states, parties, public organizations.

The new ideological opponent the Marxist-Leninists have to deal with is of a peculiar nature: this enemy operates not outside but inside the Communist movement; it smuggles in ideas

alien and hostile to Marxism-Leninism under the pretense of protecting it; it plays on the revolutionary sentiments of the masses in the name of goals which have nothing in common with those of the socialist revolution.

The history of our Party and the entire international Communist movement shows that in the struggle to overthrow the domination of the exploiters and for socialism and communism the working class and its communist vanguard have to overcome not only the fierce resistance of the forces of the old world, but also of the ideological opponents inside their ranks. The three world-historic stages of the working-class struggle — for the victory of the socialist revolution, the building of socialism and the creation of communist society — are at the same time three stages of the struggle against Right-wing and "Left-wing" opportunism.

When at the stage of struggle for the overthrow of the exploiters' power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat the great Lenin proclaimed that the socialist revolution could win in Russia, the Russian Mensheviks and all leaders of the Second International launched an ideological war against this famous thesis. All opportunists, all sceptics and defeatists shouted that Lenin's plan was unfeasible. But Lenin was adamant. He and the Party he had created confidently led the working class and all working people to victory by uncharted routes. And victory was won.

At the second world-historic stage — the struggle for socialism — still more formidable legions of ideological enemies, mostly Trotskyites, came out against Lenin and our Party. The Trostkyites argued that it was impossible to build socialism at first in one country, in the Soviet Union, and that it might even be necessary to sacrifice Soviet power for the sake of the world revolution. The Party decisively got rid of all defeatists and ideologically routed the Trotskyites, Right-wing opportunists, national-deviationists and other hostile groups. The Party rallied the Soviet people to realize Lenin's plan for building socialism. As a result of the Soviet people's selfless labor and the CPSU's theoretical and practical activity there now exists a socialist society and a science of building socialism tested in practice.

Our Party and all Soviet people have entered the third world-historic stage — the building of communism. We all are witnessing a sharp ideological struggle. The Chinese leaders have come out against the CPSU Program and the entire cause of building communism in the Soviet Union. They are by no means embarrassed by the fact that their course serves anti-revolutionary and not revolutionary purposes and that it is in effect assisting imperialism in its struggle against the leading revolutionary force of today.

We are firmly convinced that those who have challenged Leninism and the great cause of building communism will be routed ideologically and put to shame by the entire course of historical development confirming the correctness of the CPSU Program. Communism will be built in the Soviet Union despite hysterical bigotry, lies and slander. Those who are coming out against this cause would do well to weigh once again their actions and to give thought to the significance of the building of communism in the USSR for the cause of peace, accelerating the development of their own countries, and the final victory of communism on earth.

It has been a great tradition of the international working-class movement to support the world's first country of socialism and to realize and appreciate its contribution to the common revolutionary cause. This tradition cements the world Communist movement and at the same time multiples the power of each national contingent.

As for the Soviet people, they have been following and will continue to follow Lenin's path, which is the building of communism. In it our Party and our people see their happiness, their ideal and the goal of their struggle. At the same time the building of communist society in the USSR is the Soviet people's great internationalist duty to their brothers — the working people in all countries.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

21

Included in this Issue

REVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE AND OUR AGE
Leonid Ilyichov

MAO TSE-TUNG'S INTERVIEW WITH JAPANESE SOCIALISTS

VIEWS OF SYRIAN COMMUNISTS

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 21

contents

SYRIAN COMMUNISTS' VIEWS AND STAND ON ARAB NATIONAL LIBERATION AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT 5

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING

Erwin Scharf **16**

REVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE AND OUR AGE

Leonid Ilyichov **21**

CONCERNING MAO TSE-TUNG'S INTERVIEW WITH A GROUP OF JAPANESE SOCIALISTS

PRAVDA Editorial **53**

MAO TSE-TUNG'S INTERVIEW WITH JAPANESE SOCIALISTS 65

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA

October 1, 1964

SYRIAN COMMUNISTS' VIEWS AND STAND ON ARAB NATIONAL LIBERATION AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

RESOLUTIONS* OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, SYRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

In June 1964 the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party held a plenary meeting at which the internal conditions and some Arab affairs and international problems were discussed. Much attention was devoted to the results of Comrade Khrushchov's visit to the United Arab Republic and to the present situation in the world Communist movement. Organizational matters were also discussed and the following resolutions were unanimously adopted.

ON THE SITUATION IN SYRIA

Since Evacuation** Syria has passed through a very complex and eventful process.

After achieving independence the Syrian people were faced with numerous imperialist plots and intrigues and waged fierce battles to suppress them. They resolutely resisted all attempts of the British imperialists directed against the integrity of their country, such as the formation of the suspicious "Big Syria" and the "Fertile Crescent" unions. The Syrians also fought against plots of U.S. imperialism and resisted all acts of aggression committed by Israel with the encouragement of the imperialists.

The Syrian people today, too, suffer from the actions of the American, British and West German imperialists who want to subjugate the country to their influence and control. Despite all the contradictions existing among them, the imperialist powers are out to take hold of Syria and to dominate her main wealth—oil—and other industries. To this end they utilize all methods, overt and covert, that are typical of neo-colonialism.

Home reactionaries, such as the big feudals, collaborated with the imperialists and tried to block any progress. Many of them were the main support of the imperialists in the latter's criminal plots. Some of the big capitalists who were closely associated with

*Abridged from **Al-Ahbar**, August 9, 1964.

The evacuation of foreign troops from Syria in April 1946.—Ed.**

foreign capital followed suit. As soon as Syria attained independence, the extreme rightist groups of the national bourgeoisie attempted to monopolize power and to subordinate the country to their selfish class interests in order to exploit the people and increase profits. They endeavored to maintain the country's development along the capitalist path and to paralyze the struggle of the masses for democracy and social progress. To achieve their objectives, these rightist groups of the national bourgeoisie stopped at nothing, including cooperation with the feudals and reactionaries and deals with the foreign imperialists.

The workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and honest soldiers and officers and the rest of the toiling masses from the very outset waged a determined struggle for national independence, against the conspiracies of imperialism and reaction, to initiate an era of construction, change and prosperity, to uphold freedom and secure social progress for the masses and the growth of their living and cultural standards.

The frequent imperialist and reactionary plots against Syria, the wavering of the Syrian national bourgeoisie between imperialism and the people, and hence the intensification of inner contradictions regarding the political, social and economic line the country should follow—all that led to a series of crises and instability and to coups d'etat which were mostly inspired by the reactionary domestic and imperialist forces.

Despite all the difficulties of the hard battle against imperialism and reaction, the Syrian people were able to record important victories and add bright pages to their struggle. They safeguarded their national independence and on various occasions since Evacuation, achieved concrete successes in the economic and social fields. The most important of these gains are:

—Nationalization of enterprises dominated by foreign capital (electric power stations, railways, the Export Bank, foreign banks, etc.).

—The Agrarian Reform Law and the important changes in it made under public pressure delivered a strong blow at the strongholds of feudalism in Syria. Correct application of this law will secure land to the majority of poor peasants and facilitates solution of the agrarian problem in Syria.

—Promulgation of the Agrarian Relations Law, which defends many of the rights of the sharecroppers and agricultural workers.

—Important gains were secured by the workers, who won labor legislation, social insurance, the right to participate in the profits of the companies and in the boards of directors of some companies and enterprises, etc.

—Nationalization of the Central Bank of Issue and the insurance companies.

—Nationalization of the big national capitalist spinning and weaving mills.

—Construction, with the help of the socialist camp, of such vital projects as the oil refinery in Homs, some dams, the port in Tartous, enlargement of the Latakia port.

—The project of the Qamushli--Latakia and other railway lines to be built with the help of the Soviet Union.

—Formation of a state sector in the national economy comprising the nationalized foreign and national enterprises and some important projects launched by the state.

All these progressive gains were secured thanks to the struggle of the Syrian people and the influence of the socialist camp and its vanguard, the Soviet Union.

If a national-democratic, progressive rule is established in Syria, a rule that will make it possible to consolidate these gains and expand them considerably in the future, that will provide stability and ensure democratic liberties to the workers, peasants and all patriots, Syria's development may take the non-capitalist path leading to socialism. At present, however, the implementation of the majority of progressive measures is hampered by difficulties. Some circles strive to nullify the gains of the people. The feudals are trying by varied means, to destroy the Agrarian Reform Law and the Agrarian Relations Law in some localities. Backed by the government, they block the application of these laws. The big exploiters conspire against the laws on workers' rights. Progressive measures are also opposed by the imperialists and their agents. Nevertheless the progressive gains secured by the Syrian people are having an increasing impact on the life of the country. They are proof that in Syria, an Arab country, despite all difficulties, the necessary conditions for social progress are being created.

The Syrian Communist Party is confident of the ability of the Syrian people to overcome all difficulties and continue their victorious march forward. It realizes that it is the Syrian people who have played and are playing the main role in securing, safeguarding and applying all these progressive measures, and that the main feature of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Experience has shown that the Baath regime remains incapable of effecting progressive measures. The Baath came to power with no clear program. Deep contradictions exist in it, and there are many elements with a shady record in its ranks.

The Baath regime, due to its suppression of democracy, isolation from the masses, monopoly of power and inner contradictions, has proved unable either to suppress the subversive activities of the reactionary elements, or to pursue a resolute policy of industrialization. All this has led to soaring prices, increased unemploy-

ment, stagnation in trade and general deterioration of Syria's economic position.

Never in her modern history has Syria known such anarchy as now. Life itself compels all political forces in the country to search for a way out of this unbearable situation.

What is the way out?

Some reactionary politicians representing feudalism and big monopoly capital declare that the way out is in cancelling all progressive laws, giving free rein to capitalist development, and establishing a regime similar to the reactionary rule imposed after September 28, 1961. But the front-rank contingents of the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and all progressive forces of Syria categorically reject such a way out. They know from their own experience and that of the other newly-free countries that the capitalist path of development, far from ridding their country from exploitation, misery, anarchy and instability, will open the doors widely to infiltration by imperialism in its old and new forms and even endanger natonal independence.

The Syrian people are beginning to see from their own experience that the only path leading to stability and progress is the path pointed out by the Syrian Communist Party and other progressive patriotic forces, namely, the establishment of a state of national democracy.

The establishment of a national-democratic state in Syria consists of three essential features:

first, a resolute national anti-imperialist policy;

second, eradication of the sources of the influence of the feudals and other reactionary elements;

third, the granting of democratic liberties to the people and establishment of a progressive government on the basis of a broad National Front representing the workers, peasants, the petty and middle bourgeoisie and all progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie.

The Syrian Communist Party is confident that the Syrian people are capable of building such a state in their country. A state where no trace will be found of political, military or economic domination of imperialism; a state where the people, enjoying democratic rights and building a flourishing national economy, will carry out bold progressvie economic and social changes in the interests of the workers, peasants and all working people; a state which will create a firm foundation for non-capitailst development and peaceful transition to socialism.

When demanding democracy, the Syrian Communist Party does not call for the old bourgeois democracy which has played an unseemly role in our country's history and which was used as a pretext for the seizure of power by the feudals and big capitalists.

The Syrian Communist Party demands democracy for the people, democracy for the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and other groups believing in social progress, including those elements of the national bourgeoisie who are not opposed to socialism.

This progressive national democracy will lead Syria to stability, development and progress. It is the task of all patriots—Communists, Socialists (the group of Hourani and others), progressive nationalists, patriotic-minded members of the Baath, Nasserites—all those who sincerely believe in progress and socialism, to close the page of their past differences and unite their efforts so as to lead Syria to a new stage of development which is to be marked by the rallying of all the progressive forces of the country in the struggle against imperialism and Zionism, for reforms and progress, for Arab solidarity against imperialism, for the genuine unity of all the newly-free Arab countries marching along the road of social progress.

THE ROLE AND TASKS OF SYRIAN COMMUNISTS

The meeting of the Central Committee discussed the work of the Syrian Communist Party and noted that it had played an important part in the life of the country. This fact is recognized by everybody. Furthermore, the role of the Party is growing daily. The SCP is a front-rank revolutionary contingent. It has participated, together with the masses, in the struggle against foreign occupation, against the designs and intrigues of imperialism and Zionism, for social reforms. In its slogans and aims, the Party has always guided itself by the ideas of scientific socialism, which is the embodiment of the aspirations of the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, progressive patriotic soldiers and officers, and other sections of the people.

The Party has defended persistently the rights of the workers, peasants and all toilers and the right of all national progressive forces to freedom and democracy. In this endeavor, the Party has made big sacrifices.

The Party plays an increasing role in the progressive changes taking place in Syria. Together with all the Arab Communists it defends the current progressive changes in other Arab countries and works for their implementation and success.

All the progressive forces in the country realize the militant role the Party has been playing owing to its stand and proposals as regards the Agrarian Reform, the ways of transition to socialism, etc. The Syrian Communist Party has worked much to popularize socialism, explain its progressive essence to the masses, and rally them in the struggle for its achievement. The Party has indicated the strong ties linking the national liberation movement

with the world movement for socialism represented by the socialist camp and its vanguard, the Soviet Union. The Party has also pointed out that no past or future gain of the anti-imperialist movement in the field of political, economic or social reforms can be maintained in isolation from the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the Party has pointed out that every attempt to place the national-liberation movement in opposition to the world movement for socialism, or to drive a wedge between these two movements will only benefit the enemies of the people and of social progress and socialism—the imperialists, the reactionaries and their agents. Life itself has proved to all the Arab patriots and many Arab leaders, the correctness of the Arab Communists' views and conclusions on a number of vital national and international problems.

Like their comrades in the other countries, the Arab Communists do not hide their mistakes. They analyze these mistakes and spare no effort quickly to correct them. For example, some comrades in our Party displayed a tendency to over-estimate the role of the national bourgeoisie and underestimate the role of the working class and other progressive sections, while other comrades tended to overestimate the capabilities of the working class at the present stage and underestimate the role of other sections and of progressive elements of the national bourgeoisie. But owing to collective leadership, criticism and self-criticism the Party was able to overcome these tendencies and mistakes and march on forward along the road of Marxism-Leninism.

The Communist Party has always refuted the allegations of the reactionaries who tried to sow hatred for socialism among some sections of the people by claiming that under socialism the shops and homes of the small merchants and craftsmen and the land of the peasants would be confiscated and nationalized. The Party explained the falsity of these ill-intended allegations and pointed out that according to the experience of the socialist countries the socialist transformation does not include confiscation of the property of small producers, merchants and peasants. On the contrary, it is intended to protect them and help them improve their business and production and guide them towards voluntary cooperation, which enables them to occupy an adequate place in the life of the new society.

The Syrian Communists realize full well that they are no longer the only national force advocating socialism and struggling for it. World development and the concrete experience of Syria and other Arab countries have induced and continue to induce many Arab patriots to recognize socialism and sincerely work for its achievement. The SCP extends a fraternal hand to all those sincerely struggling for socialism and unity in attaining the noble common aim.

It should be fully understood by all Syrian Communists that it is the efforts and persistent struggle of the Party that largely determine the creation of prerequisites for uniting all the progressive forces of the nation in a single front which will resolutely and persistently work for consolidating politica lindependence and achieving economic independence, for the rights and democratic liberties of the people, for radical reforms, progress and socialism.

ON THE DEVELOPMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT OF THE ARAB LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The meeting of the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party, having studied the conditions of the Arab world, considers that the Arab liberation movement has registered important advances despite the resistance of imperialism and reaction. The socio-political level of this movement has risen and it has entered a new stage. This stage is characterized particularly by the progressive economic and social changes that have taken place or are being effected in a number of Arab countries.

Algeria is carrying through significant economic and social changes of a profoundly democratic, progressive and popular nature that are leading the country onto the road of socialism. Algeria owes these great victories to the growing role played by the people who are displaying initiatives in all fields of life, and to the freedom enjoyed by the workers, peasants and other sections of the population who are sincerely struggling for the unity of all the national forces and for socialism.

The statement of President Ben Bella that socialism could not be built while opposing communism, had a great political and ideological impact on the entire Arab world. It delivered a severe blow to the maneuvers and intrigues of the imperialists and the reactionaries who, by utilizing the slogan of anti-communism, are seeking to isolate Algeria from the socialist camp and to cause a division inside the Algerian popular movement, thus paving the way for the restoration of neo-colonialism there. All Arab patriots, from Communists to progressive nationalists, warmly support Algeria's policy against imperialism and for peace—a policy that rests on cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Arab patriots strongly condemn all the subversive actions supported and encouraged by the American, French and West German imperialists, and carried out by reactionary mercenaries in the hope of making Algeria abandon the road of freedom, economic independence, progress and socialism.

Positive develpments have taken place in Egypt. In addition to the already achieved important progressive economic and social changes, and the foreign policy that is directed against the

military plans and bases of imperialism and is aimed at supporting world peace, an interim constitution was proclaimed. At present work is under way to prepare a permanent constitution. The National Assembly was elected. The state of emergency was lifted, and political prisoners—Communists and democrats—were released. The government of Egypt has also taken important steps to further strengthen friendship with the Soviet Union. This was particularly apparent during the visit of Comrade Khrushchov to Egypt last May.

Like all Arab Communists and other progressive forces in the Arab countries, the Syrian Communists supported these positive changes in the domestic and foreign policy of Egypt. They believe that the consistent application of such a policy, granting more democracy to the people and to all the national progressive forces and permitting the masses actively to participate in formulating the policy of the country, will guarantee the consolidation of the achievements of the Egyptian people and will lead Egypt to the road of non-capitalist development and towards socialism. This will also lead to enhancing the prestige of Egypt among the popular masses and the national progressive circles in the Arab countries.

In Syria, despite instability and anarchy, the people were able to win by their struggle many gains and laws (such as the agrarain reform, nationalization, workers' legislation, etc.). If these were applied with the participation and supervision of the masses and by a national democratic and progressive rule that rests on a broad national front comprising all the forces opposed to imperialism and reaction, and those who believe in progress, including those sections of the national bourgeoisie that are not opposed to socialism, then this will be a good basis for taking Syria n to the road of non-capitalist development, the road to socialism. This will rapidly elevate Syria to the position of vanguard in the Arab world.

The achievements which have been attained or are being secured in some Arab countries are due to many factors, namely:

1. The influence of the socialist camp and particularly its vanguard—the Soviet Union.

2. The spread of scientific socialism to which many patriots become attracted, and the shattering of many illusions and allegations fostered by imperialism and reaction.

3. The growing pressure of the popular movement, including the Arab Communist movement, and its struggle for the satisfaction of social and economic demands of the people, the efforts of the Arab Communists in enlightening the masses, rallying them around the ideas of scientific socialism and the struggle to achieve these ideas.

4. The hatred of the popular masses for capitalism, and the conviction of many Arab patriots, including a number of leaders of these countries, that the capitalist way of development will not lead to economic and social progress.

5. The failure of the policy of anti-communism propagated and encouraged primarily by imperialism. The ever-growing realization by the masses that the road of consolidating the independence and economic and social progress is, internationally, the path of friendship with the Soviet Union and the socialist camp and, internally, the cooperation of all the forces believing in progress and socialism—Socialists, Communists and progressive nationalists of all trends.

The Central Committee of the SCP considers it to be the task of the Communists and all the progressive patriots in Syria to exert every effort in defending the gains of the Arab liberation movement in Algeria and Egypt, and consolidating and promoting these achievements. They should also strive for the same achievements in Syria. There are all the necessary conditions for this, provided that all the national progressive forces in the country will unite and jointly work for taking Syria out of the rule of anarchy, destruction and subjugation, into a national, democratic and progressive rule.

ON THE VISIT OF KHRUSHCHOV TO THE UAR

Having studied at its meeting the materials on the visit of Comrade Khrushchov to the United Arab Republic last May, the Central Committee considers this visit, which is the first to be made by the head of the great and friendly socialist state to an Arab country, a new and important contribution to strengthening Arab-Soviet friendship. This visit has opened a new page in the history of the relations between the Soviet and Arab peoples which are founded on the basis of equality and respect.

This visit served to consolidate the positions of the entire Arab liberation movement. It also helped to deepen the spread of the ideas of social progress throughout the Arab countries. On the international plane this visit was an example confirming the importance of the principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, and contributed to the cause of strengthening world peace.

The meeting of the Central Committee maintains that during his visit to Egypt Comrade Khrushcov played an extremely important role in clarifying the concept of scientific socialism, explaining with concrete examples the significance of building socialism and communism and stressing the need for unity between the socialist and the national-liberation movements. His visit also shed light on the outstanding role played by the socialist camp headed by

the Soviet Union in supporting the newly-liberated countries and in helping them to achieve economic independence and to safeguard their political independence.

During his visit to Egypt Comrade Khrushchov made a valuable contribution to exposing the true nature of the slogan of anti-communism by demonstrating that by means of this slogan imperialism and reaction are seeking to divide the ranks of the Arab liberation movement, on the one hand, and to isolate the Arab world from its most sincere friends—the Soviet Union and the socialist camp—on the other. Comrade Khrushchov pointed out the important role played by the Communists in the struggle, in each country and throughout the world, against imperialism and for peace, social progress and socialism.

The visit of Comrade Khrushchov to Egypt has further deepened the conviction of the Arab patriots that the stand of the Soviet Union in support of the Arab liberation struggle against imperialism and Zionism is principled and firm. It has also satisfied the Arabs that their countries have reliable friends who are always ready to support them in their just cause.

Comrade Khrushchov's visit to Egypt was warmly welcomed by all patriots, democrats and progressives in Syria. The visit also consolidated further the position of the national movement in Syria and strengthened the forces fighting against imperialism, for progress and socialism, and for genuine Arab unity.

The meeting of the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party is convinced that the visit of Comrade Khrushchov to Egypt has made an important positive impact on the entire situation in the Arab East, and constituted a valuable aid to the forces fighting selflessly and resolutely against imperialism, for progress and socialism.

REVISIONISM OF THE CHINESE LEADERS AND THEIR SPLITTING AND DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITY IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The meeting of the Central Committee of the Syrian Communist Party discussed the situation in the world Communist movement. It heard a detailed report on the activity of the Chinese leadership aimed at disrupting the world Communist movement and creating divisions inside the ranks of the Communist parties. The report pointed out that the Chinese leaders want to subordinate the world Communist movement to their undivided sway and to isolate the national-liberation movement from its natural ally—the socialist camp—and it vanguard—the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee meeting once again condemned the revisionism of the Chinese leaders and their splitting, disruptive activity. The meeting regards this activity as a departure from

the interests of the world Communist movement, for it benefits no others but the enemies of socialism—the imperialists and the reactionaries alike.

The plenary meeting of the CC declares its full support of the resolutions adopted by the meeting of representatives of the Arab Communist parties held in April, which resolutely condemned the revisionist views of the Chinese leadership that run counter to the general line of the world Communist movement ,as well as their disruptive and splitting activity inside this movement, and their slanders against the CPSU and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, including the Arab Communist parties.

The meeting of the CC considers it highly important to convene a world meeting of the Communist parties, which will promote rallying the ranks of the world Communist movement and consolidating its unity under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

The need for holding this international meeting is dictated by the big economic and political changes that have taken place in the world since the 1960 Moscow meeting. These developments demand analysis, exchange of views and experiences and formulating the necessary conclusions for the joint elaboration of a program of the world Communist movement on such issues as the continuation of the fruitful struggle for consolidating peace and saving humanity from destructive nuclear world war and to carry on the policy of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems, and also on questions connected with the development of the three main revolutionary forces of our time: the socialist camp, the national-liberation movement and the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries.

Important changes have taken place in the national-liberation movement. A number of newly-liberated countries have acquired new experience with regard to the methods of struggle against old and new imperialism and the methods of non-capitalist development and marching towards socialism.

These and other developments require special study and exchange of views among Communists at a fraternal international meeting in order most effectively to coordinate their efforts in the struggle, waged under the new conditions, for attaining their great common aim—the liberation of humanity as a whole from imperialism, colonialism and exploitation and the victory of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism throughout the world.

June 1964.

FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING

UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IS THE CONCERN OF ALL PARTIES

Erwin Scharf
Member of the Political Bureau, Communist Party of Austria

The first representative meeting to prepare an international conference of the Communist parties will be held on December 15 in Moscow. The CPSU has invited the parties which took part in preparing the 1960 conference: the Communist Parties of Albania, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, North Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, Syria, the USA and North Vietnam. An important step has thus been made in the spirit of the decision adopted by the Central Committee of the CPA at its meeting of May 5 and 6 when it stated that "the Central Committee deems it necessary and expedient to convene another meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties thoroughly prepared through consultations between the parties, with a view of attaining the maximum unity of the international Communist movement."

Subsequently, too, the Political Bureau of our Party dealt with problems pertaining to the international meeting and expressed the view that a committee should be appointed to prepare it. Comrade Franz Muhri wrote in *Volksstimme* on June 19: "In our opinion, it would be best of all if the preparatory committee consisted of representatives of the 26 parties which prepared the 1960 meeting." We acclaim the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee in calling the first session of the committee.

Already the overwhelming majority of the parties have declared in favor of the international meeting. This point is made in the June 15 letter of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist Party of China, which noted: "Some parties, while favoring a conference in principle, make certain reservations as to the specific time when it should be called, bearing in mind your opposition to a meeting. But as far as we know, no leadership of the party, except that of the CPC and the Albanian Party of Labor, rejects the necessity for collective measures to overcome the difficulties in the Communist movement and promote its unity."

Indeed, a series of consultations were carried out between fraternal parties in the past few months with regard to the expedience and the time of holding the international meeting, as well as on problems of the world Communist movement. This exchange of views will be continued and further extended in connection with the work of the preparatory committee. This will make it possible to prepare the international meeting thoroughly, which the CPA considers most essential. All fraternal parties that favor the meeting also share our desire to achieve maximum unity in the course of its work. Only a few days ago *Pravda* stressed: The meeting of the Communist parties is called not in order to 'excommunicate' one or another party from the Communist movement, or arbitrarily to banish one or another country from the socialist world system, not for mutual recriminations and accusations. The CPSU maintains that, in face of the differences which the Communist movement has encountered, it is above all necessary to concentrate efforts on working out common positions, findng that which unites all Marxist-Leninist parties, exploring the ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen before us."

It goes without saying that the task of the international meeting will also be to assess the changes that have taken place in the world since 1960, i.e., since the last meeting of the Communist parties in Moscow, and exchange views on the new economic and political developments with the aim of laying down a common line of the Communist parties on all essential issues of present-day world politics.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA SAYS "NO"

For quite a long time the CPSU and the CPC have conducted correspondence on the subject of convening an international meeting of the Communist parties. Part of this correspondence was published in *Volksstimme*. On July 23 we printed a letter of the CPSU Central Committee which thoroughly substantiated the need for holding preparatory meetings this year and an international conference in 1965. On July 28 the Chinese comrades flatly rejected this proposal. Forgetful of their own factional and splitting activity, they say: "We will never take part in any international meeting, or any preparatory meeting for it, which you call for the purpose of splitting the international Communist movement."

In its letter the Communist Party of China seeks to prove the correctness of the proposal to postpone the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties, scheduled for October 10-25, till some time in the first half of next year, till May, for instance. "Judging by present circumstances," the letter says, "it might require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete the preparations for an international meeting."

Further, the Communist Party of China in its letter reproaches the CPSU for allegedly intending to impose a revisionist line on the international meeting to be held next year. In particular, the Chinese comrades ascribe to the CPSU a desire to "abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat and open the floodgates to the restoration of capitalism . . .," compel "the fraternal countries to obey your baton and become your dependencies or colonies economically, politically and militarily . . ., liquidate the struggle of the oppressed nations against imperialism and old and new colonialism . . ., in partnership with U.S. imperialism to carve up the world and oppose the revolutionary struggles of the peoples of all countries."

The Chinese comrades are also against preparing the meeting by a 26-Party committee and say that it is necessary to get the unanimous approval of all the fraternal parties to call an international meeting.

The Chinese leaders then speak in defense of the various groups which have split away from the Communist parties, and insist on the right of these groups to be represented at the international meeting. The splitters and their factional activities are being extolled, and the splinter groups are dished up as revolutionary proletarian parties combating revisionism. The continuation of open debate is also approved in the same spirit. The Chinese comrades say that they have not yet finished replying to the CPSU Open Letter of July 14, 1963, and write in black and white: "So long as you persist in your revisionist line and refuse to admit your errors publicly, we will certainly continue the great debate."

NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO DICTATE

The tone and content of this letter of the Chinese comrades are hardly conducive to clarifying the problems and controversial issues. First of all, one cannot find arguments convincing enough to prove that the international meeting, demanded by the vast majority of the Communist parties, will not promote unity but will lead to a split. What is needed is good will, preparation, consultations between the fraternal parties, and the convocation of a preparatory meeting. After December 15, already on the basis of the latter, the exchange of views can be continued in a still more concrete form.

Even given all this, bilateral talks between the CPSU and the CPC would, of course, be of the utmost importance. There is nothing more desirable for the fraternal Communist parties than the early holding and success of these talks. But as the letter of the Chinese comrades indicates, it was they who postponed the meeting with CPSU representatives first till October 1964 and then till May 1965. As for the international meeting, they see its

convocation possible only in four or five years, or even later. Should it be the case, the meeting would not be held altogether or held at the time when gravest damage would have been inflicted on the world Communist movement.

We therefore consider it correct to convene a preparatory committee meeting composed of representatives of the 26 parties. For fulfilling its responsible task this committee has the trust reposed in it by the parties that took part in the 1960 meeting. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has displayed the initiative as the convener of an international meeting, can also count on the trust of the fraternal parties. The 1957 meeting gave the CPSU direct powers in this respect. The Chinese comrades' claims to the effect that these powers are valid only provided there is unanimous approval of the international meeting by all the parties are both nonsensical and utterly unfounded. In reality, the powers given the CPSU could only mean that, in the case of differences, the party which enjoys the highest international prestige should have the possibility to take the initiative. Otherwise one of the parties would be in a position to torpedo any international meeting of the Communist parties.

The slanderous assertions of the Chinese comrades that the political and ideological result of the international meeting would be betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the policy of restoring capitalism, partnership with imperialism with a view to liquidating the liberation struggle of the oppressed natons, etc., are absolutely incomprehensible and insulting to all the Communist parties. These inventions are an insult to the CPSU, which has built the first socialist state and is now laying the foundations of communism, which shoulders the brunt of the anti-imperialist struggle, and which has played a major part in securing grand victories for world socialism and the anti-imperialist liberation struggle. These concoctions are insulting to the other Communist parties to which ideological regeneration and repudiation of Marxism-Leninism are ascribed. More than that. The Chinese slanders are rendering a service to the anti-communist propaganda claims that the Communist parties are dependent on, and subservient to, Moscow.

The monstrous attacks of the Chinese comrades are obviously designed to help disruptive activities in the Communist parties. With this aim in view they demand that the groups that have broken away from some of the Communist parties be invited to the international meeting. They openly support these splinter groups, seek to perpetuate open polemics in the international Communist movement and make it altogether impossible to convene the meeting.

"So long as you persist in your revisionist line and refuse to

admit your errors publicly, we will certainly continue the great debate," says the CPC letter. This is tantamount to a declaration of war to the last ditch. Moreover, the Chinese comrades arrogate to themselves the right to decide what is and what is not revisionism. This fully exposes their subversive line which, if unresisted, would further intensify schismatic phenomena in the international Communist movement.

Therefore we firmly believe that if the Communist parties want to preserve the unity of the world Communist movement, they should not allow themselves to be led astray by the resistance and diktat of one of the parties. All the parties of the right, and are duty bound, to contribute to overcoming the disagreements and ideological differences. Joint efforts by all the parties alone can secure the maximum unity of the international Communist movement. Hence our actions aimed at holding an international meeting of the Communist parties.

REVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE AND OUR AGE*

AGAINST THE ANTI-LENINIST COURSE OF THE CHINESE LEADERS

Leonid Ilyichov

Secretary of the Central Committee,
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Marxism-Leninism is the great revolutionary science, the militant banner of our age. For more than a century now its revolutionary ideas have been inspiring the working class, all working people to fight for socialism; these ideas are being developed and applied in practice, they are gripping the minds of millions of people in all continents.

The transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism raises intricate and important problems before the Communist movement and the socialist world system—the creation of the international working class. The socialist countries and world working-class movement have become the decisive factor of mankind's development, extending a tremendous impact on the struggle of the working people for social emancipation, for peace and complete and final liberation from imperialism and colonialism. The future of world development and the progress of all mankind depend in large measure on the solidarity of the revolutionary forces, on the unity of action and unity of ideological positions of the Communist parties and the socialist states. Ideological unity has always been the pivot of the activities of the Communist parties, these parties have always regarded the purity of their ideological positions as the prime condition of their work, of success in their struggle for the cause of the working class.

At the present time the ideological and theoretical life of the Communist parties is centred around the struggle against the aggressive nationalism, the "Left" opportunism and the anti-Leninist line of the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party. This has now become the main issue in today's ideological battles.

Politically this is a struggle for the further development of the world revolutionary movement, for strengthening the socialist

*Report delivered in June 1964 at a scientific session on the "Struggle of the CPSU for the Purity of Marxism-Leninism," sponsored by the Academy of Social Sciences and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee and social sciences institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The report, reprinted from **Kommunist** No. 11, 1964, is given here with some additions.

system; it is a struggle for utilizing the new opportunities opened up in our days for the transition of the peoples to socialism, for the final abolition of colonialism, for ensuring a lasting peace and general security; it is a struggle for the cohesion of all the anti-imperialist forces, with the socialist world system and the international working class playing the leading role; it is a struggle for the fulfilment by the working class of its great historical mission in the socialist revolution, in the liberation movement of the peoples.

Ideologically and theoretically this is a struggle for proletarian, communist ideology against petty-bourgeois ideology; socialist internationalism against nationalism; revolutionary science against revisionism and paralyzing dogmatism.

To fight in our days for the purity of revolutionary science, for its creative development means to fight for the future of the revolutionary movement.

Our Party's assessment of the anti-Marxist, great-power, neo-Trotskyite position of the Chinese leaders is given in the decision of the February Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and in M. A. Suslov's report "Struggle of the CPSU for Unity of the World Communist Movement." Discussion of the materials of the plenary meeting has demonstrated the complete unity of our Party, solidly rallied behind the Central Committee. Our Party and the entire Soviet people have unanimously approved the decision of the plenary meeting, the policy and practical activity of the CPSU Central Committee and its Presidium, headed by the outstanding Leninist N. S. Khrushchov, activity aimed at building communist society in the USSR and ensuring the victory of the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, at strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement.

The position of our Party has been approved by the absolute majority of fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties.

The documents of the CPSU and other fraternal parties have already demonstrated the danger of the present stand of the Chinese leaders. Their anti-Leninist course has created serious difficulties in the socialist camp and the Communist movement. But the Chinese leaders, ignoring the calls of the Marxist-Leninist parties to take the road of eliminating the differences, are intensifying their splitting, factional, subversive activity in the ideological and political spheres. Our Party, together with the other fraternal parties, will therefore continue unswervingly to defend Marxism-Leninism, to uphold and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement on the principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, the unity and solidarity of all

the forces for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

I. STRUGGLE FOR HEGEMONY—STRATEGIC AIM OF PRESENT-DAY SPLITTERS

The assessment of revisionism and dogmatism given in the documents jointly adopted by the fraternal parties in 1957 and 1960 is generally known.

Together with the other fraternal parties, the CPSU held that in the interests of the further development of the Communist and working-class movement a vigorous struggle must be waged against revisionism, which at certain stages becomes the chief danger in the world Communist movement, and against dogmatism and sectarianism.

But the 1960 Statement contains the following highly important proposition:

"Dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual parties, unless combated unrelentingly." It did not take much time for all to see how correct this conclusion was. "The events that have occured in the Communist movement since that Statement was adopted by the fraternal parties have fully demonstrated the foresight of this conclusion," N. S. Khrushchov remarked in 1962.

What happened at the meeting of the fraternal parties in 1960 and what position the delegates of the Communist Party of China took at that time is common knowledge. Soon after the adoption of the Statement they sharply stepped up their factional, subversive activity, acting at first from positions of dogmatism and sectarianism, and subsequently revealing themselves as bellicose nationalists harboring far-reaching great-power, hegemonistic designs. Now there is every reason to say that while the struggle against revisionism remains and will continue to remain on the order of the day so long as bourgeois pressure on the proletariat exists, *"Left" opportunism is becoming the chief danger in the international Communist movement.*

It is not the first time the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties have been faced with attempts to revise the revolutionary teaching both from the Right and from the "Left".

Struggle against "Left-wing communism" passes through the entire history of the development of Marxism. Let us recall the struggle Marx and Engels waged against the "Lefts" in the First International and later on, in the course of decades. Lenin's scathing criticism of "Left" opportunism on questions of the theory and practice of socialist construction is well known. The experience

of this struggle against "Left" opportunism is of international significance; it is especially important in our days since contemporary "Left" opportunism has borrowed a great deal from its precedessors.

But no "Left" deviation in the past represented such a danger to the Communist movement as present-day "Left" opportunism.

Why? First of all, because it is being practised by the leadership of a ruling party. There is no need to prove how much more dangerous "Left" opportunism becomes when it is accepted as the basis of political line not by a faction in one or another party, but by the leadership of the ruling party in a socialist country. All ideological media in China are now concentrated on conditioning the minds of the people in the nationalistic, chauvinist spirit, while the party and government machinery of the country, instead of fighting against imperialism, is engaged in a struggle against the Communist parties, in organizing subversive activities within those parties, in struggle against the strategy and tactics of the international Communist movement jointly elaborated by them.

It is nationalism and great-power aspirations that underlie the present-day policy of the Chinese leaders. They are camouflaged by revolutionary phraseology, and to carry them out, the principles of Marxism-Leninism are distorted in the spirit of "Left" opportunism. The social base for nationalism and Leftism has been greatly extended in our days. Huge masses, peasants in the majority, are taking part in the national liberation movement. Millions of people, including those not versed in politics, have been drawn into the vortex of the struggle. The Chinese leaders are trying to capitalize both on the legitimate dissatisfaction of the masses with the exploiting system and on the political backwardness of some sections, especially on nationalist and even racist prejudices engendered by colonial rapine and imperialist oppression.

The line adopted by the Chinese leaders is not confined to separate, specific questions; it constitutes the essence of their current theoretical and practical activities. It is counterposed to the general line of the world Communist movement and is being intensively foisted by Peking on the Communist parties of the other countries. What we are faced with is an attempt to divert the international Communist movement from the Leninist path, to subordinate it to the narrow nationalistic ends of one party. The methods they use are well known: to shout as loudly as possible about "class struggle," "revolution," "dictatorship of the proletariat," to create the impression that they are the sole guardians of revolutionary science, and to accuse of apostasy, "revisionism," "betrayal," etc., all who oppose their splitting activity and expose them as anti-Leninists.

But does it necessarily follow that he who shouts the loudest is in the right?

We have to deal here with subversive work on an international scale.

Splitting activity by individual leaders or groups in the Communist movement has always been condemned by the Leninists as a grave crime against the working class. This is all the more applicable to the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders, since it is being conducted at a time when a sharp strugle is being fought between socialism and imperialism, a time when the cohesion of the world Communist movement, the unity of all the revolutionary contingents is especially vital.

Objectively, the position of the latter-day splitters plays into the hands of the forces hostile to socialism; it is doing grave harm to the revolutionary struggle of the peoples for social and national emancipation, for peace, democracy and socialism.

It is sometimes asked: what is the reason for the deviation of the Chinese leadership from the general line of the world Communist movement, their desire to break away from it? How did it come about that the leadership of a party which led its people to victory in the revolution, which in the past did much to strengthen the friendship of the Chinese people with the peoples of the USSR and the other socialist countries, has altered its line, launched a campaign of lies and slander against the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, begun to treat the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties as political enemies, come out against the strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement on all the main questions of our time, and is trying to break up the unity of that movement?

The reasons for the shift on the part of the Chinese leaders to naionalist, Leftist opportunist positions are rooted both in subjective and objective factors, both in the external and internal situation.

Let us consider the level of China's economic development. Economically, pre-revolutionary China was one of the most backward countries in the world. Her economy had a strongly pronounced agrarian character. It is indicative that even tsarist Russia, the most backward of the great powers, in 1913 produced 3.3 times more steel and 3 times more pig iron per capita than People's China produced in 1957. On the eve of the revolution locomotives of more than 200 models were running on the railways of China, but not one of them had been built in China. The textile industry had four million spindles, none of them of Chinese make. A world supplier of tungsten, China was importing filaments for electric bulbs.

The social structure of China's society is bound up with her economic backwardness.

China is the biggest peasant country in the world. Today too the peasantry comprises more than 80 per cent of her population. The urban petty bourgeoisie — small tradesmen and artisans — make up a considerable section of the population. The industrial proletariat, which is the leading force of socialist revolution, did not comprise even one per cent of the population at the moment when the revolution won in China. It now numbers about 20 million, that is less than three per cent of the population. Moreover, it is a young working class consisting to a large extent of yesterday's peasants.

The Communist Party of China has undergone considerable revolutionary schooling, but the proletarian stratum in it is extremely small. The Party grew numerically and replenished its ranks most from among the working class but chiefly from the peasantry, intellectuals, and other sections. The present leaders of the Party and the state, too, have come from their midst. Many non-proletarians joined the Party not because of their Marxist convictions, but only because they saw in it an effective force fighting against the Japanese imperialists, for the country's liberation. Some of them joined the Party prompted not by class proletarian interests, which most fully express also the basic national interests, but solely by their national sentiments. In an interview given to the American author Edgar Snow, Mao Tse-tung said that books by Chinese bourgeois nationalists and also anarchists, had greatly influenced his political awakening. As he himself noted, he had also been under the strong influence of Chen Tu-siu, who subsequently went over to Trotskyite positions and turned renegade.

Prior to the victory of the revolution, the CPC worked chiefly in remote rural localities, isolated from the main centers of the working class, the big cities and industrial areas.

For more than ten years after 1935 the Chinese revolution had its center in the border area located at the junction of three peasant provinces (Shensi, Kansu and Ningsia) with headquarters in the small district town of Yenan. Here were the Central Committee of the CPC, all the central offces of the Party and most of its members. Mao Tse-tung wrote at one time "China is a country with an extremely numerous petty bourgeoisie and our Party is surrounded by this huge social stratum. Very many members of our Party themselves came out of a petty-bourgeois environment and each one of them has inevitably dragged along with him in to the Party a more or less long petty-bourgeois tail." (*Selected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol 4, p. 96.)

Is not this pretty-bourgeois tail dragging the Chinese leaders to subjectivism and nationalism?

It was Mao Tse-tung himself who wrote that the Communist Party of China is inclined to be strongly influenced by petty-bourgeois ideology which, as he put it, is expressed in "dashing" now to the left, now to the right, in a weakness for "Left" revolutionary phraseology and slogans, in sectarian exclusiveness and adventurism.

Naturally, economic backwardness and pressure from petty-bourgeois elements do not in themselves inevitably lead to Leftist opportunist views. After all, our Party, at one time also labored under the effects of economic backwardness and no small pressure from the petty-bourgeoisie. More than that, having won power, it carried on its activities for a long time in a country which was surrounded by capitalist states and was subjected to considerable bourgeois influence from without. Nevertheless, our Party has always firmly relied on the revolutionary working class, on the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry, upheld the immutable principles of Marxism-Leninism, and resolutely defeated all opportunist deviations.

Consequently, it is not only the objective factors that matter. However strong the pressure of the petty-bourgeois element, it can be overcome if the party leadership applies a correct, sustained proletarian policy, if it is loyal to Leninism. But it is loyalty to Leninism that the Chinese leaders lack. Far from launching a struggle against the pressure of the petty-bourgeois element they have themselves succumbed to it. As far back as 1956 the Eighth All-China Congress of the CPC pointed to big shortcomings in the ideological sphere and to the need for Marxist-Leninist schooling, especially of the higher party functionaries, and the importance of ever-coming subjectivism. We see that the warning of the congress has not done any good.

The sources of the Left opportunist, nationalist views of the Chinese leaders are rooted in subjective factors, too. The Communist Party of China is known to be functioning and working today not on the basis of the principles of democratic centralism, but in an atmosphere of the personality cult. The ideology of the personality cult runs counter to the very spirit of Leninism, to the nature of the evolutionary working-class movement and of the socialist system. The practice of concentrating all power in the hands of a single individual is alien to the nature of the proletarian state, to the principles of socialist democracy. It is especially baneful in a country still weighted down by the unpleasant "burden" of such survivals of the feudal past as worship of the monarch, domination of a hierarchy and omnipotence of bureaucracy.

The cult of Mao Tse-tung's personality could not but lead in China to distortions of the socialist principles of state and Party development and of the democratic forms and methods of administration.

Materials on the gross violations of inner-party democracy in China have already been published in our press. Incidentally, the Chinese press, far from reprinting the article entitled "Certain Aspects of Party Life in the Communist Party of China" published in *Pravda*, has not uttered a single word in refutation of the facts cited in it. For 20 years prior to the victory of the revolution, all ideological and organizational work in the Communist Party of China was conducted along military lines, subordinated to wartime needs. For that period this procedure evidently was justified. But 15 years have already passed since the end of hostilities. With the switchover to peaceful work, have the Chinese leaders taken any measures to change the Party's style of work, to promote democratic centralism? No, they have not. The army style, based on one-man command, on unquestioning obedience to orders from above, has remained the basis of Party activity. Moreover, militarization of all aspects of social life has even been intensified in recent years. As before, criticism and other elementary standards of inner-party democracy are lacking.

True, at one time after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Chinese leadership began to speak about developing democracy. But that is as far as it went.

An extensive campaign is now being conducted in China under the slogan: "Learn to work like the People's Liberation Army." Political bodies patterned after the army political departments are being set up in the entire system of the Party, state and economic apparatus of China, from the Central Committee of the CPC down to enterprises and communes. Mao Tse-tung has declared: "All our economic branches, branches of industry, agriculture and trade must study the methods of the People's Liberation Army, must organize and intensify political work. Only in this way will it be possible to arouse the revolutionary spirit of millions and tens of millions of personnel and the masses on the entire economic front." (*Hungchi*, No. 6, 1964.)

Note, it is not the army that has to learn from the Party, but the Party from the army. In other words, the accent is on the army and the principles of army discipline, while the Leninist teaching on the Party is discarded.

What should be learned from the army? Party organizations of China are given the following directive: Communists must learn from the army "to carry out orders resolutely, swiftly and strictly, without entering into arguments and without haggling—do what

you are ordered" (*Jenminjihpao,* February 1, 1964). How can one speak of Party democracy when all that is demanded of a Party member is blind obedience. The demand that you unquestioningly carry out orders and, moreover, pretend that this is inner-party democracy, is sheer blasphemy. This is how the elementary standards of Party life and violated, criticism from below and the creative activity of Communists crushed, how informing and servility are encouraged. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Mao Tse-tung who judging from this directive, only issue orders, consider themselves to be exempt from Party control, from control of the Party members.

The atmosphere created by the personality cult cannot but lead to a situation when *subjectivism and the personal whims of one man become an official policy, create fertile soil for unjustified experiments, absence of control, inordinate ambition, make for extremes, instability, adventurism and nationalism.* It is in this atmosphere that the nationalist, Left opportunist, neo-Trotskyite deviation has made its nest.

The question arises: what brings together the neo-Trotskyism of the Chinese leaders with the old, "classical" Trostkyism, defeated in the past by our Party?

First of all, they have one and the same anti-Leninist ideological platform, follow the same petty-bourgeois adventurism in foreign and home policy, factional methods and splitting activity in the Communist movement, they both reject democratic principles and adhere to military, compulsory forms in state and party development. Both deviations are marked by disbelief in the forces of the working people, their ability to build socialist society, although they have been holding forth at length about loyalty to the people and faith in their revolutionary forces. Both are characterized by a desire to cover up their capitulatory essence by Leftist principles.

It would of course be historically wrong to equate the "old" Trostkyism with the "new" Trotskyism, neo-Trotskyism.

To begin with, the historical situation has radically changed. Moreover, the former reflected primarily the ideology of the urban petty bourgeoisie, while the latter reflect primarily the ideology of the peasantry, although it experiences the pressure of urban bourgeois elements too. The former was under the strong influence of anarcho-syndicalism; the latter is influenced by various forms of Utopian, chiefly peasant socialism. Speculating on the slogan of world revolution, the old Trotskyism absolutized a falsely-interpreted internationalism, counterposing it to national interests. Neo-Trotskyism is marked by strongly pronounced nationalism, and great-power chauvinism. The old Trotskyism advocated its sectarian concept of the "ultra-revolutionism" of the working class, and

ignored the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry as an ally of the proletariat. Neo-Trotskyism advocates the "ultra-revolutionism" of the peasantry and does not believe in the forces of the working class.

However, specific the views of the Chinese leaders may be, their kinship with Trotskyism is obvious, especially if account is taken of the historical evolution of Trotskyism itself. The views of the Chinese leaders on many basic questions coincide with the views of the leaders of the so-called Fourth (Trotskyite) International.

Now let us put the following question: why have the views of the Chinese leadership taken such a pronounced hegemonistic turn?

There are enough facts to give the right answer. The political evolution of China, for example, calls for profound study. Let us take the first years after the victory of the revolution. The Chinese people were successfully laying the foundations of socialism with the generous and unselfish fraternal assistance of the socialist countries. Although already then, as the Chinese leaders say, they did not subscribe in every respect to the positions of the international Communist movement, still they concealed their divergencies for the time being, declaring their full agreement with the line of the world Communist movement.

But in the spring of 1958, the Chinese leadership began to veer round sharply. Instead of approximately 15 years, in the course of which it was planned to lay the foundation of socialism in China, a period of only three years was proclaimed to be sufficient for the transition to communism. The so-called "big leap" was announced, a political and economic gamble unprecedented in conception and scale. It was a policy divorced from the actual, objective possibilities, and was based on the desire to accomplish as swiftly as possible the immense tasks and "to teach" others the newly-invented methods of building socialism and communism. The slogan of the "people's communes" was likewise proclaimed then. It was based on an attempt to skip the natural stages of socialist construction in the countryside, tested by the experience of the socialist countries, and to be "ahead of progress" in this sphere too. In a word, the economy of China, which had not gained strength as yet, was subjected to an avalanche of unjustified experiments, beyond the strength of the country's economy and running counter to the laws of economic development.

What prompted the Chinese leaders to take these steps? Evidently the successes — undoubted successes — scored by China in 1958 with the help of the fraternal socialist countries. But these successes had a dual effect on the minds of the Chinese leaders.

On the one hand, achievements in economic development made

them dizzy with success, intoxicated them. "China can accomplish anything"—such was the official conclusion. On the other hand, a comparison of what had been achieved with the tasks still to be accomplished demonstrated to the Chinese leaders, perhaps for the first time, the colossal complexity and difficulty of the process of building socialism in economically backward China. "The successes are great, but all this is a mere drop in the ocean, much more work lies ahead"—such approximately was the unofficial conclusion. "We have to make haste," the Chinese leaders concluded. Since "China can accomplish anything," is there any sense in dragging out socialist construction for decades? Would it not be simpler to try skipping the socialist stage and leap directly into communism in three years? Petty-bourgeois impatience and scorn for objective laws gained the upper hand over common sense. It may be assumed that foreign-policy, or to be more precise, great-power aspirations too played their part here.

Towards the end of 1959 it had become absolutely clear for the Chinese leadership that the "big leap" had led the economy and policy of China into a blind alley and confronted the country with grave economic difficulties.

In this situation they swung to another extreme in economic policy—agriculture was declared the basis of the economy. The calls to outstrip the most developed countries in a short time quietly died down and then disappeared completely from the Chinese press. More than that, even the victory of socialism was declared to be a matter of the remote future. The Chinese leaders shifted their claims to the role of teacher, to hegemony chiefly to the political sphere.

It is no longer a secret that the verbal acrobatics around theoretical questions, the ultra-revolutionary phrasemongering and flirting with unstable elements in other parties, the forming of blocs with all kinds of renegades and traitors to the cause of the working class, the noisy campaign called a struggle against "contemporary revisionism," and many other things have served and are serving the Chinese leaders merely as a means in their attempts to assert their special position in the socialist world, in the international Communist and national-liberation movement.

Nationalism and its poisoned fruits can be discerned lately in many of the political actions of the CPC Central Committee and the Chinese government. The biased evaluation of China's historical past, for example, cannot but attract attention.

It will be recalled that since ancient times the ideologists of China have built up an image of their country as the "Middle Empire," the oldest civilization, the custodian of world order and spiritual harmony, as the "Celestial Empire" which wields power

on earth. The imperial ideology of China's special role in the history of mankind is to a certain extent influencing the minds of the present Chinese leaders.

It would be unjust, of course, to deny the tremendous contribution made by the Chinese people to the development of world civilization, to underestimate their spiritual influence on the culture of other peoples. But it would be absolutely wrong, while paying due tribute to China's role in history, not to notice the great-power aspirations which thrived in China, to ignore or belittle the role of other countries and peoples in the history of mankind. But it is this chauvinistic and even outright racialist appraisal of China's role that can be frequently found in the writings of Chinese ideologists. According to some Chinese historians, the history of mankind is concentrated in the part of Asia where China is situated. The country's historical past is idealized, the history of other peoples is referred to slightingly and "Sino-centric" concepts are made the basis of everything. Philosophy and history, literature and art in present-day China are subordinated to substantiating such ideas.

The Chinese historians go to all lengths to extol, to demonstrate China's special role in the destinies of mankind.

If Europe had classical forms of slavery, in China, it turns out, they were "highly classical." And the feudal system in China, in contrast to Europe, was also a "model" one. True, the capitalist system developed earlier in Europe, but because the "leading position of people of the yellow race from Asia was firmly captured by people of the white race from Europe." America was discovered by the Chinese. China had Confucius, Europe did not. Europe experienced the fall of the Roman Empire, but in China this did not happen. And so on and so forth. Everyone understands the national pride of the scholar if his people performed an exploit or made a great discovery. National prides is not alien to the peoples. There is nothing wrong in this, but why belittle other peoples, other countries. In China arrogant nationalism comes to the surface not only when hoary antiquity is assessed. It is openly said in China that without reference to Chinese history it is impossible "to explain the general laws governing the development of human society."

To achieve their hegemony-seeking schemes, the Chinese leaders are pursuing a thoroughly planned and coordinated policy. Its main trends are clear already now.

First, a struggle against the CPSU and the Soviet Union, because the Chinese leaders see in the high prestige enjoyed by our Leninist Party and the USSR — the first socialist country which is success-

fully building communism — the main stumbling block to realizing their nationalistic, great-power plans.

Second, a struggle against the unity of the socialist camp, the Communist movement, the working people of all countries and continents, because this unity and proletarian internationalism are a major obstacle to the hegemonistic aspirations of the Peking leaders. That is why they have taken the line of forming factions in the Communist movement as a whole and in individual Communist parties, factions which would obediently carry out directives from Peking; the line of forming a grouping of some socialist countries, of setting the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against the peoples who are building socialism and communism and against the working class of the capitalist countries.

It can be considered an accomplished fact that of the two diametrically opposed slogans, political lines and world outlooks— proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism — the Chinese leaders have chosen nationalism. They scorned the warning made by Lenin: ". . . One who has adopted the standpoint of nationalism naturally arrives at the desire to erect a Chinese Wall around his nationality, his national working-class movement . . . is unembarrassed even by the fact that by his tactics of division and dismemberment *he is reducing to nil* the great calls for rallying and unity of the proletarians of all nations, all races and all languages." (Lenin, *Complete Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 7, p. 325.)

Third, a struggle against the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and of easing international tensions; this is tantamount to spurring on nuclear armaments and pursuing a line which can lead to atomic war. As time goes on it is becoming increasingly clear that the mainspring of many foreign-policy actions of the Chinese splitters is hidden in the wish for a big military conflict, while they themselves stand aloof, "watching from the mountain top the battle of tigers" and profiting by it.

Fourth, the persistent attempts of the Chinese leaders to dominate the national-liberation movement. To this end they flatter and play up to nationalist circles and declare the national-liberation movement to be the leading element in the world revolutionary process. Hence the theory of the "storm-center of the revolution" in the "three-A" zone (Asia, Africa, Latin America), hence the political actions aimed at dividing the world revolutionary forces according to national and even racial features.

Fifth, one of the trends of the Chinese leaders' battle for hegemony is to flirt with the imperialist powers behind the cover of talk about the "intermediate zone." The political meaning of this strategic "innovation" is to substantiate the need for separate

political cooperation between China and imperialist states — West Germany, Britain, France, Japan — while loudly accusing others of a "compact with imperialism."

This is the first time in its history that the world Communist movement is faced with such far-reaching efforts by a group of splitters to capture leadership of the revolutionary struggle at all costs and subordinate it to its great-power ambitions.

II. IDEOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL PLATFORM OF THE CHINESE LEADERS—A WEAPON OF STRUGGLE FOR HEGEMONY

The Chinese leaders have put forward their specific ideological and political platform which is openly counterposed to the general line of the world Communist movement. It is a waste of time to look for any consistency and logic in their views on the problems of our time. Lack of principle and pretentiousness glaringly stand out when you read their "theoretical researches."

Judging by everything, the Peking splitters have assigned a purely utilitarian role to their "special views."

Why, for example, did they have to fulminate against the points in the CPSU Program concerning the building of communism in the USSR and in general cast doubt on the achievements of the states? Certainly not in order to "protect" the purity of Marxist theory. The purpose here is entirely different: by rudely attacking the CPSU Program and branding it as "revisionist" they expect to cast a shadow on our Party, to discredit it. Listening to some loud-mouthed Chinese you might think that the USSR is not building communism but "restoring" capitalism. By spreading such wild fabrications about the first country of socialism, whose example is inspiring the working people to fight against capitalism, the Chinese leaders in effect are discrediting socialism as a social system and are disorienting the peoples on the most fundamental question of our time — the revolutionary transition to socialism and the essence of this new social and political system.

The truth must be squarely faced: Peking is casting doubts on the successes of the socialist states also because it hopes with the help of such disgraceful methods to justify its own gross miscalculations and failures in socialist construction.

Both the "go-it-alone" theory of building socialism and the "philosophy" of inevitable split of the revolutionary forces are of a similarly utilitarian character. Never before in the history of the Communist movement have the leaders of a Communist Party frankly and cynically proclaimed the philosophy of split to be their credo. Yet this is precisely what the Chinese leaders with their formula: "unity—struggle and even a split—a new unity on a new

basis" have done. What is this: a meaningless phrase or a thorougly considered policy? Of course, the latter. Now it is already possible to speak about a peculiar "unity" of word and deed of the Chinese neo-Trotskyites and nationalists: they have not only formulated their "philosophy of split" but are applying it in practice, are trying to realize their nefarious factionalist, disruptive schemes.

The chest where the Chinese leaders keep their "ideas" obviously has two bottoms.

From one of them for a time they extracted ideas adapted to the jointly-charted course of the world Communist movement, and from the other they are intensively drawing ideas for anti-Soviet slander, for substantiating their nationalistic line. On many questions of development of the world revolutionary process — whether major fundamental problems or concrete political actions — the present-day splitters have two positions, each of which is utilized depending on the circumstances.

Let us see how the position of the Chinese leadership has changed, for example, on the question of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the economic competition of socialism with capitalism.

Liu Shao-chi stated in the political report of the CPC Central Committee to the Eighth All-China Congress of the CPC (1956): "In foreign relations we undeviatingly pursue a consistent policy of peace and champion peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation between all states. We are convinced of the advantages of the socialist system and are not afraid to engage in peaceful competition with the capitalist countries . . . "

This was said at the highest forum of the Party seven years ago.

Have any big changes occured in the world since then, have the imperialist succeeded in undermining to any extent the policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the countries of the socialist community? No, they have not. On the contrary, the forces of socialism, peace and the national-liberation movement have grown still stronger during these years; the correctness of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence has been corroborated by the entire course of international development. But what does this matter to the Chinese leaders, gripped by their hegemonistic ambitions! Behind the back of their Party they renounced the foreign-policy line laid down in the decisions of the Eighth CPC Congress and began to oppose the Leninist principle of relations between states with different social systems. ". . . Peaceful coexistence," *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi*, organs of the CPC Central Committee, wrote in December 1963, "meets the needs of imperialism and aids the imperialist policy of aggression and war . . . It means replacement of the class struggle by class collaboration on a world scale."

Such an about-face of the Peking leaders on the question of peaceful coexistence reflects their present policy directed against the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, against the general foreign-policy line of the socialist countries elaborated by the world Communist movement.

The Chinese leaders are veering from one position to another also on such a major question as the methods and peace of building socialism and communism. Here too the main thing for them is not to find a constructive and real solution of the problem, not to theoretically comprehend the real processes in socialist society, but again to discredit the Soviet Union and communist construction at all costs, to denigrate the experience of the CPSU. Having proclaimed in 1958 the "big leap" and "people's communes" slogans, the Chinese leaders declared at that time that the Soviet Union had got stuck at the stage of socialism and was marking time, while China was advancing to communism with seven-league strides.

Posing as clairvoyants who had discovered a short cut to communism, they put forward a slogan: "Three years of hard work —ten thousand years of happy life."

But when their policy of the "big leap" to communism failed, the Peking leaders at once began attack the CPSU from diametrically opposite positions. This time they accused our Party of drawing up Utopian plans of building communism in the USSR in the lifetime of the present generation. They "forgot" everything they had said earlier, and are now asserting that to build socialism, communism, the efforts of many generations—five and perhaps ten generations are needed, in any case "not tens of years but a hundred and even hundreds of years." (Article in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* of July 14, 1964.)

But to tell the working class, the entire people that socialism, communism can be built only centuries later means ideologically to disarm the working people, to revise Lenin's well-known propositions on the building of communism. This is nothing but surrender on the part of the Chinese leaders in the face of the difficulties of building a new society, betrayal of revolutionary science.

As recently as a few years ago the Chinese leaders still recognized the inseverable bond between the international and national tasks of the revolutionary movement, the need "closely to coordinate the national democratic revolution of the oppressed peoples with the socialist revolution of the proletariat." Today, however, the Chinese leaders state the very opposite: to suit their purposes they are trying to sever the national-liberation movement from the socialist community, from the entire international working-class movement and thereby weaken and undermine the forces of the national-liberation movement. At the Afro-Asian Solidarity

Conference, held in Moshi in February 1963, Liu Ning-yi, one of the Chinese leaders, told the Soviet delegates: "East European countries should not interfere in Asian and African affairs . . . We are sorry you came here at all. You have no business here, your presence is an insult to the solidarity movement of the Afro-Asian countries. . . . Do as you wish, but we shall be against you."

Reducing theory to the role of an auxiliary instrument, the Chinese leaders are willing to make use of anything that can in some degree help realize their plans.

The political complexion and ideological sympathies of those who subscribe to the views of the Peking splitters are quite variegated. The Chinese leaders have dragged into their ideological lumber-room "Left" phrases, Troskyite slogans, nationalistic calls and apologia of the personality cult. All this is calculated to "catch" people, to win supporters whatever their views might be.

The "Left" phrases and the parading of a revolutionary spirit are intended for unstable, politically immature elements who are easily intoxicated by calls for the immediate armed overthrow of capitalism, without pausing to consider whether there are objective conditions for the victory of the socialist revolution or not.

The Trotskyite slogans are designed to attract all sorts of renegades ejected from the Communist parties, to draw them into a common factional bloc and to step up their subversive activity.

The nationalist calls are addressed to the young anti-imperialist forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Juggling with such calls, speculating on the community of historical destinies of the "three A's" the Chinese leaders expect to rally round themselves nationalistic-minded people.

The apology for the personality cult should, in the Chinese leaders' view, rally round them men in the Communist parties who adhere to doctrinaire conservative views and who abhor the revolutionary, creative spirit of the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, the Declaration and Statement adopted by the meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties.

In view of this, there is nothing surprising in the eclectic nature of the ideological and theoretical platform of the Chinese splitters. It is a conglomeration of "Left" opportunism, dogmatism and frankly revisionist ideas, fragments of revolutionary theory, Trotskyite theses, idealist opinions and sophistry of ancient Chinese philosophers, nationalistic and at times racialist ideas.

The lack of principle on theoretical questions displayed by the Chinese leaders is amazing. Today they can put forward one slogan, proclaim it the last word in Marxist science, and tomorrow replace it by another, directly the opposite and again announce that another great theoretical discovery has been made. But the logic of the

splitter clearly stands out behind this "theoretical" shuffling and manipulation of theses and slogans. The Chinese leadership is prepared to uphold any position as long as it is opposed to the views of the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties, the single general line of the world Communist movement, as long as it benefits the present-day splitters and helps them gain their ends.

The Chinese leaders cannot conceal the utilitarian nature of their ideological and theoretical platform however hard they try. Nor can anyone be deceived by their assurances that they are "defending" revolutionary theory from distortions of "contemporary revisionism."

The present-day splitters are trying to play the role of ideological pontiffs, "custodians" of revolutionary science; they lay claim to a monopoly of theory by stressing the universal significance of "Mao Tse-tung's ideas." They proclaim as illegitimate any new theoretical proposition not fathered by Mao Tse-tung. Small wonder that they are so vexed by the fact that the Communist parties are enriching the revolutionary teaching with new theoretical conclusions and propositions born in the struggle for socialism, the national independence of the peoples, and peace.

It is not accidental that the Chinese leaders are trying to discredit the conclusions and assessments made by the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties on the basis of an analysis of the changed historical conditions and generalization of rich revolutionary experience. Quotation juggling is a favorite method of the Chinese theorists: passages are torn out, literally plucked out of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and quoted frequently without any relation to their context.

They do not care in the least at what period, in what concrete situation the proposition quoted was put forward and in what conditions it was applied. Moreover, one and the same quotations migrate from one article to another, from one statement to another. It is not in this way, not by citing quotations that loyalty to the revolutionary teaching is demonstrated! We all know how scathingly Lenin ridiculed such a method of utilizing quotations.

Revolutionary reality, revolutionary action that is the proving-ground where the theoretical weapon of Marxism-Leninism is tested and perfected!

The Chinese leaders do not stop at outright distortion of statements by the founders of scientific communism when this suits their purpose. Many such instances have been exposed by the press of the CPSU and the fraternal parties. The dogmatism of the Chinese theorists is closely intertwined with an open revision of important tenets of Marxism-Leninism. In general, a rather peculiar situation has arisen: those who at every step are revising the revolutionary

teaching are screaming loudest about "contemporary revisionism." A combination of Leftist doctrinairism and revisionist tendencies is not in the least original and has been long familiar to the Communist movement. The point is that both dogmatism and revisionism are fed by a more or less homogeneous social source. **Dogmatism is merely the reverse side of revisionism.**

Constant rejection of the fundamental gains of Marxist thought in our time, just as frank revision of basic propositions of revolutionary theory, is ultimately crowned by attempts to replace Marxism by "Sinified Marxism," by the "ideas of Mao Tse-tung."

It is here that the political and ideological efforts of the Chinese leaders link up. It is characteristic that while in their articles addressed to the outside world the Chinese leaders appear to speak in the name of Marxism-Leninism, the articles addressed to the Chinese Communists talk only of the ideas of Mao Tse-tung and urge the Chinese Communists and all the working people to study only these ideas. So far the Chinese leaders still say formally that the ideas of Mao Tse-tung are connected with Marxism-Leninism, although they have already declared them to be the "most advanced stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism today." But judging by the Chinese press, the relation of Mao Tse-tung's ideas to Marxism-Leninism is mentioned in China more for tactical considerations, for the time being. Actually the indications are that the founding of a "new teaching" is about to be proclaimed.

Measures have recently been taken in China to mobilize workers in the sphere of scientific theory and ideology for struggle against the creative revolutionary conclusions of the international Communist movement, the CPSU and the fraternal parties.

Conferences have been held in provinces and cities of China. The training of post-graduates has been considerably extended at the philosophy departments of universities; new branches of the Association of Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences and of the Association for the Study of Afro-Asian Countries have been set up. At an enlarged session of the Council of the Philosphical and Social Sciences Department of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, held in Peking in the autumn of 1963, Chinese scientists were told "to study anew" Marxism-Leninism, the ideas of Mao Tse-tung, "to raise the banner of criticism in all spheres of ideology."

The entire arsenal of the social sciences in China has been placed on nationalistic lines and converted into a weapon of struggle against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

In the sphere of philosophy, Chinese scientists have been set the task of providing a system of apologetics for the philosophical views of Mao Tse-tung. According to modern Chinese treaties, there is no proposition of Marxist philosophy, no category of dia-

lectical and historical materialism which has been if not discovered, then at least formulated finally and completely by Mao Tse-tung. It is claimed in Peking that he revealed the connection of theory with the struggle of the masses, established that the production activity of man is the foundation of knowledge, elaborated the doctrine of practice as the criterion of truth, determined the difference between sensory and rational cognition, substantiated the idea of the correct combination of absolute and relative truth, put forward the thesis of "the active revolutionary theory of reflection" and made a whole series of other philosophical "discoveries."

As we see, the Chinese theorists, by ascribing to Mao Tse-tung all kinds of services in the field of philosophy, want so to say, to pave the way to placing him above Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Yet the philosophical articles of Mao Tse-tung "Concerning Practice," "Concerning Contradictions," "On the Question of Properly Resolving Contradictions Within the People" and others, which are depicted as the summit of Marxist philosophical thought, give no grounds whatsoever for claiming for their author any special contribution to philosophy. This is more than an exaggeration, it is inordinate laudation dictated by the personality cult. At best, Mao Tse-tung's philosophical articles may be regarded as a popular exposition which, moreover, suffers from serious mistakes and oversimplification.

The economic science of Marxism is now also being rewritten and turned inside out on a nationalistic pattern in China. Any subjectivist experiment of the Chinese leaders is proclaimed a new contribution to economic theory. Disregard for objective laws of economic development is elevated into a rule. In effect, economic science has been abolished in China. Indeed, what science can there be in question if the tasks of economic theory are reduced to justifying groundless experiments after they are made; if economic laws are utterly ignored; if economic policy is determined by ar-lectical and historical materialism which has been if not discovered, bitrary decisions, and the very role of economic factors in the life of society is challenged.

The Chinese leaders are importunely proclaiming the slogan: "Politics is a commanding force."

What meaning is invested in this formula? Perhaps the meaning invested in Lenin's well-known proposition: "Politics is a concentrated expression of economics?" No, this is a different concept. According to this concept politics acts as a military leader who issues orders, while the economy, like a disciplined soldier, carries them out. If the "supreme commander" decides on an assault, decides to attack, it orders the economy to make a "big leap" or, say, melt steel in "backyard furnaces," which it promptly does. But the

economy takes cruel revenge for attempts to do it such subjectivist violence.

To justify to the masses their economic policy, which has disorganized the economy of China, her leaders invent their own "economic laws" of socialism. Instead of the law of planned, proportionate development of the economy, they have invented the "law of wavelike development." The following "law" of motion is imputed to the socialist economy: "Flow—ebb—higher flow, that is, leap—conservatism—big leap." There is no need to prove that this abstruse formula ascribes to the socialist economy the cyclical development of the capitalist economy and replaces planned development and proportionality of the socialist economy by a formula of the constant disturbance of proportionality.

The Chinese leaders assign historical science a special role in "substantiating" their nationalistic claims and indoctrinating the people in the chauvinistic spirit.

In recent years, frankly nationalistic and even racialist ideas have been widely advocated in the works of Chinese scientists on questions of history. The messianic role of China is tirelessly underscored in the works of Chinese historians, in newspapers and magazines. They place in the center of world history the history of China which is pervaded with great-Han chauvinism and is pictured as a relay of cults from the ancient dynasties to our days. Anti-Sovietism and discrediting the revolutionary experience of the CPSU and the Soviet state is another manifestation of nationalistic tendencies in contemporary Chinese historical science.

Attempts are being made in China to revise scientific appraisals of certain historical events. For example, of late Chinese historians have been extolling the sanguinary, devastating campaigns of Genghis Khan. Why is a new interpretation given in China to questions of the Mongol and Manchu rule, why is it that the racial and state unity of the Mongol, Manchu and Han nations is now so persistently emphasized? Evidently here too everything is subordinated to considerations of the moment, to the tasks of the current home and foreign policy. That is why history is being "stretched and strained" to fit the requirements of the day. Behind all this are nothing more or less than thinly-disguised but far-reaching territorial claims.

Historical science in China is falsified along all lines and directions. The history of the Communist Party of China is being rewritten, reduced to the history of "deeds" performed by Mao Tse-tung and his closest entourage.

Let us turn to one more group of questions — to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of state and law.

The present-day splitters are revising in theory and in practice Lenin's injunctions concerning the need for the strictest observance

of socialist legality. To this day there are actually no legal codes in China: neither a code of criminal legal procedure, a civil code, nor a code of civil legal procedure. Moreover, attempts are actually made in Chinese juridical literature theoretically to justify violations of the law. Socialist law is regarded chiefly as an instrument of suppression; its creative, constructive role is ignored. Thus, the Chinese press asserts that articles of the law "possess a definite elasticity and they may be called an 'elastic measure'." In his article "On the Question of Properly Resolving Contradictions within the People" Mao Tse-tung advises judicial workers to look for grounds to apply an "elastic measure" to enemies of the people.

In effect, the main emphasis in present-day Chinese juridical science has been shifted to justifying and affirming arbitrary actions taken in the atmosphere of the personality cult.

The spirit of nationalism and hegemony has gripped contemporary Chinese literature, art and esthetics. Endlessly repeating the invocations about historism and the class nature, Chinese theorists are implanting extreme forms of a utilitarian view of the role of literature and art; they are in effect advocating subjectivist arbitrariness in art. The very concept of socialist realism has been discarded; a "new" creative method has been invented instead, which in effect leads to abstract idealization of phenomena and characters, to the substitution of legend for reality. The problem of reflecting life's truth has actually been removed from Chinese esthetics.

The Chinese press is ever more frequently stressing the priority of the national and speaking less and less about the international features in art. Moreover, of late it has been speaking already of the national spirit of Chinese art—to be more exact, of its national exclusiveness. On questions of revolutionary tactics the specific historical experience of the Chinese revolution is made a fetish of and imposed on other Communist parties as a model of tactics regardless of the concrete conditions in which these parties function.

It must be considered an accomplished fact that in China the social science have been shifted from Marxist-Leninist positions onto nationalist positions. Most likely it is not for nothing that a considerable part of the works of the Chinese historians, philosophers, jurists and economists, are carefully hidden from the outside world to this day. The sending of many books and scientific journals abroad has been strictly forbidden. The number of books sent by Chinese libraries to Soviet libraries on an exchange basis has been sharply cut. Chinese organizations have reduced to a minimum the contacts of Chinese scientists with foreign, above all Soviet, scientists.

By fencing off their scientists from their colleagues in the socialist

countries the Chinese leaders are isolating social science as such from Marxism-Leninism.

III. ANTI-LENINIST ESSENCE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE PRESENT-DAY SPLITTERS

The spread of Marxist ideas in China, it will be recalled, began under the influence of the October Socialist Revolution. The first Marxist work in Chinese was published at that time.

The present Chinese leaders studied the dialectical materialist world outlook after being brought up on the ideas and traditions of ancient Chinese wisdom. Moreover, they studied Marxism primarily from the book *The ABC of Communism* and later from various works of Stalin. Marxism frequently was perceived by Chinese intellectuals in a specific way, through the prism of the traditional philosophy of Confucianism. The living dialectics of life was replaced by the sophistry of Confusion and his disciple Lao-tze. To this day the traditions of dead wisdom weigh down on the living in China.

It is not at all accidental that attempts were made in China to portray Confucius as all but a Marxist. Kuo Mo-jo's story, describing an allegorical conversation between Marx and Confucius, is little known in our country. The author makes Marx utter the following words: "I never expected that in the distant East two thousand years ago there was such an esteemed man who had identical ideas. You and I are completely at one in our views." First published in the '20s, Kuo Mo-jo's story was reprinted in China in 1950.

If one reads carefully the works of Mao Tse-tung and his commentators, it is not difficult to discern that their theoretical thinking bears the stamp of oversimplification and schematism.

Let us take the officially-approved text-book of dialectical materialism, published in Peking in 1962. Philosophical propositions are not expounded in it but are simply dogmatically proclaimed. The formula: "Mao Tse-tung said . . ." serves as the sole and most potent argument.

Doctrinairism, replacement of dialectics by sophistry is the determining features of "Maoism." The views of Mao Tse-tung and his commentators on the dialectical method differ from the views of the classics of Marxism. It will be recalled that Marx, Engels and Lenin energetically opposed vulgarization of the dialectical method, and attempts to explain objective phenomena on the basis of *a priori* schemes and formulas. Elaborating and developing their method, the classics of Marxism-Leninism proceeded from life and did not construct life proceeding from formulas. Proponents of "Sinified Marxism" act the other way round: they proceed from abstract propositions and impose formulas on life.

Here is a dictum extolled in China as "classical:" "Marxist philosophy holds that the law of the unity of opposites is the basic law of the universe. This law operates everywhere both in nature and in human society and in the minds of people."

That the law of the unity and struggle of opposites is universal is a truth known for a long time. But Marxist philosophy has never counterposed one law of dialectics to another, never considered one law basic and the others, as it were, secondary. The classics of Marxism have always warned against a one-sided approach, against singling out one link in development outside its connection with the other links, stressing that it is in such arbitrary singling out that the epistemological roots of idealism are hidden.

The law of the unity and struggle of opposites is the core of dialectics. But divorced from other laws governing the development of nature, society and thought it turns into an absolute. It is such a separation that Mao Tse-tung effects when he tries to deduce from this law the entire sum-total of social life, artificially constructs a "contradiction within the people," and sets the task of "continuously resolving contradictions" — without regard for the degree of their maturity — in order to ensure the "continuous revolution," the continuous "big leap," ignoring objective laws and skipping necessary stages of development. While regarding the law of the unity and struggle of opposites the "basic law of the universe," Mao Tse-tung nevertheless views it onesidedly. He sees only the *struggle* of opposites and does not notice the specific forms of their dialectical *unity* in different social conditions. Such an approach ignores in advance the specific manifestations of the laws of dialectics in different socio-economic formations. Moreover, this precludes the presentation of the question: could not our knowledge of the dialectics of social development be rendered more exact and enriched by the study of the experience of socialist construction? It is this truly scientific approach to an analysis of social phenomena that is demanded by the method of dialectical materialism. Otherwise, Lenin noted, "instead of an objective connection and interdependence of historical phenomena in their entirety, a 'subjective' concoction is presented to justify, perhaps, a foul cause" (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 30, p. 351).

It is such a subjective concoction that is presented by the Chinese theorists' statements on questions of socialist and communist construction, particularly by the violently provocative articles in *Jenminjihpao* and *Hungchi* of February 4, March 31 and July 14, 1964.

Juggling with the law of the unity and struggle of opposites, the Chinese ideologists assert that after the socialist transformations too, there supposedly remain antagonistic classes, that the question "who will win" has not been settled in the USSR: a struggle is

going on between classes and between two ways—the socialist and the capitalist. That such "theoretical" conclusions are drawn not out of ignorance but for the attainment of very definite, obviously foul ends is revealed by the fact alone that the articles are crammed with slanderous fabrications about the existence of class struggle in the USSR and the "restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union." At the same time the practices in China are lauded to the skies and incense is burned to Mao Tse-tung as the great leader and infallible thinker.

The hidden designs thus become clear. Today there is no longer any doubt that the "theoretical" exercises of the Chinese nationalists and splitters have but one objective—to justify their actions directed against the Soviet Union, the CPSU and the world Communist movement.

To adapt theory to their political purpose the Chinese leaders have discarded the dialectical method and have adopted a mechanistic position and are manipulating with the theory of equilibrium which has always served as a methodological basis for distorting Marxism both from the Right and from the Left.

Take, for instance, Mao Tse-tung's reasoning as regards planning: "In our country," he writes, "an economic plan is drawn up annually, a corresponding proportion between accumulation and consumption is established so as to attain equilibrium between production and needs. This equilibrium is a temporary and relative unity of opposites. A year passes and, generally speaking, this equilibrium is upset by the struggle of opposites, this unity changes, the equilibrium turns into disequilibrium, the unity ceases to be unity, and next year we again have to strive for equilibrium and unity. This is the advantage of our planned economy. In fact, such equilibrium and unity are partially disturbed every month, every quarter, and this makes partial regulation necessary. At times, in view of the fact that subjective regulation does not correspond to objective reality contradictions arise and the equilibrium is upset. This is called making a mistake. Contradictions continuously arise and are continuously resolved, and it is this that is the dialectical law of development of things and phenomena."*(On the Question of Properly Resolving Contradictions Within the People)*.

Here, as we see, the dialectical materialist teaching on the unity and struggle of opposites as the source of development is openly exploited to justify derangements and failures in the economy.

It should be noted that a universal, general philosophical meaning is imparted to the line of reasoning about equilibrium and disequilibrium. But such a "theory" with its cyclical movement on one and the same plane according to the formula: equilibrium—disequilibrium—equilibrium, creates only a semblance of forward move-

ment. It does not provide a way out of the contradictions and plunges us into a vicious circle. What has this in common with dialectics? Similarly mechanistic distortions are contained in other formulas of Mao Tse-tung, for example: "Practice — knowledge, and again knowledge;" "cohesion — criticism — cohesion;" "summing up of experience — introducing it among the masses — new summing up of experience," and the like.

In China all this is called "saddle-like" rhythm of development. But "saddle-like" rocking on one spot has nothing in common with dialectical development along an ascending line.

The mechanistic views of the Chinese theorists, presented as dialectics, are an outright distortion of the dialectical doctrine of contradiction. Indeed, the dialectical unity and struggle of opposites must not be reduced to the mechanical antagonism of two external forces. In such a case, the interaction of opposite sides of a process, their interpenetration and struggle drops out, and only antagonism remains — the counterposing of opposites, and ultimately their physical clash. Chinese propaganda has declared Mao Tse-tung's "development" of the doctrine of contradictions to be one of his greatest theoretical contributions. In reality, however, it has been turned into the main object of theoretical speculations and tricks of sophistry.

Mao Tse-tung's work *On the Question of Properly Resolving Contradictions within the People* clearly shows the direction in which he is "developing" the kernel of dialectics.

It will be recalled that Lenin, summing up the first steps of socialist construction in our country, wrote that after the victory of the socialist revolution new forms of the class struggle arise: suppression of the resistance of the exploiters within the country and civil war, neutralization of the petty bourgeoisie, employment of bourgeois specialists, development of a new labor discipline, etc. Mao Tse-tung begins from the other end: he replaces the Leninist concept of new forms of the class struggle by the concept "contradictions within the people." In so doing he completely loses sight of the new factors of social life — alliance of the working class and the working peasantry, socio-political unity of society, and others. He has invented a whole system of "contradictions within the people." It is known, for example, that the socialist government represents the interests of the people and serves the people. But according to Mao Tse-tung, there exists a contradiction between the people and the socialist government. Contradictions within the working class, within the peasantry and within the intelligentsia are similarly invented.

There is no disputing the point that socialism has its own—non-antagonistic—contradictions. But they arise and are resolved within the framework of the growing socio-political and ideological unity

of society. Mao Tse-tung's thesis, however, that each contradiction of socialist society is a "contradiction within the people" is becoming the methodological basis for the assertion that the victory of socialism does not rule out sharp class struggle and class antagonisms. Moreover, it is asserted that the successes of socialist construction lead to a revival of social antagonisms and to the inevitable birth, within socialist society, of classes or social groups that are the carriers of such antagonisms. From this the conclusion is drawn that under socialism the class struggle grows more acute. Doubt is thereby cast on the very possibility of deciding the question "Who will win?", on the very possibility of the victory of socialism and communism. As we see, the Chinese theorists have adopted Stalin's erroneous thesis: the greater the successes in building socialism, the more bitter and sharper the class struggle.

Metaphysically making opposites into an absolute, the Chinese theorists are discarding the objective laws of development of the proletarian movement, of socialist construction.

Marx and Engels scientifically substantiated the historical mission of the proletariat as the grave-digger of capitalism and demonstrated that the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie is the motive force of development in the present epoch. They issued the call: "Workers of all lands, unite!" These militant words are not only a slogan. They express a major law of the class struggle of the proletariat: unity of the workers of all countries is decisive for their victory over the bourgeoisie. Revolutionary struggle against capitalism and unity of the workers of all countries are two sides of one law.

Those who undermine the unity of the workers of all countries, undermine the foundation of their class struggle and betray Marxism-Leninism.

It is this road that the leadership of the Communist Party of China has now taken. Speculating on the "holy of holies" of dialectics, namely on the doctrine of contradictions, on the law of "division of the whole," the Chinese theorists are hastily elaborating the "theoretical principles" of their splitting actions. If we are to believe them, the Communist movement develops and advances only because it divides into opposites: unity inevitably and inexorably gives way to division; out of division, out of the struggle of the opposed forces a new unity arises, which is again divided leading to a new split, and so on and so forth. If the contemporary Communist movement grows weaker and regresses, the reasons for it should be sought in its unity; if world communism is destined to perish, it will perish only because of unity—this is written in all seriousness by *Jenminjihpao.*

What is there here of Marxism-Leninism? This is irresponsible

chatter, a splitting game fraught with grave dangers for the international Communist movement.

The present-day splitters advise the world Communist movement not to be afraid but boldly to split its unity, because without division of the whole there supposedly is no forward movement. Let the world Communist movement split, they say in Peking, nothing terrible will happen — "the sky will not fall down, fish will go on swimming and women will go on bearing children."

What is this if not deliberate falsification of Marxist philosophy, subversion of the forces of the revolution?

Dialectical materialism is the philosophy of revolutionary action which represents unity of theory and practice. While assigning a tremendous role to man's activity, incorporating practice in the theory of knowledge as its starting point, basis and ultimate result, the philosophy of Marxism has never denied the great role of theory. A pragmatic, utilitarian approach, when theory is converted into a meek hand-maiden of practice understood in a narrow-minded way, is alien to the creative spirit of Marxism. But it is this pragmatic approach that is highly characteristic of the Chinese leaders.

"Maoism" introduces into philosophy an element alien to Marxism, an element of utilitarianism and subjectivism, of which voluntarism is the extreme expression in social theory.

The internal dialectical interconnection of the objective laws of social development and subjective factors of historical development have always been a stumbling block for opportunists, irrespective of whether they attack Marxism from the Right or from the "Left". Fatalistic overestimation of objective conditions and disparagement of the importance of the revolutionary activity of the masses is known to be the theoretical basis of Right-wing opportunism. Picturing history as a spontaneous process predetermined by immanent laws of motion, Right-wing opportunists inevitably slip down to downright evolutionism, to bourgeois objectivism.

But is the activity of the heroes of "Left phrases" — who with a light heart sacrifice an objective analysis of reality in order to satisfy their petty-bourgeois vehemence and to issue a bombastic slogan—less dangerous and pernicious for its consequences? "No error could be more dangerous for the proletarian party," Lenin warned, "than to base its tactics on subjective desires . . ." (*Collected Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. 31, p. 352).

Any attempt to be "more to the Left" than Marxism inevitably leads to subjectivism, to replacing a scientific materialist understanding of history by idealistic views.

Take the voluntaristic "theory of violence" preached by the Chinese leaders. They assert that war is the decisive driving force: no matter where you turn, mankind's road to a lasting peace, to the triumph of socialism on a worldwide scale passes through war.

"There is only one way to destroy war," Chinese theorists claim, "and that is to fight war with war." War, they orate, is not only as inexorable as fate, it is the bridge across which "mankind will march into a new historical epoch." According to this militarist theory, any revolution is a clash and revolutionary methods are always military methods. Revolution is war; war and revolutionary actions are concepts as it were, of the same order. "Every Communist," Mao Tse-tung says, "must learn the truth that the rifle gives birth to power."

Of course it is one thing when the masses rise in revolt, when they are confronted with the enemy's weapons. But to declare such a situation universal, suitable in all possible historical circumstances, is absurd. Life dictates diverse forms of struggle.

This hash of revolutionary phrases and arguments in the spirit of the theory of violence borrowed from *Duehring*, all this eclectics of the Chinese theorists is loudly declared to be the theoretical foundation of the "general line" of the Communist movement!

It is therefore hardly surprising that even such a statement by Mao Tse-tung as "imperialism is merely a paper tiger" has been lauded in China as a scientific discovery, has been elevated to the rank of a basic law of imperialism's development and equated with the scientific exploit of Marx. "By discovering the law of surplus value, Marx revealed the essence of capitalist exploitation," we read in a Chinese textbook on dialectical materialism. "Comrade Mao Tse-tung, on the basis of an analysis of imperialism's contradictions, has revealed the law of development of imperialism and of all reactionary forces: 'To run amuck, suffer defeat, again run amuck, again suffer defeat and so on until they perish', and thereby revealed the essence of imperialism which is that outwardly imperialism seems powerful but in reality it is no more than a paper tiger."

Is there any need to analyze the economic and political processes under way in contemporary capitalism? Not at all, for everything is so very simple, like taking a drink of water: "The imperialists and all reactionaries are paper tigers."

Such an assessment of the enemy's forces, called "strategy of contempt" in China, can only engender and nurture the petty-bourgeois illusion that all tasks of the struggle against imperialism can be accomplished at one fell swoop. We might note that the pseudo-scientific "strategy of contempt" serves as the starting point for falsifying the entire world historical process. According to the latest revelations of the Chinese theorists, all historical development is governed by the general sociological law of "accumulation of weapons" in the hands of the exploited. The destinies of all social movements in the past depended, it appears, on the quantity of these weapons; it likewise predetermines the expansion

of the sphere of revolutionary action in our time. The only thing needed is weapons, and victory is assured.

This is how scientific analysis and the scientific method of historical study are sacrificed to reckless schemes.

At present our Party, the Communists of the world are faced with the urgent task of repulsing the attacks of the Chinese splitters on Marxism-Leninism, exposing the anti-Leninist, nationalistic essence of their positions, and upholding and strengthening the socialist community, the unity of the international Communist movement and all the revolutionary forces of our time.

The struggle against the line of the Chinese leaders is based on the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism.

When we speak of the need to uphold the purity of Marxism-Leninism, we least of all have in mind worship of formulas, mummification" of formulas and an attitude to theory as a hard and fast rule for all regardless of the time, place and circumstances. Nothing is more alien to the Marxist-Leninist teaching, which is revolutionary and critical in its very spirit, than its conversion into a catechism of ossified dogmas. That is why to fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism means to expose distortions of it, creatively to develop it and to enrich it with new ideas and new experience. It is this that enables the Party and the working people to measure up to the tasks of our time, to take into account the changed reality, to choose the most reliable ways of struggle for the victory of socialism, for building communist society. All creative work of developing theory and scientifically elaborating urgent problems of internal and international life must rest, naturally, on the methodolgy of Marxism-Leninism and be steadily guided by class, proletarian interests.

Our Party consistently upholds the fundamental ideas of the Marxist-Leninist teaching:

It is the teaching concerning the historical role of the working class, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat; the idea of proletarian internationalism, of uniting the socialist community, the world Communist movement and the working people of all countries in the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

It is the idea that socialism is the affair of the people themselves and that any imposition of it from the outside, just as the export of counter-revolution, are impermissible; the idea that for the victory of the socialist revolution it is necessary to educate and organize the masses politically and to master all forms of struggle.

It is the idea that the masses must be drawn to the maximum extent into the conscious making of history because both socialism and communism are the vital concern of the working people themselves. It is the idea that the socialist State of the entire people,

into which the State of the proletarian dictatorship turns at a definite historical stage, ensures the all-round development of socialist democracy.

It is the proposition that the socialist countries exert their main influence on the course of world development by their economic successes, by the power of example, by the correct realization of the ideals of socialism; that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence is the firm foundation of the foreign policy of the socialist states.

It is the ideals of communism proclaimed in the Program of our Party—Peace, Labor, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness for all the peoples.

Mankind is now living in the great epoch of the transition of ever new countries and peoples to socialism. This mighty movement is embracing the broadest social strata, which naturally are bringing into it their views and ideas. On the whole, this is a favorable objective process; it is supported by the Marxist-Leninists, who take a broad-minded and friendly view of all sincere supporters of socialism, even if they have not yet taken a firm and consistent scientific stand.

But it is in such conditions that it is necessary to particularly carefully protect the theory of scientific socialism from possible distortions and to creatively develop it, to advocate with special persistence the ideas of Marxism-Leninism which indicates the only true road to building a genuinely just society, and to popularize the international experience of building socialism on the basis of applying the theory of scientific socialism. It is in this way that we will be able to preserve best of all the purity of our great teaching and contribute to its new successes.

We must act not as a scientis divorced from practice who preserves the purity of a culture in an isolated test-tube, but as a ploughman who thoroughly tills the soil so that the selected seeds planted in it should yield a rich harvest.

The struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism and for the unity of the world Communist movement confronts all branches of Soviet social science with important tasks. Soviet scholars must feel and, what is most important, act like militant fighters of the ideological front; they must produce new studies creatively elaborating the most diverse aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory, including popular works on all the main questions of our time.

The views and actions of the leaders of the Communist Party of China are gravely harming the socialist community and the entire world liberation movement.

We have no right to close our eyes to the fact that the present-day splitters have succeeded in breaking away some contingents from the world Communist front and forming factional groups in a

number of Parties. The enemies of communism are gleefully rubbing their hands, predicting the collapse of the Communist movement. But it has happened more than once that our enemies from the imperialist camp rejoiced and prepared for a funeral feast for the working-class movement. But how did all this end? The Communist parties emerged from what seemed to be critical situations stronger and more battle-seasoned than ever. Socialism is triumphantly advancing, while the positions of imperialism are steadily growing weaker and its spheres of influence are shrinking.

We are convinced that the anti-communist fortune-tellers will discredit themselves this time as well. The world Communist movement will overcome the present difficulties too. Consolidation of the Marxist-Leninist parties, their firm resolve to uphold and strengthen the unity of the revolutionary forces and the purity of the great banner of Marxism-Leninism, are a pledge of victory.

Social development, the entire course of events are increasingly laying bare the ideological poverty of the present-day splitters, the subjectivism and adventurism of their policy. The swiftly flowing stream of life, the irrepressible growth of the revolutionary forces will show the complete bankruptcy of the positions of the Chinese petty-bourgeois nationalists, "Left" opportunists and neo-Trotskyites. As for those who have taken a wrong stand stand because of delusion, insufficient maturity or lack of experience, the practical achievements of the Communist parties in applying the Leninist general line are bound to bring them back to the right road.

Under the banner of creative Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism the world Communist movement will achieve new outstanding victories.

CONCERNING MAO TSE-TUNGS INTERVIEW WITH A GROUP OF JAPANESE SOCIALISTS*

Mao Tse-tung's interview with a group of Japanese Sociailsts who visited Peking was recently published in Japan. The bourgeois newspapermen lauded his statements to the sky: they liked what the Chairman of the Communist Party of China said. The contents of the conversation were such that at first it was difficult to believe its authenticity. Indeed, bourgeois newspapers write all sorts of things in an effort to poison the international atmosphere, to provoke quarrels between socialist countries.

One expected that Peking would refute this report but no denial was forthcoming. On the contrary, Chinese leaders made it clear that Mao Tse-tung's interview published by the Japanese press did take place. When a Soviet representative in Peking asked Wang Ping-nan, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, for an explanation, the latter declared that "if Mao Tse-tung said so he agreed with him." On August 1, the Japanese newspaper *Asahi,* published a statement by Chou En-lai. This statement actually contained the same ideas as those expressed in Mao Tse-tung's interview.

Consequently there was no longer any doubt that the Japanese press had reproduced the statement made by the Chairman of the Communist Party of China.

This interview discloses the aims and positions of the Chinese leadership of which they had hitherto spoken only in whispers. Therefore it is useful to publish this talk so that the Soviet people could see how far the CPC leaders have gone in their struggle against our people, the peoples of other countries of socialism, the entire world Communist movement.

It is well known that the Chinese leadership, having started their struggle against the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties, have been trying to make it appear as if they were coming out in defense of Marxism-Leninism, "safeguarding" the interests of the world revolutionary and liberation movement. More than that, when vilifying our Party and our country and speaking about the "bourgeois degeneration of the Soviet people," the CPC leaders had the temerity to claim that they were concerned for the interests of our country and of other countries of socialism.

---

*Pravda editorial, September 2, 1964.

When in 1960 the CPC leaders started a polemic about the character of our epoch, about the possibility of preventing world war, about peaceful and non-peaceful transition to socialism and other questions, one could think that they disagreed with the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties on ideological problems only. But as they developed the polemic, more and more doubts appeared: do the CPC leaders really mean what they write? The unseemly political aims of the CPC leaders became more and more clearly discernible behind theoretical controversies. Mao Tse-tung's interview provides further confirmation of this.

As is evident from the interview given by the CPC Chairman, the Chinese leaders even now do not try to camouflage their expansionist aspirations. According to the Japanese press, Mao Tse-tung does not even mention ideological questions. In his talk there is not one single word about Marxism-Leninism, about socialism, about the unity of the working class, about the struggle for the interests of the world working-class and national-liberation movements. In this talk there is not a trace of a class analysis of the contemporary world, of a class approach to the choice of friends and allies in the struggle against imperialism. The main thing with which Mao Tse-tung is concerned is to whip up anti-Soviet feelings, to speculate on the nationalist sentiments of the most reactionary forces.

I

Mao Tse-tung began his talk with statments about the so-called intermediate zone. This theory came into being as early as 1946. In its original form it boiled down to the following: the Chinese leaders divided the whole world into three parts or zones. The first—American imperialist, the USA. The second—the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The third zone, lying between them, as it were, (hence—intermediate)—mainly the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Now Mao Tse-tung is introducing a correction into this "theory". Slanderously declaring that the USSR "has entered into a complot with the United States to struggle for world domination," he actually combines the two main zones into one. This scheme leaves him with two zones: "Soviet-American" and the so-called "intermediate" which actually includes China as well. The division of the world into two opposing social systems which is recognized by all Marxists thus disappears.

According to the Chinese theoreticians, the intermediate zone represents revolution and progress. As for the Soviet Union and the United States, they, according to this theory, "entered into a complot" in order to struggle for world domination. Hence the conclusion is drawn that the peoples of the intermediate zone

must wage a struggle against American imperialism and, at the same time, against the Soviet Union. Such is the main purpose of the theoretical exercises of the Chinese leadership.

To say that the theory of the intermediate zone has nothing in common with Marxism is to say very little. This is not merely a non-Marxist concept; it is a militant anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist concept.

The basic principle of Marxism-Leninism consists in the class approach to all phenomena of the life of society, in the assessment of all these phenomena from the positions of the proletariat, the most progressive class. Precisely such an approach underlies the analysis of our epoch given by the Communist Workers' parties of the world in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings. The contemporary world is not divided into geographical zones but into opposing social systems—the socialist and the capitalist systems. Revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism constitutes the basic content of our epoch: all revolutionary forces of our time—the world system of socialism, the workers' movement in the capitalist countries, the national-liberation movement—merge into a single front and jointly pressure imperialism, achieving more and more successes in the struggle for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

But this class approach does not satisfy Peking theoreticians. They brush it aside completely. Their "intermediate zones" equate the countries fighting against imperialism, for their national independence with the imperialist states; with the working class, the working masses of the capitalist countries, with the ruling bourgeoisie. Thus Chairman Mao lumps together in the intermediate zone the exploiters and the exploited, the oppressors and the oppressed.

In the interview it was stated: "All the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America come out against imperialism. Europe, Canada and other countries also come out against imperialism." Note, not the working people of Europe and Canada, but the whole of Europe and the whole of Canada, including capitalist monopolies, the reactionary bourgeois parties, the French "ultras," the Bonn revanchists and the like. All these, it turns out, are fighters against imperialism, and the revolutionary movement has no other alternative but to welcome to its ranks the Messrs. Krupps, Thyssens, Rothschilds, and, perhaps even General Franco himself.

In accordance with the intermediate zone theory the course of events in the world is not determined by the struggle of antagonistic classes and opposing social systems but by the struggle of some powers and geographical regions against others. This theory actually ignores the nature of the social system of this or that country. Not only does it merely ignore the class approach

but replaces it by a super-nationalistic approach prompted by the great power policy of the CPC leaders.

Guided by such an approach, the Chinese leaders are playing their dangerous political game. Since they regard the socialist camp as an obstacle to the realization of their hegemonistic schemes with regard to the national-liberation movement, they are trying to cut off this movement from the world system of socialism. This is why they construct the first intermediate zone with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, including China. Since the Chinese leaders are looking for rich economic partners and potential allies in the international arena among the developed capitalist countries, they include nearly the whole capitalist world into the intermediate zone and issue it the mandate of a "fighter against imperialism."

Moreover, Chairman Mao now and then issues personal mandates to those imperialist countries with which Peking is flirting with particular zeal. It was but yesterday that Chinese propagandists referred to General de Gaulle as a "fascist and bandit." But it was enough for him to hint at the possibility of a rapprochement with Peking for the General to become one of the most active fighters against American imperialism. This is not enough. The Chinese leaders clearly hint in a number of pronouncements that "France may restore her influence in Asia."

Examples of this kind are also found in the interview published today. Japan is a developed country, Mao Tse-tung says, "she may help us in many respects. We also must support each other politically. This invitation to cooperate is immediately backed up by a mandate issued not to the country as a whole but to its ruling class. Japanese monopoly capital belong to the second intermediate zone, Mao Tse-tung says. "Even this capital is displeased with the USA, and some of its representatives openly come out against the United States. Although the monopoly capital of Japan now depends on the USA, in time it will throw off the American yoke." Thus it follows that it will be not the Japanese people, not the working class who will throw off the yoke of their own and foreign oppressors, as the progressive representatives of the Japanese working people say, but monopoly capital that will throw off the yoke of its American counterpart.

Thus the French and Japanese monopoly capitalists are classed with the anti-imperialists. And what will happen if tomorrow the United States' monopolists find it advantageous for themselves to revise their policy of non-recognition of the PCR and offer it economic cooperation? Will they also be issued a mandate as "fighters against imperialism?" Will it then be necessary to include the United States into the "intermediate zone" too?

We should be grateful to Chairman Mao Tse-tung: no one has

exposed the actual aims of the Chinese leadership better than he has. The theory of the intermediate zone is a hopeless, futile attempt to provide some "ideological basis" for a frankly nationalistic policy. Of course, there are contradictions between the imperialists of the United States and Japan as well as France and other capitalist countries, and a struggle is waged for markets and spheres of capital investment. The revolutionary forces make use of these contradictions. But to use contradictions in the camp of imperialism in the interest of the common struggle of peace and social progress is one thing and to flirt and form blocs with the class enemy is something entirely different. But the Chinese leaders, who call themselves internationalists, are actually ready to compact with anybody in the name of the struggle against the friends and allies of People's China—the Soviet Union and other countries of socialism.

Mao Tse-tung described the struggle waged by the CPC leadership against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as a "paper war" and added that such a war does nobody any harm since no one is killed in it. This in the first place contains recognition of the fact that the Chinese leaders regard their polemic with the CPSU and other fraternal parties as "a kind of war." Secondly, this clearly reveals the supercilious attitude of the CPC leaders to the interests of the unity of the world Communist and liberation movement.

The Communists of the whole world express deep concern over the situation that has taken shape in the international Communist movement through the fault of the Chinese leaders. The damage they have inflicted on the cause of the struggle of the peoples for peace, national independence and social progress is obvious to everybody. And here is Mao Tse-tung declaring: no reason to worry, this is a war without bloodshed, without any casualties!

No, we cannot agree with the Chinese leaders' assessment of their own actions. Their struggle against the CPSU, against the world Communist movement, against the USSR and other socialist countries is not a "paper war." In ferocity, scale and method, it does not differ from the cold war of imperialism against the countries of socialism.

II

Mao Tse-tung's pronouncements on the territorial question clearly show how far the Chinese leaders have gone in the cold war against the Soviet Union. He is not just claiming this or that part of Soviet territory but is depicting his claims as a part of some "general territorial question."

We are faced with an openly expansionist program with far-reaching claims.

This program did not appear today or yesterday. In 1954 a textbook on modern history was put out in the CPR with a map of China showing the country as it was, in the opinion of its authors, before the first opium war. This map included, as parts of China, Burma, Vietnam, Korea, Thailand, Malaya, Nepal, Bhutan, Sikkim; in the North the border ran along the Stanovoi Range cutting the Far Eastern territory from the USSR; in the West parts of Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan (up to lake Balkhash) were also included into China. Sakhalin too was shown as Chinese territory. According to the textbook, all these lands and countries were once "state territory of China" taken from her.

At that time it seemed that the publication of such a textbook was the result of an oversight or the provocative activities of nationalistic elements. But subsequent events disproved this conjecture. Maps showing various parts of the Soviet Union and other countries neighboring on China as Chinese territory continued to be published in the CPR.

Chinese representatives have latterly been referring with increasing frequency to hundreds of thousands of square kilometers of Soviet territory which allegedly belong "by right" to China.

The recent issue of the Peking magazine *Lishih Yenchiu* (No. 4, 1964) contends that "Russia captured vast lands to the north of the River Heilungkiang and to the east of the River Ussuri," ". . . Russia has at various times annexed vast lands in Sinkiang and in the Northeast area."

And now Mao Tse-tung declared in the above interview: "About a hundred years ago the area to the east of Baikal became the territory of Russia and since then Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka and other points have been the territory of the Soviet Union. We have not yet asked for a settlement of this account!"

By what right are the Chinese leaders claiming lands that did not belong to China? They refer to the fact that many hundred years ago Chinese troops came to these areas and that once the Chinese Emperor collected tribute from the local people. Indeed, if the question involved were not so serious, such "historic arguments" could be described as childish.

The history of mankind is full of examples of the rise and fall of states, the resettlement of peoples in the course of which the borders between states changed more than once. By resorting to the method of "historic references" in the question of borders one can prove anything. For instance, one can prove that England is French territory because she was once the possession of the Duke of Normandy. One can prove, on the contrary, that France is an English possession because at one time, during the 100-Years'

War, she was almost completely conquered by the English. With the help of such arguments one can also prove that the borders of the CPR pass only along the line of the Great Wall of China which is less than 100 kilometers away from Peking. Indeed, the border of China did once pass there and the wall itself bears testimony to this.

But even if one were to take the references to "historic rights" seriously, one would find that in this case they do not correspond in any way to facts. As is known, in the middle of the 17th century China's possessions extended only to the Khingan Range, that is considerably to the south of the River Amur. The territories to the north of Khingan were populated by local indigenous tribes (Evenks, Daurs, etc.) who were subjected from time to time to raids by the Manchurians and paid tribute to them. There was no indigenous Manchurian or Chinese population in the Amur area. The process of the definition of actual borders took place with the development by Russia of the northern half of the Amur basin and of the southern part by China. More than a hundred years ago the border was established accordingly in the Aigun and Peking treaties.

No one denies that the tsarist government pursued a predatory policy, as did the Chinese emperors to the extent of their abilities. At various times the stronger prevailed over the others. This resulted in a certain change in the distribution of the peoples. But the working people did not think about territorial gains. They worked on the land they had to live on, watering it with their sweat. One can only be amazed that anyone can question the right of workers and peasants to the land on which they have lived and toiled from time immemorial on the sole grounds that once upon a time a certain emperor defeated another and was later on himself defeated.

Do those who question the fact that this territory of more than one and a half million square kilometers belongs to the Soviet Union think of these claims will be taken by the Soviet people who have lived and worked on this land for several generations and consider it their homeland, the land of their forefathers?

That is why we say that the present border has developed historically and has been established by life itself, and the border treaties are a basis which cannot be disregarded.

The CPSU headed the struggle of the working class and all toiling masses of Russia against tsarism and routed it completely. It is well known that in the very first years of its existence the Soviet government cancelled all the unequal treaties with China. Continuing the Leninist policy, the Soviet government gave up the naval base in Port Arthur and handed over free of charge to the CPR government all its rights in the joint management of

the Chinese-Changchun Railway with all the property belonging to the railway. Lenin wrathfully condemned the capture of Port Arthur by the tsarist government and the infiltration of Manchuria. But it was none other than Lenin who said: ". . . Vladivostok is far away, but this city is ours."

The USSR is an absolutely new state formation which emerged as a voluntary union of Soviet Republics created on the ruins of the tsarist empire. And whereas the borders of tsarist Russia were determined by the policy of imperialist invaders, the borders of the Soviet Union were formed as a result of a voluntary expression of the will of the peoples on the basis of the principle of free self-determination of nations. The peoples who joined the Soviet Union will never allow anyone to encroach upon their right to guide their own destiny.

In his interview Mao Tse-tung bemoans the fate of Mongolia which, as he put it, the Soviet Union "placed . . . under its rule." This can evoke nothing but indignation. Everybody knows that the Mongolian People's Republic has been a sovereign socialist state for more than 40 years now and enjoys all the rights of an independent country.

Why did Mao Tse-tung have to make such obviously wild statements? The fact is that the existence of an independent Mongolian state which maintains friendly relations with the USSR and other socialist countries does not suit the Chinese leaders. They would like to deprive the MPR of independence and make it a Chinese province. The CPR leaders proposed that N. S. Khrushchov and other Soviet comrades "come to an understanding" on this during the latter's visit to Peking in 1954.

N. S. Khrushchov naturally refused to discuss this question and told the Chinese leaders that the destiny of the Mongolian people is determined not in Peking and not in Moscow but in Ulan Bator, that the question of Mongolia's statehood can be settled only by the country's working people themselves and by nobody else.

As noted above, the Chinese leaders are trying to elevate territorial claims to the level of some universal principle. But this involves the foundations of international relations. What would happen if all states were to follow the Peking recipe and start presenting mutual claims for a revision of historically established borders? There is no difficulty in answering this question. This course would mean an inevitable aggravation of international tensions, would be fraught with the danger of military conflicts with all the consequences ensuing therefrom.

The question of borders and territorial disputes is tremendously complicated. There are different kinds of territorial issues and it is necessary to differentiate between them. There is such a

thing as the legitimate striving of peoples to liquidate the remnants of the shameful colonial system, to secure the return of territories inhabited for centuries by the given nation and held by imperialists. For instance, the right of the Indian people to return Goa to their motherland was indisputable. Just as indisputable was Indonesia's right to return West Irian to the Republic. We have said and we say now that People's China has every right to press for the liberation and reunification of Taiwan and Hong Kong which are part of the country and the majority of whose population are Chinese. Such examples are numerous.

Another thing entirely are territorial claims stemming from attempts to revise historically formed borders between states, to force some form or other a revision of treaties and agreements concluded after World War II as a result of the defeat of Hitler fascism and Japanese militarism. The peoples who won the war at the cost of millions upon millions of lives will never agree to such claims.

In his talk with the Japanese Socialists Mao Tse-tung dismissed with amazing ease the entire system of international agreements concluded after World War II in keeping with the interests of strengthening peace and the security of the peoples. He declared: "The places occupied by the Soviet Union are too numerous" —and even named some territories with the obvious aim of adding fuel to the fire of nationalistic passions. It is hard to believe that the Chinese leader does not understand the causes and the historic circumstances which led to the establishment of the present borders between states in Europe and Asia. It is hard to assume another thing—that he is not aware of the most dangerous consequences which any attempt to recarve the map of the world could have in the present conditions.

Mao Tse-tung pretends to be attacking the interests of our country alone, but surely it is obvious that such a provocative appeal to revise borders (if taken seriously) would be bound to generate a whole number of retaliatory claims and unsolvable conflicts between countries in Europe and Asia. All this is self-evident and gives grounds to state that only those who find it profitable for some reason to sow mistrust and animosity among the peoples of socialist countries could behave in such a manner.

It is precisely with this aim in view that Mao Tse-tung is trying to fabricate the so-called territorial issues between a number of socialist countries. But these attempts are doomed to failure in advance. No one will succeed in undermining the friendship and cooperation of the peoples of the socialist countries.

For a long time now the rulers of the capitalist world have been watching the nationalism of the Chinese leaders, their great-power behavior. It is not fortuitous, therefore, that the

representatives of the Right wing of the Japanese Socialists, too, put the question of the Kuril Islands to Mao Tse-tung and received from the Chairman of the CPC precisely the answer they needed.

It is known that these islands passed into the full posession of the Soviet Union not as a result of Soviet expansion, as Mao Tse-tung would make it appear. This act was dictated by the need to curb the aggressive policy of Japanese imperialism which, beginning with 1918, harbored plans of capturing Soviet territories in the Far East and repeatedly tried to implement them. The Kuril Islands were allotted a special role in the aggressive plans of the Japanese militarists—the role of an important beach-head for attacking the Soviet Far East. Understandably, the Japanese military had to be deprived of such an opportunity. This was done, and at the time the Chinese representatives repeatedly voiced their approval of this security measure. It was pointed out in the statement of the CPR government of August 15, 1951: ". . . the Kuril Islands must be handed over, and the southern part of Sakhalin and all its adjacent islands returned to the Soviet Union."

Can one say that the situation in this area has changed radically since then and that the threat of aggression against the USSR and the other countries of socialism has ceased to exist? Of course not. Militarist forces which would like to lead the country along the old road of military ventures are active in Japan contrary to the will of her people. There are U.S. military bases in Japan which are kept by the Pentagon, not without reason, in the vicinity of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of Asia. Only a few days ago the Japanese government has succumbed to the pressure of the United States and granted it the right to bring nuclear submarines into Japanese ports, in other words, permitted the United States to use these ports as its military bases. In these conditions the statement that the USSR must hand over the Kuril Islands to Japan plays into the hands not only of the Japanese but also of the American militarists.

If we proceed from Mao Tse-tung's so-called historic principle then all the rights to this territory belong to the Soviet Union. But Chairman Mao treats the principles which he himself advances in an absolutely unprincipled manner. He invokes them when he finds it profitable and flouts them if this suits his political schemes.

There are no grounds legal or moral for claims to the Kuril Islands, nor can there be. This, however, does not mean that in changed circumstances a search for solutions that would not infringe upon the interests of the USSR and would meet the needs of the Japanese people would be excluded.

Mao Tse-tung cannot but realize that the Chinese leadership's position on the territorial question is a far cry from internationalism. To mitigate this impression he appeals not only to history

but also to "justice." His thesis actually boils down to the assertion that since the population of the globe is distributed unevenly justice demands a reallotment of territory.

The demagogic nature of this thesis is clear. The distribution of people in the world is the result of a long and complicated development due to which different peoples live in different conditions. It is in order to ensure a better life for all peoples that the Communists are fighting. When socialism triumphs throughout the world and the productive forces achieve a high level everywhere, the process of the drawing together of nations will result in the gradual disappearance of the differences in the living conditions of the peoples of different countries and state frontiers will lose their significance. In these conditions the solution of the problem of a more even distribution of people in the world will become possible.

But this is a matter for the future. To raise this question now, when opposing social systems still exist, when the objective process of consolidation of statehood and sovereignty is under way, is extremely harmful.

Incidentally, it should not be forgotten that history knows many cases when the most reactionary wars were started with a view to expanding "lebensraum." Thus Mao Tse-tung's pronouncements about "unfair distribution of territory" are not so very new. He has predecessors of whom he can hardly be proud.

Nor can one pass over Mao Tse-tung's statements about the "greatness of Japan," statements which are rather surprising coming from a Communist. The great-power views of the CPC leaders, their admiration of the factor of brute force in international relations are clearly discernible in these statements.

In what does Mao Tse-tung see the greatness of the Japanese people? In their industriousness? In the fact that they succeeded in bringing their country up to the level of the foremost powers of the world within a short space of time and creating a wonderful material and spiritual culture? No, his attention is not attracted by these facts. With extraordinary inspiration he speaks about the crimes of the Japanese military who in the early forties occupied enormous expanses in South-East Asia and Oceania. In other words, Chairman Mao declares the aggressive actions of the Japanese *samurai* to be the source of Japan's national greatness, i.e., actions which the Japanese people themselves regard as their national disgrace.

History teaches that no country ever achieved greatness by taking the path of military gambles and aggressions. True greatness of peoples is achieved on the path of social progress, friendship and cooperation. We are convinced that the vital interests of the Chinese people also lies on this path.

All those who cherish the interests of socialism, the interests of preserving peace and the security of nations cannot but denounce most emphatically the expansionist views of the CPR leaders, their attempt to gamble with the destinies of the peoples.

The true intentions of the Chinese leaders have come into the open. These intentions have nothing in common with the interests of the struggle for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism. They are permeated through and through with great-power chauvinism and hegemonism. Mao Tse-tung's interview with the Japanese Socialists is the most eloquent and graphic evidence of this.

MAO TSE-TUNG'S INTERVIEW WITH JAPANESE SOCIALISTS*

"Chairman Mao Tells SPJ Delegation: the Kurils Must be Returned to Japan" — under this title Shekai shuho, *a weekly published by the Jiji Tsushin-Sha, carried an article in its issue of August 11 on the recent visit to the People's Republic of China of a group of Socialist members of parliament, headed by Kozo Sasaki. Below we give a slightly abridged translation of the article.*

* * *

A group of members of parliament of the anti-majority group of the SPJ consisting of five people headed by Kozo Sasaki, had a long talk with Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the CPC, in Peking on July 10. During the talk Mao Tse-tung declared that he "supports Japan's position in the question of the return of the Kurils." Arriving in Hong Kong on July 12 the group told this to Japanese correspondents accredited there. The contents of the interview deserve special attention.

Akio Kasahara, Secretary of the SPJ headquarters, who accompanied the Sasaki group, conveyed the contents of Mao Tse-tung's talk with the Socialists basing himself on the notes made by Kozo Sasaki, Shitiro Matsumoto and Shigeo Oshiba. These notes offer valuable material revealing Chairman Mao's views.

The talk, which was held in the People's Assembly Hall lasted two hours and 40 minutes, an unusually long time. Present from the Japanese side, in addition to the five members of the Sasaki group and Mr. Kasahara, were the Hisao Kuroda group of three who arrived in Peking separately from the Sasaki group; the Kanemitsu Hososako group of five; the Tetsuo Ara group of four; the Suketsugu Soga group of eleven people; Haruo Okada and Minoru Ono, as well as Kinkazu Saionji who lives in Peking—32 people in all. Present on the Chinese side apart from Chairman Mao, were Liao Cheng-chi, Chao Anpo and other influential leaders in the field of relations with Japan.

We give below the views expressed by Chairman Mao.

CONCERNING THE INTERMEDIATE ZONE THEORY

Chairman Mao began by broaching the following subject: "Japan and China must act in unity, cooperate with each other. Japan is a relatively developed country in the industrial sense. Therefore, it can render us help in many respects. We must support each

*Pravda, September 2, 1964.

other politically, too. Is it possible to oppose each other as was the case a few years ago?" After exchanging remarks with Kozo Sasaki and other leaders on Japan's aggression against China in the past, Chairman Mao touched upon the question of American imperialism and intermediate zones, and developed the following idea.

As a result of the war Japan came under the domination of American imperialism. American imperialism also dominates in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, etc. The United States is reaching out to the western Pacific and South-East Asia. It is reaching too far.

The United States dominates over Europe, Canada and entire Latin America with the exception of Cuba. It is reaching all the way to Africa.

All peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are opposed to imperialism. Imperialism is also opposed by Europe, Canada and other countries. Imperialists too are coming out against imperialists. Is not de Gaulle an example of this?

There are now two intermediate zones in the world. Asia, Africa and Latin America make up the first, and Europe, North America and Oceania—the second. Japanese monopoly capital belongs to the second zone. Even this monopoly capital is discontented with the United States, while some of its representatives openly oppose it. Though the monopoly capital of Japan is now dependent on the United States in time it will throw off the American yoke.

The Japanese nation is a great nation. It waged war against the United States. It waged war against Britain and France. It attacked Pearl Harbour, occupied Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaya.

This, of course, does not mean that I would agree to a repetition of the aggression of Japanese imperialism.

However, I do not think that monopoly capital of Japan will allow the United States to sit on its neck forever. Nothing could be better than for Japan to become completely independent and establish contact and cooperation with the forces in Asia striving for national independence.

ON THE CHINESE-SOVIET DISPUTE

Dwelling on the so-called Chinese-Soviet dispute, Mao mentioned Soviet military aid to India, the recall of Soviet specialists and technicians from China, etc. Pointing out that "the relations between us and the Soviet Union since the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 have been deteriorating," he said:

"We have been challenged and we are giving a rebuff. The proposal was made to us that the open discussion be terminated if only for three months. We said that we would not cease it even for

three days. We waged war for 25 years: twenty-two years of civil war and the war against Japan, and three years of war in Korea. Before that I was a teacher. I did not know what war was. Three teachers taught me war. One of them was Chiang Kai-shek, the other—Japanese imperialism and the third—American imperialism. Everyone knows what war means: when it is waged, people die. These 25 years of war cost the Chinese people several tens of millions in killed and wounded.

"As for war on paper, no people are killed in such war. We have been waging it for several years now, but not a single man has died. And we are ready to continue this war for another 25 years."

ON THE TERRITORIAL QUESTION

Tetsuo Ara, leader of the delegation of the Hokkaido headquarters of the Socialist Party, asked: "Behind our backs the Kuril Islands were taken away from us under the Yalta agreement and Potsdam declaration. We demand that they be returned to us, and would like to hear the opinion of Chairman Mao on this score."

The reply was as follows:

There are too many places occupied by the Soviet Union. According to the Yalta agreement, the Soviet Union, under the pretext of guaranteeing the independence of Mongolia, has actually placed that country under its domination. Mongolia occupies a much larger area than the Kuril Islands. In 1954, when Khrushchov and Bulganin came to China, we raised this question, but they refused to talk with us. They appropriated part of Rumania. They separated part of East Germany, and expelled the local inhabitants to the western part. They separated part of Poland and incorporated it into Russia, giving Poland part of East Germany in compensation. The same happened in Finland. They have separated everything that could be separated. Some people have stated that the Sinkiang area and the territories north of the River Amur should be incorporated into the Soviet Union. The USSR is concentrating troops on its border.

The Soviet Union occupies an area of 22 million square kilometers, and its population is only 200 million people. It is time it stopped the partition. Japan occupies an area of 370,000 square kilometers, and its population is 100 million people. About a hundred years ago the area east of Baikal became Russian territory, and since then Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka and other places have become the territory of the Soviet Union. We have not yet asked for a settlement of this account. As for the Kuril Islands, this question is clear for us. They must be returned to Japan.

NOTES

NOTES

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues:
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

22

Included in this Issue

TOGLIATTI MEMORANDUM

WHICH ROAD? — John Gollan

RESOLUTIONS CP OF ISRAEL

FILE COPY

Issued by

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 22

contents

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ARGENTINA REPLIES TO CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE LETTER 5

STATEMENT OF D. URBANY
Pravda Interview with General Secretary of Communist Party of Luxembourg 7

CPSU INITIATIVE TIMELY
Central Committee Portuguese Communist Party 9

FOR CONCRETE SOLIDARITY WITH THE CONGOLESE IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION 12

TOGLIATTI MEMORANDUM 15

WHICH ROAD?
John Gollan 27

RESOLUTIONS OF 15TH CC MEETING OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL 63

THE CHINESE LEADERS AND BARRY GOLDWATER
The Worker 68

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
OCTOBER 22, 1964

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ARGENTINA REPLIES* TO CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE'S LETTER

The Central Committee
of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

We have received your letter proposing to the Communist and Workers' parties that on December 15, this year, a drafting committee should be convened, composed of representatives of the 26 parties that took part in preparing the 1960 meeting, in order to draft basic documents to be submitted to the future international meeting.

We are glad to express our full agreement with this proposal and with the basic propositions regarding the need for a meeting, stated in your letter. We declare our readiness to contribute to the collective search for a basis that would help preserve and strengthen the unity of the world Communist and working-class movement.

Expressing its agreement our Party acts in conformity with its position as laid down by its Twelfth Congress and repeatedly reaffirmed in various documents of the Central Committee, specifically in the resolution adopted recently in connection with your letter of July 15 this year, to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

We agree with you that this committee should get down to work at the date proposed even if any fraternal party does not send its representatives, for we consider an international meeting to be a pressing necessity.

As was stated in the above-mentioned resolution, such a meeting is necessary not only in order to analyze the differences, caused by the Chinese leaders, in the light of the general line of the world Communist and working-class movement laid down at the 1957 and 1960 meetings, but also to bring this line into conformity with the changes in the international situation and work out in common our future policy and tactics.

This is especially important today in view of the onslaught

*Nuestra Palabra, August 18, 1964.

launched by imperialism, U.S. imperialism in particular, against the working-class and democratic movement and also against the liberation movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This onslaught, which endangers world peace is constantly conducted against Cuba. Of late it has been manifested in violent action against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Cyprus and the Congo.

We avail ourselves of this opportunity to express to the Central Committee and to your Party the gratitude and congratulations of the Argentinian Communists for the wise spirit of unity in which you propose, in your letter, ways of overcoming the differences existing in the world Communist movement.

In view of this we regard as very important the part of your letter which reads: "We want to stress once again that as far as we are concerned the question of calling the meeting is inseparable from the problem of maintaining and promoting the unity of the world Communist movement. If the line pursued at the meeting is one of aggravating the differences and if its purpose is seen as one of condemning someone, attaching offensive labels and making irresponsible charges, the result may be further dissociation rather than greater unity. We believe that in view of the differences which the Communist movement has come up against, it is necessary, first and foremost, to concentrate on bringing out what all the fraternal parties have in common and what unites them, on seeking ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen."

There is no doubt that the meeting, if held in this spirit, will bring success to the world Communist and working-class movement in its struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

As regards the composition of our Party's delegation to the drafting committee, we hereby inform you that it will consist of several members of the Central Committee.

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Argentina.

STATEMENT OF D. URBANY

PRAVDA INTERVIEW* WITH GENERAL SECRETARY OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF LUXEMBOURG

The Communist Party of Luxembourg has more than once expressed its attitude to the differences between the leaders of the Communist Party of China and the other Communist parties, and emphatically condemned the former's splitting activities in the world Communist movement. The congress of the Communist Party of Luxembourg, held on April 5, 1964, demonstrated the complete solidarity of the Luxembourg Communists with the position of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties. It reaffirmed our fidelity to the historic documents jointly worked out by the Communist parties at the 1957 and 1960 meetings and vigorously rejected the sectarian and revisionist line of the CPC leadership.

Today the question of convening a new meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties has acquired particular importance. Our Party maintains that such a meeting should be held at the earliest possible date, and fully shares the views of the CPSU on this question.

The Communist Party of Luxembourg, like other fraternal parties favoring the convocation of a meeting, considers that the meeting should thoroughly examine the most important problems of the international Communist movement at the present stage, and to discuss the tasks of strengthening the unity of our movement. Delay in convening the meeting can only facilitate the maneuvers and splitting activities of the Chinese leaders.

We hold that in the four years since the last international meeting of the fraternal parties, new phenomena have arisen in the world that demand appraisal by the Communist parties. The Communist parties have acquired fresh experience in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, for unity in the ranks of the working people.

In this connection I would like to refer to the experience of our Party. Guided by the basic principles of the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties as laid down in the documents of the meetings of the fraternal parties, the Communist Party of Luxembourg has achieved considerable success in strengthening its influence among the masses.

In the parliamentary elections held in June the Party nearly

*Pravda, September 3, 1964.

doubled its vote and now has five deputies in Parliament instea of three.

This success shows that the masses correctly understand th role the Communists of our country play in the struggle for peace democracy and socialism. The aims we are striving for are nea and understandable to them.

The Communist Party owes this success to its resolute pursui of the policy jointly worked out by the 1957 and 1960 meeting and the repudiation of the unsound stand and bombastic phraseol ogy of the Chinese leaders.

We express our profound satisfaction over the fact that prepara tions are now under way for a new international meeting of th fraternal parties. We believe that it will be held within the tim limits approved and supported by the overwhelming majority o the Communist parties.

The Communist Party of Luxembourg, proceeding from its ow experience, believes that the policy pursued by the CPSU and othe fraternal parties will ensure the success of the forthcoming meetin and fresh victories for the entire world Communist movement.

Sharing the standpoint expressed in the *Pravda* editorial, w think that the meeting should be held with the participation of a the Marxist-Leninist parties, but should the CPC not wish to tak part in it, it should be held without its participation.

The world Communist movement only stands to gain from th calling of the new meeting.

To all appearances the Chinese leaders intend to go on wit their splitting activities. However, we Communists will overcom these difficulties in our movement as well. A resolute and opa action against the Chinese leaders' dogmatic propositions and spli ting activities is of vital importance, for their differences with th world Communst movement concern not the questions of tatic but also the correct interpretation of the general line of our mov ment.

The Communists of Luxembourg are confident that the forthcom ing meeting will be successful and will further the great cause o the world Communist movement. It will rally its ranks still mor closely on the basis of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism.

CPSU INITIATIVE TIMELY

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party, Alvaro Cunhal, General Secretary of the PCP, has sent the following reply* to the CPSU Central Committee's letter of July 30, 1964, on the question of convening an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties:

In resolutions adopted at CC meetings in August 1963 and April 1964 the Portuguese Communist Party came out in favor of the earliest convocation of an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties. The same opinion was expressed by the absolute majority of the fraternal parties, which thus displayed their determination to overcome the existing differences and difficulties in the Communist movement through an open discussion by all the parties.

Some Communist parties hold a different view regarding the timeliness and the date of convening the meeting. This, however, cannot serve as grounds for not holding it. For in that case the will and initiative of the Communist and Workers' parties in the collective study of problems of common interest would always be paralyzed by the opinion of one party.

In order to get down to preparatory work, we agree with the proposal that a committee be convened of the same 26 fraternal parties that formed the drafting committee of the 1960 Meeting. Although in the conditions now prevailing in the international Communist movement the drafting committee should, in our opinion, have a different composition, more favorable for achieving mutual understanding, the proposal should be accepted in order to start preparatory works as soon as possible. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the discussion on the new composition could serve as another pretext for differences and delays, which would worsen the situation still more.

The refusal of any party to take part in the work of the committee cannot be appraised in any other way than evidence that such a party, or parties, do not strive for the unity of the Communist movement and reject the only road than can lead to overcoming the differences and controversies—the road of open exchange of opinions by all the fraternal parties, the road of discussion and achievement of agreement.

That is why we hold that the committee should begin its work

*Pravda, September 4, 1964.

at the proposed date even if representatives of one of the parties concerned fail to come.

It seems to us that if all the fraternal parties set themselves the aim of avoiding a split in the Communist movement, the time proposed for the work of the committee—about six months—will be sufficient to prepare the meeting in such a way that the latter will find ways and means of overcoming the existing difficulties and preserving and strengthening the unity of the international Communist movement.

Since the absolute majority of the fraternal parties have declared for the meeting, not a single party, if it sincerely strives for the unity of the Communist movement, can refuse to take part in the international meeting of Communists and discuss all problems of common interest.

We agree with the CPSU that the holding of the meeting is inseparably connected with the idea of maintaining and strengthening the unity of the Communist movemnt and that its efforts must be concentrated on what unites all the fraternal parties—on finding the means to overcome the difficulties and on working out common positions and common, mutually acceptable agreements.

As for the composition of the Meeting, we agree that it should be attended by the same parties which took part in the 1960 Meeting, that only the meeting itself can decide on sending invitations to new fraternal parties formed later on.

However, we would resolutely object to proposals on the participation in the meeting of any groups, even if they call themselves "Marxist-Leninist parties," which have appeared in some countries in violation of the principle of democratic centralism and as the result of splitting activities and struggle against the lawfully elected leadership of the fraternal party in the given country.

We believe, as before, that the unity of the international Communist movement is incompatible with interference by any fraternal party in the internal affairs of another fraternal party for the purpose of giving support to elements expelled from fraternal parties, irrespective of their attitude towards the questions disputed in the international Communist movement. Strict observance of this principle is essential for upholding and strengthening the unity of the Communist movement.

In view of the differences and difficulties existing in the international Communist movement, the Portuguese Communist Party considers that the main effort of the Communist and Workers' parties should be toward preventing a split, both internationally and in each country, and in this sense the CPC supports the proposals of the CPSU.

We believe, as before, that despite the existing deep disagreements and the gravity of the situation caused by splitting activities,

what unites the Communists is sufficient for all the fraternal parties to close their ranks in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism.

FOR CONCRETE SOLIDARITY WITH THE CONGOLESE IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION

STATEMENT* OF THE CC, COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM

A highly dangerous situation is brewing in the Congo. It overflows the bounds of the country and may at any moment develop into a broader conflict endangering peace.

The source of this danger is the constant interference of some imperialist powers in Congolese affairs.

The main responsibility for this rests with the United States and Belgium, which, in effect, pursue a common policy aimed at:

—preserving the domination and privileges of the big colonial monopolies and facilitating, specifically with the help of the personnel of the big companies and the missions, neo-colonialist penetration into the Congo;

—setting up and supporting governments which collaborate with the imperialists and accept their constant interference in the affairs of the country;

—providing these governments with a punitive army of mercenaries,

A primary role in the pursuit of this policy is played by Belgium. This is due to the existence of special relations between the Congo and this country as the former metropolitan power, to the positions still held in the Congo by big Belgian mining, industrial and agricultural enterprises, the financial pressure Belgium is able to exert on the Congolese government both through her special financial relations with the Congo and by means of dragging out the settlement of disputed Belgian-Congolese financial issues, and, ultimately, by virtue of the policy of cadres Belgium can pursue in the Congo under the pretext of rendering allegedly disinterested and humane technological assistance.

But the seeming moderation of the Belgian government's position and the efforts it is making to camouflage the character and magnitude of Belgian interference in the Congo will hardly deceive public opinion.

In reality Belgium is stepping up her interference in Congolese affairs, the military field included. She is rendering obvious support to the Tshombe-Kasavubu group in its policy of ruthless repressions.

---

*Drapeau Rouge, September 7, 1964.

This Belgian interference is all the more unwarranted since the Tshombe government cannot be considered a lawful government appointed in accordance with the constitutional norms effective in the Congo. This government is far from representing the Congolese people who are fighting for genuine independence. It does not rely on the lawfully elected parliament, which was arbitrarily disbanded by the head of state. It is carrying through a policy of brutal persecutions.

This is proved beyond doubt by the presence of heads of the Katanga and South Kasai separatists in the government and the support it receives from the South Rhodesian and South African racists and from the American and Belgian colonialist groups.

The aspirations of the Congolese people are vividly expressed by the countrywide rebel movement which is being organized and is closing its ranks, and of which the most prominent spokesman is the National Liberation Council.

There is no doubt that despite all the repressions and difficulties it may encounter the rebel movement will grow and gain strength and will, in a more or less short time, become the dominant force.

Support for Tshombe means active opposition to the genuine interests of the Congolese people, which will make future contacts between Belgium and the Congo difficult if not altogether impossible. Support for Tshombe means endangering the lives of the Belgians still remaining in the Congo on legal grounds, which does not run counter to the country's striving for genuine independence; it means aiding and abetting the most reactionary groups, siding with the rabid racists of Rhodesia and South Africa, and isolating oneself from the emergent new Africa.

The policy of intervention pursued by the Belgian government is unpopular. The working people disapprove of it and come out for actual solidarity with the Congolese people fighting for genuine liberation. They realize that the inspirers of the Belgian government's policy in the Congo initiate in Belgium itself various anti-democratic measures, such as the uniform law and the laws against strikes, and resist the necessary structural reforms and an extension of democracy.

The working people realize that the continuation of the Congolese gamble involves the dispatch of soldiers to Africa, growing military expenditures, and acute frictions that may jeopardize world peace.

But this opposition to the government's policy must be concretized in the immediate and most energetic implementation of the following measures:

—immediate termination of military and logistic aid to Tshombe;
—recall of all Belgian servicemen from the Congo;
—measures against the recruitment of Belgian mercenaries and the recruiting centers operating in Belgium;

—the Belgian government must declare to the U.S. government without delay that Belgium can no longer participate in the policy of intervention in the Congo, and demand that the United States also discontinue this intervention.

The Central Committee calls upon all Party members to intensify, in cooperation with democrats of all trends, the campaign in support of these slogans. No trade union meeting or mass political rally, especially meetings in connection with the communal elections, should be held without these questions being raised and corresponding resolutions adopted.

The Central Committee protests against the government's refusal to comply with the demand of different deputies, Communists included, for a session of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission to discuss its policy in the Congo. It instructs the Communist parliamentary group again urgently to demand the convening of the commission.

It is necessary to express in a concrete and effective way the Belgian working people's solidarity with the people of the Congo and their organizations fighting for liberation.

Let them know that the democratic forces of Belgium will support the solution of the Congolese problem by the joint efforts of the African peoples, a solution aimed at restoring peace in the Congo, establishing an independent, truly national government, and rendering it multilateral technological and financial assistance without political and economic interference.

For mass actions under the following slogans:

Out with Belgian and American military in the Congo!

Out with foreign mercenaries in the Congo!

Solution of the Congolese problem by the Congolese themselves with the help of the African peoples!

Solidarity with the Congolese people fighting for genuine independence!

Central Committee,
Communist Party of Belgium.

***Brussels, September* 6, 1964.**

TOGLIATTI MEMORANDUM*

The Memorandum of Palmiro Togliatti was prefaced by the following introductory note by Luigi Longo, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party:

The Memorandum we publish on problems of the international working-class and Communist movement and on questions of its unity was written by Comrade Togliatti a few hours before his fatal illness.

It was intended to get this document typed while Comrade Togliatti visited Artek, the international Young Pioneer camp. He wanted to go over the typewritten text once again on his return.

We know that Comrade Togliatti wrote his works in exceptionally clear language and handwriting, with practically no corrections and very insignificant additions in the margin. This is evidenced also by his latest work, and this shows that Comrade Togliatti worked with great energy and that his mind was very clear till the very last moment. Nothing suggested that a terrible misfortune would prevent Comrade Togliatti from going over his Memorandum.

We believe, however, that even without final revision we may regard the text left to us as a precise expression of his ideas regarding the questions dealt with. The leadership of our Party read the document drafted by Comrade Togliatti with deep emotion and recognized that "it sets forth with utmost clarity the position of our Party in regard to the present situation in the international Communist movement" and adopted it as its own document.

We, therefore, publish the Memorandum of Comrade Togliatti as an exact expression of the position of our Party on problems of the international working-class and Communist movement and its unity.

* * *

August 1964, Yalta.

The CPSU letter with the invitation to attend a preliminary meeting to prepare for an international conference reached Rome just a few days before I was to leave. For that reason and also because many of the comrades were absent we were not able to take it up for collective discussion in the Party leadership. We could only cursorily exchange views among the comrades on the Party secretariat. This letter will be put before the Central Committee which is to meet in mid-September. Neverthless it remains firmly established that we shall take part, moreover, an active

*Unita, September 5, 1964.

part, in the preparatory meeting. However, we still have doubts and reservations as to the advisability of convening an international conference, especially because it is now growing more and more obvious that, besides the Chinese party, a group of parties, which cannot be ignored, will not be participating. It will no doubt be possible at this preliminary gathering to set out and substantiate our point of view, in particular, because it covers a whole series of problems pertaining to the international labor and Communist movement. In this memorandum I shall briefly review these problems, also with the aim of facilitating a further exchange of views with you when that will be possible.

The plan we suggest for carrying on an effective struggle against the erroneous political positions and disruptive activities of the Chinese Communists was different from what is actually being done. On the whole our plan was based on the following points:

—never to discontinue the polemic against the points of principle and policy of the Chinese;

—to conduct this polemic—in contrast to what the Chinese are doing—without going to verbal extremes and without sweeping accusations, that is, to deal with concrete issues, in an objective and convincing manner, and always to show respect for the opponent;

—to organize, at the same time, among the different groups of parties a series of meetings to make a deeper study of, and better to formulate, the tasks now facing the different sectors of our movement (Western Europe, Latin America, the countries of the third world and their contacts with the Communist movement in the capitalist countries, the People's Democracies, etc.). This should be done bearing in mind that since the time of the 1957 and 1960 meetings the situation in all these sectors has undergone serious changes and that without a thorough collective discussion it will be impossible correctly to formulate the general and common tasks of our movement;

—only after such preparations, which might need a year of work or even more, would it be possible to discuss the convocation of an international conference which could truly mark a new stage in our movement and its factual consolidation on new and correct positions. By acting in this fashion, we would be able better to isolate the Chinese Communists and organize in opposition to them a more firmly rallied front that would be united not only in applying jointly drafted formulations with respect to the Chinese positions but also in a deeper knowledge of the common aims of the whole of our movement and the tasks that concretely face each of its sectors. Furthermore, if the tasks and the political line were to be defined for each sector, it might be possible to give up the idea of holding an international conference, should such action

be necessary to avoid a formal split.

Actually another line is being pursued and I think the ensuing consequences are none too good. Some (and perhaps many parties) expect a conference to be convened at an early date to hand down an explicit and solemn injunction binding on the entire movement. Any delays in this respect might even disorient them.

Meanwhile the Chinese leaders' offensive has assumed a wide scale as have their activities aimed at forming small splinter groups and winning over some of the parties to their side. As a rule this offensive has been countered with ideological and propaganda polemics, not by elaborating and enriching our policy from the standpoint of combating the Chinese positions.

In this last sense, a series of actions has been undertaken in the Soviet Union—the signing of the Moscow nuclear test ban treaty, Comrade Khrushchov's visit to Egypt, etc. These actions were real and important victories over the Chinese. However, the Communist movement in other countries has so far not done anything along these lines.

I want to make my point clear. I have in mind, for instance, the important role that could be played by an international meeting organized by some Western Communist parties with broad representation from democratic countries of the "third world" and their progressive movements to work out a concrete program of cooperation with these movements and rendering aid to them. This would be a way to fight the Chinese with deeds, not just with words.

I believe that in this sense the experience of our Party is of interest. There appeared inside and outside the Party small groups of Party members and sympathizers who tended towards the views of the Chinese and defended these views. Some Party members had to be expelled from our ranks for factional activity and breaches of discipline. But, generally speaking, we are conducting broad discussions on all the points at issue with the Chinese at the meetings of cells, sections and town groups. We have been most successful when we passed from the consideration of general subjects (the nature of imperialism and the state, the motive forces of the revolution, etc.) to the concrete problems of our current policy (struggle against the government, criticism of the Socialist Party, trade-union solidarity, strikes, etc.). On these subjects the Chinese arguments are absolutely indefensible and powerless.

From these observations I draw the conclusion that (even if the work to convene an international conference continues) political initiatives which could contribute to the defeat of the Chinese stand should not be ignored, and that such initiatives can best be developed on the basis of discussion and formulation of conclusions

concerning the concrete situation facing us today, and the actions necessary to solve the problems existing in the various sectors of our movement, in the different parties and in our movement as a whole.

We are somewhat pessimistic about the prospects of the present situation both internationally and in our country. The situation is now worse than it was two or three years ago.

The most serious menace today comes from the United States. That country is experiencing a profound social crisis. The racial conflict between the whites and Negroes is only one aspect of this crisis. The assassination of Kennedy demonstrated to what lengths the offensive of the reactionary groups can go. In no way should one exclude the possibility of the Republican candidate (Goldwater) winning the presidential election, and he has included war in his program and speaks like a fascist. The worst thing of all is that as a result of his offensive the whole American political front is shifting to the Right and there is a growing tendency to regard greater aggressiveness on the international arena as a way out of internal contradictions and a basis for agreement with West-European reactionary groups. This aggravates the general situation.

Although the situation in Western Europe is highly varied, its dominant common feature is the process of continued monopoly concentration, of which the Common Market is the instrument and arena. U.S. economic competition which is becoming ever more intense and aggressive tends to speed up the concentration process. This increasingly strengthens the objective basis for the reactionary policy aimed at abolishing or restricting democratic freedoms, preserving and establishing authoritarian fascist regimes, preventing any advance on the part of the working class and substantially worsening its living standard. As for international relations, profound contradictions and rivalry exist here. The old organization of NATO is going through an obvious and serious crisis, due to the position taken by de Gaulle, in particular. But we must not have any illusions. There are of course differences which we should use to the full, but so far the ruling circles of the continental countries have evinced no tendency towards independent and consistent action to relax tensions in international relations. All these circles are pursuing, in one or another way and in greater or lesser degree, neo-colonialist policies in order to hinder the economic and political progress of the newly-free African states.

The events in Vietnam and in Cyprus show how—especially if the rightward shift on the world scene continues—we can find ourselves confronted with very sharp crises and dangers in the face of which the entire Communist movement, all the working-class and socialist forces of Europe and the whole world will have to employ all their potential.

We think it necessary to take this situation into account in our entire attitude to the Chinese Communists. The unity of all the socialist forces, concerted action, ideological differences notwithstanding, against the most reactionary groupings of imperialism is an urgent necessity. One must not think that China and the Chinese Communists can be excluded from that unity. Consequently, we should work already now, to facilitate this task rather than put obstacles in the way of its achievement. By no means should we end the polemics, but in the polemics it is necessary to proceed from showing, on the basis of the facts of today, that the unity of the working-class and Communist movement can and must be achieved.

In connection with the meeting of the Preparatory Commission on December 15 we should already be thinking of some concrete initiative. For instance, we could consider sending a delegation made up of the representatives of various parties, to convey to the Chinese comrades our intention to stand united and to work together in the struggle against the common enemy, and to propose to them that a search be made for the ways and the specific forms of such cooperation.

It should also be borne in mind, and we believe this to be essential, that if our struggle against the Chinese positions is to be a struggle for unity, the resolutions we may adopt should reflect this. They should avoid general definitions of a negative character; on the contrary, positive political content conducive to unity should predominate in them.

We have always considered it incorrect to give a predominantly optimistic picture of the working-class and Communist movements in the Western countries. Our development and forces in this part of the world, are not as yet equal to the tasks facing us at present, even if we have achievements in one or another area. With the exception of certain parties (France, Italy, Spain, etc.) we have not yet emerged from a situation where the Communists are unable to develop genuine and effective political actions linking them with the broad masses. They confine themselves to propaganda activities, exerting no effective influence on the political life of their countries. Everything should be done to move on from this phase; the Communists should emerge from their relative isolation and participate, actively and continuously, in social and political life, take the political initiative and become an effective mass movement.

Proceeding also from these considerations—although we have always regarded the Chinese positions as erroneous and harmful—we have always had and still have serious reservations as regards the usefulness of an international conference devoted, exclusively or mainly, to denouncing these positions and the struggle against

concerning the concrete situation facing us today, and the actions necessary to solve the problems existing in the various sectors of our movement, in the different parties and in our movement as a whole.

We are somewhat pessimistic about the prospects of the present situation both internationally and in our country. The situation is now worse than it was two or three years ago.

The most serious menace today comes from the United States. That country is experiencing a profound social crisis. The racial conflict between the whites and Negroes is only one aspect of this crisis. The assassination of Kennedy demonstrated to what lengths the offensive of the reactionary groups can go. In no way should one exclude the possibility of the Republican candidate (Goldwater) winning the presidential election, and he has included war in his program and speaks like a fascist. The worst thing of all is that as a result of his offensive the whole American political front is shifting to the Right and there is a growing tendency to regard greater aggressiveness on the international arena as a way out of internal contradictions and a basis for agreement with West-European reactionary groups. This aggravates the general situation.

Although the situation in Western Europe is highly varied, its dominant common feature is the process of continued monopoly concentration, of which the Common Market is the instrument and arena. U.S. economic competition which is becoming ever more intense and aggressive tends to speed up the concentration process. This increasingly strengthens the objective basis for the reactionary policy aimed at abolishing or restricting democratic freedoms, preserving and establishing authoritarian fascist regimes, preventing any advance on the part of the working class and substantially worsening its living standard. As for international relations, profound contradictions and rivalry exist here. The old organization of NATO is going through an obvious and serious crisis, due to the position taken by de Gaulle, in particular. But we must not have any illusions. There are of course differences which we should use to the full, but so far the ruling circles of the continental countries have evinced no tendency towards independent and consistent action to relax tensions in international relations. All these circles are pursuing, in one or another way and in greater or lesser degree, neo-colonialist policies in order to hinder the economic and political progress of the newly-free African states.

The events in Vietnam and in Cyprus show how—especially if the rightward shift on the world scene continues—we can find ourselves confronted with very sharp crises and dangers in the face of which the entire Communist movement, all the working-class and socialist forces of Europe and the whole world will have to employ all their potential.

We think it necessary to take this situation into account in our entire attitude to the Chinese Communists. The unity of all the socialist forces, concerted action, ideological differences notwithstanding, against the most reactionary groupings of imperialism is an urgent necessity. One must not think that China and the Chinese Communists can be excluded from that unity. Consequently, we should work already now, to facilitate this task rather than put obstacles in the way of its achievement. By no means should we end the polemics, but in the polemics it is necessary to proceed from showing, on the basis of the facts of today, that the unity of the working-class and Communist movement can and must be achieved.

In connection with the meeting of the Preparatory Commission on December 15 we should already be thinking of some concrete initiative. For instance, we could consider sending a delegation made up of the representatives of various parties, to convey to the Chinese comrades our intention to stand united and to work together in the struggle against the common enemy, and to propose to them that a search be made for the ways and the specific forms of such cooperation.

It should also be borne in mind, and we believe this to be essential, that if our struggle against the Chinese positions is to be a struggle for unity, the resolutions we may adopt should reflect this. They should avoid general definitions of a negative character; on the contrary, positive political content conducive to unity should predominate in them.

We have always considered it incorrect to give a predominantly optimistic picture of the working-class and Communist movements in the Western countries. Our development and forces in this part of the world, are not as yet equal to the tasks facing us at present, even if we have achievements in one or another area. With the exception of certain parties (France, Italy, Spain, etc.) we have not yet emerged from a situation where the Communists are unable to develop genuine and effective political actions linking them with the broad masses. They confine themselves to propaganda activities, exerting no effective influence on the political life of their countries. Everything should be done to move on from this phase; the Communists should emerge from their relative isolation and participate, actively and continuously, in social and political life, take the political initiative and become an effective mass movement.

Proceeding also from these considerations—although we have always regarded the Chinese positions as erroneous and harmful—we have always had and still have serious reservations as regards the usefulness of an international conference devoted, exclusively or mainly, to denouncing these positions and the struggle against

them, for we fear that the Communist parties of the capitalist countries will thus be impelled in a direction opposite to that desired. They may become bogged down in internal polemics of a purely ideological character far removed from reality. The danger would become especially serious if things came to an open split in the movement and to the establishment of a Chinese international center which would set up its "sections" in all countries.

All parties, and especially the weakest, would be forced to devote much of their effort to polemics and struggle against the so-called "sections" of a new "International," while the masses would be discouraged and serious obstacles for the development of our movement would arise. The fact is that the Chinese facttionalist efforts have already gone far in almost every country. We must see to it that quantity does not turn into quality, i.e., a real, general and established split.

Objectively the conditions are highly favorable for our advance in the working class and among all working people generally as well as in public life as a whole. But it is necessary to know how to take advantage of and utilize these conditions. The Communists should possess enough political daring to overcome dogmatism in all its forms, to advance and solve new problems in a new way, to adjust the methods of work to the rapidly changing political and social situation.

I shall cite several examples.

The economy of the bourgeois world is in the grip of a profound crisis. The system of state-monopoly capitalism is faced with entirely new problems which the ruling classes are no longer able to solve by traditional methods. In particular, the biggest countries are today faced with the question of the centralization of economic direction and attempts are being made to solve it through programming from above in the interests of the big monopolies and by means of state intervention. This question is on the order of the day throughout the West and now there is talk of international programming, preparations for which are being conducted by leading bodies of the Common Market. Clearly, the working-class and democratic movement cannot remain indifferent to this question. We have to fight also on this issue.

For this it is necessary to extend and coordinate the immediate demands of the working class and proposals for economic structural reforms (nationalization, agrarian reforms, etc.), and to combine them in a general plan of economic development as an alternative to capitalist programming. Of course, this would not be socialist planning; the conditions for such planning do not exist as yet. But it is a new form and a new means of struggle for advance towards socialism. The possibility of this advance taking the peaceful way is today closely linked with how this problem is presented

and solved. A political initiative in this direction may make it easier for us to win added influence over the broad sections of the population which have not yet taken the path of socialism but which are seeking new roads.

In this context the struggle for democracy assumes a content different from before, a content more concrete and more closely connected with the realities of economic and social life. Indeed, capitalist programming is always accompanied by anti-democratic and authoritarian trends which have to be countered by the adoption of a democratic method also in the direction of economic life.

With renewed attempts at capitalist programming the position of the trade unions becomes increasingly difficult. Indeed, an important element of programming is the so-called "incomes policy" which calls for curbs on the struggle for wages in the form of a system of control from above over the level of wages and the introduction of a wage increase ceiling. Such a policy is doomed to failure (of interest in this connection is the example of the Netherlands); however, its failure can be secured only if the trade unions act resolutely and sensibly, combining their immediate demands with the demand for economic reforms and the drafting of an economic development plan conforming to the interests of the working people and the middle sections.

Trade-union struggle in the conditions existing in the West today can no longer, in our opinion, be waged in an isolated manner, country by country; it must develop on an international scale with common demands advanced and common aims formulated; and the circumstance that we lack this is one of the most serious shortcomings of our movement. Our international trade union organization (WFTU) has so far confined itself to propaganda of a general nature. It has not taken so far any effective joint action against the policy of the big monopolies. There is also no initiative on our part in regard to other international trade-union organizations. This is a serious mistake, since there are people in these organizations who already criticize the intentions and the policy of the big monopolies and seek to oppose them.

But there are also other questions, many other spheres, in which we can and must act more boldly, discarding the outmoded formulas no longer conforming to present-day reality.

During the time of Pope John there was an obvious shift to the Left in the organized Catholic world and among the mass of the Catholics. Today there is a counter-shift to the Right in the center of Catholicism. But at its lower rungs we observe conditions and pressures making for a shift to the Left, which we must appreciate and foster. For this purpose the old atheistic propaganda is of no use. The very problem of religious mentality, its content, its roots in the masses and the problem of overcoming it—all this must be

approached differently, not as it was approached in the past, if we want to reach the Catholic masses and be understood by them. Otherwise our "extended hand" may be regarded by the Catholics as a temporary device and even a piece of hypocrisy.

In the same way in the sphere of culture (literature, art, scientific research, etc.) there are today vast opportunities for communist penetration. For in the capitalist world today the conditions are such that the freedom of intellectual life is threatened with destruction.

We must act as champions of the freedom of intellectual life, the freedom of artistic expression and scientific progress. For this we must not counterpose in an abstract way our concepts to the tendencies and trends of a different nature, but must start a dialogue with all these trends and, through this dialogue, try to go deeper into the cultural issues of today. Not all who are today far from us in the various spheres of culture, in philosophy ,in historical and social sciences are our enemies or agents of our enemies. Mutual understanding reached through continuous discussion adds to our authority and prestige and at once helps us to expose our real enemies, the pseudo-thinkers, mountebanks in art, etc. In this area great help could come to us—which is not always the case—from those countries where we already guide the entire social life.

For reasons of brevity I shall not touch on many other subjects.

In drafting our policy we, on the whole, proceed, and have always maintained that we should proceed, from the positions of the Twentieth Congress. However, today, it is necessary to deepen and develop these positions still further. Thus, deeper study of the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism will serve to clarify what exactly we mean by democracy in a bourgeois state, how the limits of freedoms and democratic institutions could be broadened and what forms of participation by the workers and toiling masses in economic and political affairs would be most effective. There, then, arises the question of the possibility of the working people winning positions of power within the framework of a state whose nature as a bourgeois state has not yet changed, and, hence, the question of the possibility of a struggle aimed at gradually changing this nature from within.

In countries where the Communist movement is already as strong as in our own country (and in France as well), this is a central issue stemming from the political struggle. That, naturally, calls for imparting a more radical character to this struggle, and on it depend the further perspectives.

An international conference can, without doubt, help towards a better solution of these problems; but essentially the task of going deeper into them and resolving them lies with the individual

parties. It is therefore to be feared that adoption of any general and rigid formulations may prove a hindrance here. My view is that within the framework of present historical development and the general prospects which it holds out (I mean the advance to, and victory of, socialism on a world scale), the concrete forms and conditions for such an advance to socialism and its victory will both now and in the immediate future greatly differ from what they used to be in the past. At the same time conditions differ greatly in the different countries. Consequently each party must learn to act independently. The autonomy of the parties, a point we most determinedly champion, is not only the inner necessity of our movement, but also an essential requisite for our progress in the present conditions. For that reason we are against all proposals to reinstitute a centralized international organization. We are resolute partisans of unity in our movement and in the international labor movement; this unity, however, should be maintained in a situation where we have a multiplicity of concrete positions that accord with the conditions in the different countries and their levels of development. This, of course, gives rise to the danger of isolation of some parties from others, and, hence, to some amount of confusion. It is against these dangers that we must struggle, and we believe that to this end it is necessary to undertake a series of measures, namely: to arrange for rather frequent contacts and the exchange of experience between different parties on a large scale; to call collective meetings for the purpose of analyzing problems common to a definite group of parties; to hold international meetings to study the general problems of economics, philosophy, history, etc.

Furthermore, we take a positive view of having discussions between different parties on subjects of mutual interest. These discussions may also be public so as to interest the entire public opinion. Of course, they should be conducted with due tact, with respect for the other side and on the basis of objective arguments, and not with the vulgarity and rudeness that the Albanians and the Chinese display.

We attach, in order to develop our movement, the greatest importance to the establishment of extensive contacts—in the sense of mutual acquaintance and cooperation—between the Communist parties of the capitalist countries and the liberation movements in the colonies and former colonies. Such relations should be established, though, not only with the Communist parties in these countries but also with all forces struggling for independence against imperialism, and also as far as possible, with the ruling circles of the newly-free countries having progressive governments. The aim should be to try and draft a common and concrete platform in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Parallel with this, we should analyze more profoundly the problem of the ways

of development of the one-time colonial countries, what the aim of achieving socialism means for them, etc. All these are new subjects which we have not yet dealt with. For that reason we, as I have already pointed out, would welcome the calling of an international conference devoted exclusively to these problems, and, at any rate, they should henceforth be given more attention and become a more important part of our work.

I think I can safely say that the unbridled and shameless campaign which China and Albania have launched against the Soviet Union, the CPSU and its leaders, especially Comrade Khrushchov, has had no effect to speak of on the board masses, thought it was exploited in every way by propagandists and governments of bourgeois countries.

The Soviet Union's authority and prestige among the broad masses remains vast. Even the crudest slanders of the Chinese (the bourgeois degeneration of the USSR and the like) have taken no root in them. The only thing that is somewhat perplexing is the recall of Soviet specialists from China.

However, what alarms the masses, and even—at least in our country—a rather large proportion of Communists, is the very fact of such an acute dispute arising between two countries which both became socialist as the result of the victory of the two great revolutions. This fact is generating discussions with respect to the very principles of socialism and we have to exert much effort to explain what the historical, political, party and personal circumstances were that have now led to this dispute and conflict. I may add that in Italy we have extensive areas inhabited by the poor peasants, among whom the Chinese revolution is rather popular precisely as a peasant revolution. This obliges the Party to discuss the Chinese positions, criticize them and refute them also at large public gatherings. On the other hand, nobody pays any attention to the Albanians, though in our South we have several Albanian-speaking ethnical groups.

Besides the conflict with the Chinese, however, there are other problems in the socialist world which, in our opinion, merit attention.

It is wrong to say that everything always goes well in the socialist countries (the Soviet Union included). This is the mistake, for one, of that part of the 1960 resolution which deals with these countries. Actually there crop up in the socialist countries difficulties, contradictions and new problems which should be presented in their true light. It is worst of all first to create an impression that everything always goes well and then, all of a sudden, be faced with the need to speak about difficult situations and explain them. But this concerns not only some particular facts. This concerns the entire complex of problems involved in the socialist

construction, both economic and political, of which the West has a too superficial and often even primitive idea.

There is a lack of knowledge of the variety of situations in particular countries, of the variety of planning methods and their gradual transformation, the method that is followed and the difficulties that arise in the field of economic amalgamation of various countries, etc. As a result some situations appear hard to understand. In some cases one gets the impression that there is a difference of opinion in the ruling groups but it is not clear what the actual state of affairs is and where the difference lies. Sometimes it might be useful for the socialist countries as well to have open discussions on burning problems, with leaders of these countries also participating. Such discussions would doubtlessly be conducive to the growth of the authority and prestige of the socialist system itself.

There is no denying the fact that the criticism levelled at Stalin has left rather deep traces. The most serious one is a certain scepticism with which even the circles close to us take the reports on new economic and political successes. Besides, it is believed that the problem of the origin of the Stalin personality cult has not been generally solved up until now and that no explanation has been furnished as to how it became possible at all. The explanation of everything by the considerable personal vices of Stalin is found insufficient. Attempts are made to find out what could be the political errors conducive to the birth of this cult. Such a discussion is going on in the circles of historians and competent cadres of our Party. We do not discourage this discussion for it leads to a more profound knowledge of the history of the revolution and its difficulties. But we recommend care in drawing conclusions and to take into account Soviet publications and investigations.

The problem meriting the greatest attention—this concerns both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—is, however, that of overcoming the regime of restricting and suppressing the democratic and personal freedoms which was introduced by Stalin. We do not see an identical picture in all the socialist countries in this respect.

The general impression is that of a slowness and resistance encountered in returning to the Leninist norms that ensured within the Party and outside it a broad freedom of expression and debate in culture, art and also in politics. This slowness and this resistance are difficult for us to explain, above all in the present conditions, when capitalist encirclement no longer exists and economic construction has had tremendous successes. We have always proceeded from the idea that socialism is a system where the workers enjoy the broadest freedom and actually participate, in an organized way,

in the direction of the entire social life. That is why we welcome all the principled positions and all the facts showing that this is really so in all the socialist countries, and not only in the Soviet Union. At the same time, we consider harmful for the entire movement those facts that at times point to the opposite. One fact that worries us and which we cannot fully explain is the manifestation of a centrifugal tendency among the socialist countries. In this lies an evident and serious danger which, in our opinion, should alert the Soviet comrades. This tendency undoubtedly has an element of reviving nationalism. We are aware, however, that national feelings remain a permanent factor in the working-class and socialist movement for a long time, even after the winning of power. Economic achievements do not weaken but strengthen them. In the socialist camp too it is perhaps necessary (and I underline the word "perhaps" because many concrete facts are unknown to us) to beware of imposing uniformity from outside and to consider that unity should be established and maintained in conditions of diversity and complete independence of individual countries.

To conclude, we hold that also as regards the socialist countries one should have the courage to approach many situations and many problems in a critical spirit if we want to create a basis for better mutual understanding and for the closest unity of our entire movement.

I should have added much to give exact information on the situation in our country. But these notes are too long as they are, for which I beg to be excused. It will be better to explain and expound the purely Italian affairs verbally.

WHICH ROAD?*

John Gollan

With the adoption of our program, *The British Road to Socialism*, our Party, for the first time, worked out a comprehensive strategy for social revolution in terms of the actual political conditions of Britain.

The Marxist case for social revolution was never just the glaring contradiction of poverty *versus* riches, or the need to end capitalist exploitation. Marx put it in *Capital* in these words:

"The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

CASE FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION

In the modern epoch of imperialism the case is even more overwhelming than it was in Marx's time. In capitalist society of the 1960s we see fulfilled Lenin's prophecy of the extreme concentration of power—economic, political and social—in the hands of the monopolists. The development of science, technique and automation has brought the contradiction between productive power and the relations of production—the class relations in production—to breaking point. This contradiction can only be resolved by a social revolution. Exploitation was never higher. In Britain, some

---

*Marxism Today, July 1964.

The titles of Lenin's writings from which quotations are taken in this pamphlet are as follows, in the order quoted:

State and Revolution*; Left Wing Childishness and Petty Bourgeois Mentality*; Letters from Afar, First Letter*; On Dual Power*; A Shameless Lie of Capitalists; How a Simple Quotation is Muddled; Speech at the Congress of Soviets, June 17, 1917*; The Political Situation*; On Slogans*; On Compromises*; The Russian Revolution and the Civil War; The Task of the Revolution; Letter to Committees and Bolshevik members of Petrograd and Moscow Soviets, October 1, 1917*; Meeting of CC, October 23, 1917*; The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*; Imperialism and the Right of Nations in Self-determination.

Those wisihng to consult the text will find all of these in the Lawrence & Wishart edition of the **Collected Works** in forty volumes, publication of which is proceeding. Those marked with an asterisk are included in the three-volume edition of **Selected Works,** published by Lawrence and Wishart in 1964.

seven to eight million people are living "precariously close to the margins of poverty." One-third of the families in Britain have to exist on a deficient diet. The final solution of all the great social issues—housing, education, town planning—is bound up with the social revolution. So it is also with the final elimination of war.

Politically, monopoly rule, as Lenin said, leads to "reaction all along the line, whatever the political system": it threatens bourgeois democracy with authoritarian rule and fascism, or makes it more and more only a facade for the rule of the monopolists. The further development of democracy is incompatible with monopoly rule. Today the fight to defend and extend democracy brings one inevitably up against the issue of social revolution and the development of socialist democracy. And the central issue of social revolution is state power.

This is the basis of our fundamental disagreement with reformism and the position taken up by the right wing of the Labor Party. The substance of their position is to aim to administer capitalism more efficiently to come to the rescue of the ruling class when capitalism is in difficulties, instead of organizing the mass action of the people to solve those difficulties through the social revolution, the ending of capitalism and the building of socialism.

TWO PATHS—VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT

One of the main issues of controversy in the international Communist movement is about the way to social revolution.

The two World Conferences of the International Communist Movement (1957 and 1960), declared: In a number of capitalist countries the possibility exists to win state power without civil war. There were two ways to state power, peaceful and non-peaceful. The actual possibility in each country depends on the definite historical conditions. There was no dispute in the meetings that there are *two* ways. For many countries in view of the actual conditions the non-peaceful course is their only way. It was up to the Communist movement in each country to decide in the light of their circumstances.

The working class, said the 1960 Statement, "seeks to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means," the forms and course of development of the socialist revolution "will depend on the specific balance of class forces in the country concerned, on the organization and maturity of the working class and its vanguard, and on the extent of the resistance put up by the ruling class."

At the time, the Chinese Communists supported this position of the two World Conferences, and the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement were adopted unanimously (in both, the paragraphs on the two paths are identical). But the Chinese comrades are now

saying "it is necessary to amend the formulation of the question in the Declaration and the Statement. . . ." Even before they had made that admission and released private documents showing that they had disagreed all along, this was already clear from their earlier writings.

Now they are quite categorical. The only way to revolution is by violence: "Marxism has always proclaimed the inevitability of violent revolution" (*The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchov's Revisionism*, p. 8).* ". . . Violent revolution is a universal law of proletarian revolution" (p. 11), and Mao Tse-tung is quoted: "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war is the central task and the highest form of revolution. The Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

On this basis, of course, our Party should abandon *The British Road to Socialism*. The armed struggle is to prevail from Southeast Asia to Britain, irrespective of political conditions, traditions or systems of government.

We disagree. The world Communist movement has long since abandoned the practice of direction from a single center or deciding on a single strategy to be applied in every country irrespective of conditions. Each Communist Party must decide its own course, and the conditions under which they work differ radically. But apart from this, we deny that the armed struggle is a universal law of Marxism to be applied everywhere, irrespective of conditions.

In taking up this attitude the Chinese are challenging the position laid down by the world Communist movement. It is understandable that a Party of such authority which came to power after decades of civil war, should have such views. At the same time a Party with even greater authority, revolutionary experience and achievement, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, holds to the view of the Statement that there are *two* paths to revolution, violent and non-violent.

ATTITUDE OF MARX

It is totally wrong to say that the universality of violent revolution was or is the classical position of Marxism. On the contrary, Marxism confirms the position of the 1957 Statement and 1960 Declaration—namely, there are two ways depending on conditions. It is equally wrong in the complex conditions of today to put the strategy of social revolution in a dogmatic strait-jacket.

Marx and Engels for most of their lives worked in a revolutionary Europe. It was the age of bourgeois democratic revolutions and more than once Engels fought on the barricades. But both were

*Note: All the quotations on the Chinese case are from this pamphlet except where otherwise noted.

also concerned with the development of an international labor movement which crystallized in the International Working Men's Association. The International combined the day-to-day struggle of the mass labor movement against capitalism with the aim of the emancipation of the working class and the ending of all class rule—made more precise in 1872 as the aim of social revolution and the conquest of political power.

This was after the test had come with the Paris Commune of 1871, the first attempt in history to carry out a working-class revolution. Marx and the International, irrespective of previous warnings that a rising would be premature, without hesitation supported the Commune and its worldwide historical significance. Bloodily suppressed by counter-revolutionary force, the Commune was of decisive importance for the clarification of Marx's ideas on state power. On April 12th, 1871, he wrote to Kugelmann:

"If you look at the last chapter of my *Eighteenth Brumaire* you will find that I say that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer as before, to transfer the bureaucratic military machine from one hand to another, but to *smash* it, and that is essential for every real people's revolution on the Continent."

His second conclusion was that for a successful revolution the working class needed its own independent revolutionary party.

At the same time Marx treated the whole matter historically—he allowed for the peaceful transition to socialism as well as the violent transition.

In July 1871, a few months after the defeat of the Commune, Marx gave an interview to a correspondent of the American journal *The World* on the purpose and program of the International. It had, he said, "the aim of the economic emancipation of the working class by means of the conquest of political power: the aim of using this political power to achieve social tasks. Our aims must be broad enough to include all forms of activity of the working class . . . In every part of the world our task presents itself in some particular form. . . . In England, for example, the path is open to the working class to display its political strength. Insurrection would be madness where peaceful agitation would lead to the aim by more rapid and certain means. In France the multitude of repressive laws and the deadly antagonism between classes make inevitable, apparently, a violent termination to the social war. But it is the working class itself of that country which has to choose by what means it seeks this termination."

The correspondent then pressed Marx, in view of his statement on England, to be more categorical and give an absolute assurance of a peaceful path in Britain. But Marx refused to go any further than he had already gone, saying:

"On this point I am not as optimistic as you. The English bour-

geoisie has always shown its readiness to accept a majority decision so long as it disposed of a monopoly of votes. But believe me, at the moment when it finds itself in a minority on questions which it considers vitally important, we shall have a new slaveowners' war. . . ."* (*Collected Works,* Russ. Ed., Vol. 17, pp. 634-7.)

In other words, in relation to England at least Marx advanced the possibility of a peaceful transition and said that whether or not there would be violence depended on the ruling class. This was the consistent position of Marx and Engels over the following 20 years.

A few months later in a speech to the London Conference of the International Working Men's Association in September 1871, Marx said:

"We must declare to the governments: we know that you are the armed power which is directed against the proletarians: we will go forward against you in a peaceful way so long as that is possible to us, and with arms, if it should be necessary."

A year later at a public meeting in Amsterdam following The Hague Congress of the International in September 1872, Marx again returned to the two possibilities of revolution. He said:

"Some day, the workers must conquer political supremacy in order to establish the new organization of labor; they must overthrow the old political system whereby the old institutions are sustained. If they fail to do this they will suffer the fate of the early Christians, who neglected to overthrow the old system and who, for that reason, never had a kingdom in this world. Of course, I must not be supposed to imply that the means to this end will be everywhere the same. We know that special regard must be paid to the institutions, customs and traditions of various lands; and we do not deny that there are certain countries, such as the United States and England, in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means. If I mistake not, Holland belongs to the same category. Even so, we have to recognize that in most continental countries, force will have to be the lever of the revolution. It is to force that in due time the workers will have to appeal if the dominion of labor is at long last to be established." (*History of the First International,* G. M. Stekloff, pp. 240-1.)

ENGELS' VIEW

Engels, of course, was at one with Marx on all this. He prefaced the first English translation of *Capital* in November 1866 with the words:

"Surely at such a moment, the voice ought to be heard of a man whose whole theory is the result of a life-long study of the economic history and condition of England, and when that study led

*In their pamphlet the Chinese quote this last part of the interview, but not the first part.

to the conclusion that, at least in Europe, England is the only country where the inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means, he certainly never forgot to add that he hardly expected the English ruling class to submit without a 'pro-slavery rebellion' to this peaceful and legal revolution" (p. 32).

Five years later Engels published his *Critique of the Erfurt Program* of 1891. He was of the opinion that in relation to political demands the main point was not in the Program—whether the then absolute power in Germany must not be broken before the other political demands could be met, and he remarked:

"It is possible to conceive that the old society could develop peacefully into the new in countries where the parliament concentrates all power within itself, where anything one pleases can be done constitutionally once the majority of the people is behind one; in democratic republics like France and America, in monarchies like England where the impending buying out of the dynasty is spoken of every day in the press and where this dynasty is powerless in face of the will of the people." (*Works of Marx and Engels*, Vol. 22, Germ. ed., Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1963, p. 234.)

On March 6th, almost on the eve of his death in 1895, Engels wrote his famous Preface to Marx's *Class Struggles in France*. He dealt with the future of the revolutionary struggle in the condition of advanced capitalism, where the movement has been building up working-class strength through legal forms. Again he analyzed the two aspects of the revolutionary struggle, peaceful and non-peaceful. He showed how the old style of 1848 barricade insurrection was out of date:

"The newly built quarters of the large cities, erected since 1848, have been laid out in long, straight, wide streets, as if made for the effective use of cannons and rifles. The revolutionary would be mad who would of himself select the new working-class districts of the north and east of Berlin for barricade struggle."

Immediately after this, he added:

"Does this mean that in the future the street struggle has no role to play? Not at all. It only means that the conditions since 1848 are far more unfavorable for the insurrectionaries, far more favorable for the military. Accordingly, a street struggle can only be victorious if this unfavorable nature of the situation is compensated for by other factors. Therefore, it will more seldom come in the beginning of a great revolution than in its later developments, and must be undertaken with greater forces. These, however, will then probably, as in the great French Revolution, on September 4 and on October 3 in Paris, prefer the method of open attack to the passive barricade tactics."

His prediction was brilliantly proved correct in the actual con-

ditions of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.

The German Social Democratic leadership, confronted with this Preface, carefully suppressed the key revolutionary passages in it, so that in the published version the balanced picture of the relationship of peaceful and non-peaceful forms of struggle was distorted into the preaching of legality at all costs as the only future path. On April 3, 1895, Engels wrote in fury to Lafargue to express his anger that the extracts from his Preface had been used to make him appear "in support of peaceful, anti-violent tactics at any price" whereas "I preach those tactics only for the Germany of today and even then, with many reservations. For France, Belgium, Italy, Austria, such tactics could not be followed as a whole, and for Germany they could become inapplicable tomorrow."

One can sum up, therefore, on the position of Marx and Engels in the last century when the working-class movement was still weak and when no socialist countries existed. They did not say that armed struggle was a universal law to be applied irrespective of conditions. There were two possibilities, peaceful and non-peaceful, depending on the actual circumstances and relation of forces in each country. Special regard had to be paid to the political institutions, the customs and traditions in each country, including the powers or otherwise of parliament. The outcome largely depended on whether the ruling class resorted to violence or whether the conditions could be developed which could prevent violence on their part. Theirs was a non-dogmatic position.

The Chinese comrades, of course, know all this. Their answer is to quote Lenin's conclusion that the exception allowed for by Marx in England and elsewhere had become outdated by history.

LENIN ON THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

Lenin's treatment is important. Before he engaged in his polemic with Kautsky, he dealt with the matter in *State and Revolution,* written in 1917. Commenting on the Letter to Kugelmann which we have quoted above, Lenin remarks that Marx confined his conclusions to the continent, and continues:

"This was natural in 1871, when England was still the model of a purely capitalist country, but without militarism, and, to a considerable degree, without a bureaucracy. Hence, Marx excluded England, where a revolution, even a people's revolution, could be conceived of and was then possible, *without* the condition of first destroying the 'ready-made state machinery.'

"Today in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, Marx's exception is no longer valid. . . . Today both in England and America, the 'essential' thing for 'every real people's reovlution' is the *smashing,* the *destruction* of the 'ready-made state machinery' (brought in these countries between 1914 and 1917 to general

'European' imperialist perfection)." (*Selected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 37.)

Similarly, commenting on Engels' reflection on the Erfurt Program, Lenin wrote:

"Engels declares that precisely because there was no republic and no freedom in Germany, the dreams of a 'peaceful' path were absolutely absurd. Engels is sufficiently careful not to tie his hands. He admits that in republican or very free countries 'one can conceive' (only 'conceive'!) of a peaceful development towards socialism. . . ." (ibid.)

This, of course, is characteristic of Lenin. Working in conditions of Tsarist absolutism and illegality (which only ended with the February Revolution), writing at the height of the First World War, one could understand if he had brushed aside all these considerations of Marx and Engels as now irrelevant. But he did not. He accepted that in the historical conditions Marx and Engels were dealing with, the possibility of peaceful transition was there.

Exceptionally interesting was Lenin's treatment of this issue in the period of the argument with the "Left" Communists in Russia in 1918 (see *Selected Works*, Vol 7, pp. 368-70). Bukharin recalled that Marx thought it advantageous in certain circumstances for the working class to "buy off" the capitalists. Lenin argued that what Marx wrote did not apply to the conditions of Soviet Russia in May 1918. But his comments are instructive. He said that at the time Marx wrote, England was still a country where militarism and bureaucracy were less pronounced.

"A country in which there was the greatest possibility of a 'peaceful' victory for socialism by the workers 'buying off' the bourgeoisie. And Marx says: under certain conditions the workers certainly will not refuse to buy off the bourgeoisie. Marx did not commit himself—or the future leaders of the socialist revolution—to matters of form, to methods and ways of bringing about the revolution; for he understood perfectly well that a vast number of new problems would arise, that the whole situation would change in the process of the revolution, and that the situation would change *radically* and *often* in the process of revolution."

Lenin's attitude, therefore, was clear. No principle was involved for Marxism on the issue of peaceful or violent revolution, and indeed, no revolutionary leader would tie the hands of future revolutionary leaders. Marx had stressed the possibility of peaceful change as an exception, and now the historical conditions which made Britain an exception had changed, especially with the development of the state and the growth of militarism.

It is not surprising that in the circumstances of his times the great bulk of Lenin's writings teach the necessity of violent revolution.

But it is instructive to examine his treatment of the possibility of the peaceful development of the Russian Revolution over the whole period from February to November 1917. Even in the appalling conditions of the First World War, with a developing revolutionary situation over a great part of Europe, Lenin allowed for this possibility, slight though it was, and tried to bring it about.

The Chinese, in their argument, say it is sophistry to refer to these thoughts of Lenin, that they have no validity for the modern situation. They agree that, for some time after February 1917, Lenin allowed for this as an exception because of the special circumstances existing then, but that "in July 1917 the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie government suppressed the masses by force of arms. . . . After this incident Lenin declared that "all hopes for a peaceful development of the Russian Revolution have vanished'," (p. 20.)

Lenin was concerned to win over the masses, to win a majority in the Soviets, to win over the army, and if possible achieve a peaceful development of the revolution. Putschism was alien to him.

The February Revolution was only the first stage, was his theme. "Only when the largest possible masses of the population are enlightened, only when they are organized, can complete victory of the next stage of the revolution and the conquest of power by a workers' government be secured." (*Collcted Works*, Part I, Vol. XX, p. 26.) The Soviets existing alongside the Provisional Government constituted a dual power although as yet weak and embryonic. The task, he wrote on April 22: "to become a power, the class-conscious workers must win the majority over to their side. So long as no violence is committed against the masses, there is no other road to power. We are not Blanquists, we are not for the seizure of power by a minority" (p. 117). Three days later, on April 25, he was repeating, "While you, Messrs. Capitalists, who are in control of the army command, have not yet begun practising violence, we, the Pravdists, we of the Party, confine ourselves to the struggle for influence among the proletarian masses, the struggle for influence among the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers Deputies. . . ." (p. 172.)

In May he was writing that in Russia there was now such a degree of freedom "that enables us to ascertain the will of the majority by the composition of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Therefore, the proletarian party, if it seriously wishes to gain power (not Blanquist fashion) must fight for influence within the Soviets." (p. 260.)

On May 18, 1917, as a result of the Provisional Government's Declaration of May 1 that it would continue the imperialist war to a decisive victory, and the growing opposition, a decided shift to the right took place. A second Provisional Government was formed—this time a Coalition Government, including representatives of the Soviet; Tsereteli and Skobelev of the Mensheviks; Kerensky and Chernov of the Socialist Revolutionaries; and two of the People's Socialists. That is, six from the Soviet out of 14, the others being Cadets or other bourgeois groups from the previous Provisional Government. An attack was launched on all the liberties won by the revolution, the question was being asked, had dual power disappeared, and Lenin answered: "No, dual power is still here. The basic question of state power is still in an indefinite, unstable and transitory state." In a speech on June 17, he said:

"It is one thing or the other: either we have an ordinary bourgeois government—then there is no need for peasants', workers', soldiers', or any other kind of Soviets, then they will be dispersed by the generals . . . or we have a real government of the Soviets. . . . Friction, Party struggle for power within the All-Russian Soviets are inevitable." *(Collected Works,* Vol. XX, Part II, p. 196.)

The developments of June and July were critical. Having prohibited the Bolshevik demonstration of June 23, the Soviet Congress was itself compelled by pressure to call a demonstration for July 1, when 400,000 soldiers and workers came out, most of the banners bearing the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" and other Bolshevik slogans.

On that same day the Provisional Government's long-planned offensive on the Western front began, which was completely defeated two days later. The defeat at the front, and sabotage by the capitalists, increased the economic difficulties. On July 15, 1917, the Cadets in the Provisional Government resigned, and a few days later a second Coalition Government was formed, headed by Kerensky, with seven other representatives of the Soviets and seven Cadets.

On July 16 and 17, spontaneous demonstrations developed, the Bolsheviks calling for a peaceful demonstration. The demonstrators were fired on, and returned the fire. On July 18, counter-revolutionary troops brought in by Kerensky and military cadets suppressed the movement and made arrests. The *Pravda* buildings were destroyed.

It was then, July 23, that Lenin wrote his article on *The Political Situation,* to which the Chinese refer. "The counter-revolution has become organized and consolidated, and has actually taken state power into its hands. . . . All hopes for a peaceful development of the Russian Revolution have definitely vanished." (*Collected Works,* Vol. XXI, Part I, pp. 36-7.)

He explained the whole position in detail in his article *On Slogans*:

"During that period of our revolution, now past, there prevailed in the state the so-called 'dual power' which both materially and formally expressed the indefinite and transitory character of state power. . . . At that time, power was in a state of flux. It was shared, under a voluntary agreement, by the Provisional Government and the Soviets. The Soviets represented delegations from the mass of free workers and soldiers, i.e., such are not subject to any force from without. The workers and soldiers were armed. Arms in the hands of the people, and the absence of an outside force over the people—this is what the situation was *in essence*. This is what opened and guaranteed a peaceful road of development for the whole revolution. The slogan 'All Power Passing to the Soviets' was the slogan of the next step which could be immediately made along this peaceful road of development. . . . We say peaceful, not only because nobody, no class, no single force of importance, was then . . . able to resist or to prohibit the transfer of power to the Soviets. This alone is not the whole story. Peaceful development would then have been possible even in the sense that the struggle of classes and parties *within* the Soviets could—provided full state power had passed to the latter in due time—have taken the most peaceful and painless forms. . . . Had they had full power, then the main shortcomings of the petty-bourgeois circles, their main fault, namely, their confidence in the capitalists, would have been overcome in practice. The classes and parties which had power could have succeeded each other peacefully inside the Soviets as the only body possessing all power; the contact between all the Soviet parties and all the masses could have followed this course had power in due time passed to the Soviets. It would have been most easy, most advantageous for the people. Such a course would have been the most painless, and it was, therefore, necessary to fight for it. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXI, Part I, pp. 43-4.)

SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER

On September 8, following a secret agreement with the Provisional Government, Kornilov moved some Cossack detachments to the capital. Then he demanded the creation of a new government able to smother the revolution, with himself as dictator, Kerensky was forced to declare him a traitor. The Petrograd and Moscow Soviets joined in the defense, and the Bolsheviks sent agitators to meet the Kornilov detachments and succeeded in disintegrating them. Throughout September, Lenin was continually stressing the need for a new revolution. He suggested on September 14-16 that the Party should offer a voluntary compromise to the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks:

"The compromise on our part is our return to the pre-July demand of All Power to the Soviets, a government of S.R.'s and Mensheviks responsible to the Soviets.

"Now, and only now, perhaps *only for a few days*, or for a week or two, such a government could be created and established in a perfectly peaceful way. In all probability it could secure a peaceful *forward* march of the whole Russian Revolution, and unusually good chances for big strides forward by the world movement towards peace and towards the victory of socialism.

"Only for the sake of this peaceful development of the revolution —a possibility that is *extremely* rare in history and *extremely* valuable, a possibility to be found only in exceptional cases—can and must the Bolsheviks, partisans of a world revolution, partisans of revolutionary methods, agree to such a compromise, in my opinion. . . .

". . . really full freedom of propaganda and the immediate realization of a new democracy in the composition of the Soviets (new elections to them) and in their functioning would in themselves secure a peaceful forward movement of the revolution, a *peaceful outcome* of the Party strife within the Soviets.

"Perhaps this is *already* impossible? But even if there is one chance in a hundred, the attempt at realizing such a possibility would still be worth while." (pp. 153-4.)

The compromise was rejected. But on September 29, Lenin again returned to the theme of the possibility of peaceful transition:

"If there is an absolutely undisputed lesson of the revolution, one absolutely proven by facts, it is that only a union of the Bolsheviks with the S.R.'s and Mensheviks, only an immediate passing of all power to the Soviets would make civil war in Russia impossible. For no civil war begun by the bourgeoisie against such a union, against the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies is thinkable, such a war would not even live to see one battle. . . .

"The peaceful development of any revolution is, generally speaking, an extremely rare and difficult thing, for the revolution is the maximum sharpening of the sharpest class contradictions; but in a peasant country . . . a peaceful development of the revolution is *possible* and *probable* if all power passes to the Soviets. . . .

"Against Soviets that have given all the land to the peasants without compensation and offer a just peace to all the peoples, against such Soviets a union of the English and French with the Russian bourgeoisie . . . presents no dangers at all: it is completely impotent." (pp. 237-8.)

He added that if it was possible to get a union of the city workers with the poorest peasantry by the passing of power to the Soviets, so much the better. "The Bolsheviks will do *everything* to secure this *peaceful* course of the development of the revolution."

Almost on the eve of the seizure of power on October 9-10, in his article, *The Tasks of the Revolution,* he again returned to this theme:

"The Kornilov affair is instructive. The Kornilov affair has proved very instructive.

"It is impossible to know whether the Soviets will be able to go further than the leaders of the S.R.'s and Mensheviks, and thus secure a peaceful development of the revolution, or whether they will continue to mark time, thus making a proletarian revolution inevitable.

"We cannot know this.

"Our business is to help to do everything possible to secure the 'last' chance for a peaceful development of the revolution, to help this by presenting our program, by making clear its general, national character, its absolute harmony with the interests and demands of an enormous majority of the population. . . ." (p. 257.)

"Before the democracy of Russia, before the Soviets, before the S.R. and Menshevik parties, there opens now a possibility very seldom to be met with in the history of revolutions, namely, a possibility of securing the convocation of the Constituent Assembly at the appointed date without new delays, a possibility of securing the country against a military and economic catastrophe, a possibility of securing a peaceful development of the revolution.

"If the Soviets now take state power into their hands, fully and exclusively, with the purpose of carrying out the program set forth above, they will secure not only the support of nine-tenths of the population of Russia. . . .

"There could be no question of any resistance to the Soviets if there were no vacillations on their part. . . .

"Having seized power, the Soviets could still at present—and this is probably their last chance—secure a peaceful development of the revolution, peaceful elections of the deputies by the people, a peaceful struggle of parties inside the Soviets, a testing of the programs, of various parties in practice, a peaceful passing of power from one party to another." (pp. 263-4.)

With the successive rejection of Lenin's proposals by the Mensheviks and the S.R.'s, the chance of a peaceful development of the revolution was finally lost.

From then on all Lenin's writings, mainly in the form of letters, were insistently directed to the preparation of insurrection. (See *Collected Works,* Vol. XXI, Part II.) On October 14, in a letter to the Central Committee, the Moscow Committee, the Petrograd Committee and the Bolshevik members of the Soviet, he insisted power must be taken immeditaely, to hesitate would be a crime.

Yet even then he wrote:

"If power cannot be obtained without insurrection, we must

resort to insurrection at once. It may very well be that right now power can be obtained without an insurrection, for example, if the Moscow Soviet took power at once, immediately, and proclaimed itself (together with the Petrograd Soviet) the government." (Lenin's *Selected Works* in 3 volumes, Vol. 2, pp. 466-467, Lawrence and Wishart, 1964.)

On October 23 came the resolution of the Central Committee on the uprising—That the CC . . .

"recognizes that the international situation of the Russian revolution (the mutiny in the navy in Germany as the extreme manifestation of the growth in all of Europe of the worldwide socialist revolution; the threat of a peace between the imperialists with the aim of crushing the Revolution in Russia) as well as the military situation (the undoubted decision of the Russian bourgeoisie and Kerensky and Co. to surrender Petrograd to the Germans) and the fact that the proletarian parties have gained a majority in the Soviets; all this, coupled with the peasant uprising and with a shift of the people's confidence towards our party (elections in Moscow); finally the obvious preparation for a second Kornilov affair (the withdrawal of troops from Petrograd; the bringing of Cossacks to Petrograd; the surrounding of Minsk by Cossacks, etc.)—places the armed uprising on the order of the day." (*Collected Works*, Vol. XXI, Part II, p. 107.)

Finally, the famous letter to Members of the Central Committee of November 6—to delay action is the same as death.

What is the conclusion from all this? The February Revolution won new conditions of liberty and organization in Russia. The Soviets, democratic representative bodies, had been thrown up in the struggle (no democratic representative institutions existed) alongside the Provisional government headed by Kerensky and the bourgeois parties. The army was disorganized by defeats in the war, the desire for peace was overwhelming, a revolutionary situation existed, sections of the workers were armed, the question was which would prevail, the Provisional government or the Soviets. For eight months the struggle went on, a mass political struggle to win the masses, to win the army. At the first Congress of Soviets in June 1917, the Bolsheviks accounted for 13 per cent of the deputies; at the Second, on November 1st, 51 per cent, and not until June 1918 had they won 61 per cent. Lenin continually stressed that with the balance of power the Soviet could take over without bloodshed and the future course of the revolution would be decided by the political struggle of the parties within the Soviets and among the masses. In the event the peaceful transformation did not take place. Power was seized with arms on November 7. But everything possible was done to take advantage of the possibility of a peaceful development.

LENIN'S CONCLUSIONS

If this was the case in tsarist Russia in the conditions of 1917, surely the general line of Lenin's approach is significant for the conditions of 1964 in Britain. Here democratic institutions, that is, assemblies elected by universal suffrage, the product of a long struggle for liberty do exist. The task is to win a majority in these institutions by mass political work, to isolate the monopolies and their Party, to seek alliances between the Communists and all democratic forces, and to battle out in our democratic institutions, as well as in mass struggle outside, the problems of power and the advance to socialism.

In 1918, in the aftermath of the war, almost the whole of defeated Europe was confronted with a revolutionary situation. The idea of Soviets and social revolution was sweeping Central Europe. Social Democracy became the agent of counter-revolution, counterposing slogans of parliamentarianism to the actual realization of the revolution. It is in this setting that Lenin waged his polemic with the renegade Kautsky. It is not surprising that Lenin stressed that the developing counter-revolution had to be met with force for this corresponded with the actual situation. With German defeat and the abdication of the Kaiser, power was put into the hands of the working class in the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils. Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske, the Social Democratic leaders, forming the German Provisional Government, entered into active alliance with Hindenburg and the General Staffs to use force to save German capitalism and crush the working class and the German Revolution of 1918.

It is against this historic background that Lenin returned to Marx's references on the exceptional conditions of England. When Kautsky used Marx on the possibility of a democratic transition it was to oppose the fact of the German revolution and of revolution in Europe. In defending the so-called parliamentary position, he was defending the bourgeois state machine. So Lenin concluded:

"Kautsky, the 'historian,' so shamelessly falsifies history that he forgets the fundamental fact that pre-monopoly capitalism, which reached its zenith in the seventies of the nineteenth century, was, by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits (which were most typical in England and America) distinguished by its relative attachment to peace and freedom. Imperialism, i.e., monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is by virtue of its fundamental *economic* traits, distinguished by the least attachment to peace and freedom, and by the greatest and universal development of militarism everywhere. To 'fail to notice this' in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable, is to stoop to the position of a common

or garden lackey of the bourgeoisie." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 125-6.)

So the general position of Lenin was that in the circumstances of his time the non-peaceful way was being forced on the working class by the development of imperialism and counter-revolution. Lenin was above all a creative Marxist. He insisted on studying every new development thoroughly. He refused to be shackled by what had previously been said about totally different circumstances. Lenin would have been the first, had he lived, to have looked at everything afresh in the light of the colossal world changes and the changes in particular countries.

HISTORICAL CHANGES

The question is—have further historical changes during these 40 years made the road to peaceful change in some countries more or less possible? Or, in brief, are the Chinese leaders correct that armed struggle is now universal for all places and all time?

Our case is that in the 40 years since Lenin wrote, and particularly in the last 20 years, circumstances have changed in such a way as to make a peaceful transition possible in some countries. There is no argument that in other countries, perhaps the majority, the working class and national-liberation movement have no alternative but to take the violent road. This has never been in dispute by any Communist.

Our Party has always defended, and, to the best of our ability, has assisted any subject people in the British Empire in their struggles. We have exposed and fought against the intolerable imperialist dictatorial rule, the reason for national revolt. So today, for example, we fully support the South African national-liberation forces in their just revolt against the hated rule of apartheid. Our long record of principle in relation to the struggles in Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanganyika, India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, and in support of whatever forms the movements there have considered justified, is well known.

The question for us is the line of strategy, the road to social revolution in advanced capitalist countries like ours where we have won a large degree of political liberty.

Put briefly, our general case is this:

The issue is not whether Communists would prefer the peaceful advance. We would all prefer it. Nor is the issue whether force used by the bourgeoisie should be answered by force. We all agree it should.

The issue is—are there more favorable possibilities for the advance to socialism on which we should base our strategy?

As we have seen our position is not contrary to Marx, Engels and Lenin—it is a development of their ideas in the light of historical

changes since their time and applying their principles to the analysis of these changes and the conclusions to be drawn.

Our opinion is that, because of the changes of the past 40 years, peaceful transition is, in a number of countries, now a *real* opportunity.

Both external and internal factors make possible a new approach. Externally, the strength of the socialist forces, the enormous attractive power of socialist ideas, the superiority of socialism in the fight for victory in peaceful competition, the victories of the national-liberation forces, the possibility of preventing imperialist attempts to export counter-revolution, and the perspective of preventing world war, are the factors which facilitate a peaceful transition.

It goes without saying that the economic, political and moral superiority of the socialist sector of the world will grow At present rates of economic development, by 1980 the socialist world will be producing twice as much as the whole capitalist world put together. If the power of socialism can do so much to aid new governments and stop the export of counter-revolution now, how much more important these powers will become with each succeeding year.

PERSPECTIVE FOR BRITAIN

But, of course, social revolution does not come from without whatever the power of the socialist world. Our case is that the basic social contradictions are growing in Britain and the working class and democratic forces are increasing.

Internally the concentration of economic and political power more and more in the hands of the monopolists, the squeezing out of the small people, the fact that imperialism and monopoly attack not only the working class but the petty-bourgeoisie, the different sections of the middle class and even the small shopkeeper, opens up the possibility and the need to unite all sections of the people—the vast majority—against the monopolists. This can only take place successfully under the leadership of the working class.

As far as Britain is concerned, it is a country whose working class in industry and agriculture makes up the great majority of the population. We agree there is a powerful military, bureaucratic state machine. But we also see the working class as a highly organized working class with a long tradition of struggle and civil liberties. In addition considerable sections of people employed by the state machine are being drawn into the class struggle through their trade unions.

The problem is that the grip of the right-wing Social Democrats on the Labor movement to a large extent paralyzes it and prevents its power from being used.

Once that grip is broken the potential power of the British

working class will be overwhelming. As Engels said: "There is no power in the world which could for a day resist the British working class organized as a body." In view of the monopoly attacks on all middle sections, with unity the working class could rally the vast majority of the population.

Of course, we are not Utopian Socialists. We do not expect the capitalists to be converted to socialism because of the example of the socialist countries. The aim must be to confront the capitalists with such overwhelming strength that they are compelled to accept the democratic verdict of the people.

At the same time we warn the people that the capitalists may stake everything on a desperate resistance, and that the working-class forces must be prepared to rebuff force with force.

It is obvious that we do not consider that *only* parliamentary methods should be used. That would be a ludicrous misrepresentation of our position. We have fought reformists for years on this issue, always stressing the necessity for mass struggle outside Parliament.

The Chinese comrades, of course, subscribe to the changes in the world situation, which are patent and obvious—the enormous growth of the socialist camp, the vast sweep of national liberation, which have changed the world balance of power in favor of socialism, peace and progress.

One would think it is clear that in such circumstances more favorable conditions arise of the possibilities of peaceful transition in countries like Britain. The Chinese argue the opposite, namely, what was considered a rare or exceptional possibility in the time of Marx, Engels and Lenin, when there was no socialist world and imperialism was supreme, is now absolutely impossible despite the change in the balance of world forces.

Here the Chinese will claim that they are following Lenin. That just as he pointed out that the growth of militarism and the state bureaucracy removed Marx's famous exception in the period of the First World War, so the even greater growth of militarism in the U.S. and Britain since the Second World War rules out the exception now.

They write:

"Two outstanding facts since World War II are that the imperialists and the reactionaries are everywhere reinforcing their apparatus of violence for cruelly suppressing the masses and that imperialism, headed by the United States, is conducting counter-revolutionary armed intervention in all parts of the world." (pp. 28-9.)

NEW POSSIBILITIES

This, of course, is a powerful argument and the Chinese leaders

are right to stress it (so did the 1960 Statement). But, of course, it is the *one* side of the picture. The other side is the tremendous growth of the socialist and progressive forces. The issue is—who will beat whom?

In answer to the statement that the changed balance of power can stop imperialist intervention and lessen the possibility of the bourgeoisie unleashing civil war, they instance U.S. intervention on the side of of Chiang, in Greece, Korea, the Lebanon, Laos, UN intervention in the Congo, the attacks on Cuba, the war on South Vietnam, Panama and Cyprus. And they draw the conclusion:

"Facts have demonstrated that nowadays in order to make revolutions and achieve liberation all oppressed peoples and nations not only have to cope with violent suppression by the domestic reactionary ruling classes, but must prepare themselves fully against armed intervention by imperialism, and especially U.S. imperialism." (p. 35.)

With the exception of Greece, all these were and are national-liberation struggles.

The fact is, however, that despite the enormous growth of militarism and intervention and attempted intervention, the victories of the national-liberation struggles have far outweighed any defeats.

Since the Second World War, over fifty countries have won political freedom from imperialist rule. In all of them there was the most bitter struggle of the most varied kinds; in some of them, long, bitter national-liberation wars, in some partial armed struggle, in yet others no armed struggle.

The attempts at armed intervention by imperialism have more often been prevented and defeated than they have been successful. Why? First of all because of the united national character of the movements; second, because of the aid and strength of the socialist world, and third, because of the solidarity struggle of the working class and democratic movement in the imperialist countries.

The matter was put very well by Castro in his speech in Moscow on April 28, 1963:

"Without the existence of the Soviet Union, the socialist revolution in Cuba would not have been possible. This, however, does not at all mean that the Cuban revolution was carried out by the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding the whole stream of slander and lies, the enemies of the Soviet Union have not gone to the length of asserting that. It means that without the existence of the Soviet Union, the imperialists would have strangled any national-liberation revolution in Latin America."

Or, as Ben Bella put it after the negotiations with the Soviet Union in May this year, the agreement reached "makes it possible to protect Algeria from the forces which are trying to throw it off

its chosen path." There is no doubt, too, that despite all problems and difficulties the movement will triumph in South Vietnam, Korea, Laos and Cyprus.

In Greece, the Karmanlis government has been defeated by the electoral victory of the left and center forces. Tony Ambatielos and the Greek democratic leaders imprisoned for 17 years have been released. New possibilities of democratic advance are opening up in Greece.

The question of the path of development to socialism after the anti-imperialist revolution is a complex one. What are the Chinese comrades trying to argue? That these countries should resort to self-defense if imperialism attacks them is obvious. Here the socialist world has played the major role in providing the means for such self-defense, and also in many cases of preventing attempts at intervention. But within these countries—is it to be armed struggle as the path to socialism? In some cases maybe. But is it not more likely that there will be a non-violent path of non-capitalist development as suggested in the 1960 Statement? Are not Algeria and other countries showing this?

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY

However, for us in our political conditions all this misses the issue. Our problem, as we have said, is the path of social revolution in the countries where a large field of democratic freedoms has been won.

How do the Chinese comrades put the issue of the working-class struggle in such countries? They write:

"We have always held that the proletarian parties in the capitalist countries must actively lead the working class and the working people in struggle to oppose monopoly capital, to defend democratic rights, to improve living conditions, to oppose imperialist arms expenditure and war preparations, to defend world peace and to give vigorous support to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations." (p. 40)

But to the argument that the fight for socialism and the struggle for democracy in the capitalist countries are intertwined, they say this is to substitute immediate for long-range struggles and reformism for proletarian revolution. And they quote Lenin "every democratic demand . . . is for the class-conscious workers subordinated to the higher interests of socialism."

So it is. But for the Chinese to quote Lenin in this way simply begs the question.

Our political struggle takes place in the actual political conditions of Britain and Western Europe. What are they? The growth of monopoly capitalism and the state threatens every democratic right. The monopolists seek to undermine all parliamentary institu

tions, to shackle the trade unions and the right to strike, and oppose the broad masses of the people.

The November 1959 meeting of the Communist parties of capitalist Europe pointed to the existence of fascist dictatorships in Spain and Portugal, the de Gaulle regime in France, the general movement of the monopolists to circumscribe and hamstring democratic life. While we expose all the limitations of bourgeois democracy and our Party has carried on a basic and systematic critique for years, what are the tasks of Communists in such a situation—to remain indifferent? No, even the Chinese comrades are agreed here.

In such conditions the task of the Communist parties is to develop the broadest mass movements and struggle to defeat the monopolists, for the fullest extension of democracy, for resistance to unjust electoral laws, and for representative parliaments.

But what is the conclusion to all this and the determining factor in our strategy? It is the ruling class which is out to destroy and limit democracy. Our task is to defend and extend it and to show that the full flowering of democracy is bound up with the battle for socialism. In other words, we have to present a democratic advance to socialism.

In this we are guided by two important thoughts of Lenin. Discussing the relationship between socialism and democracy, Lenin wrote:

"It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the strugggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from the socialist revolution, or obscure it, or overshadow it, etc. On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy." (*Selected Works,* Vol. V, p. 268.)

Our approach, therefore is a Leninist approach.

FORMS OF TRANSITION

But in addition Lenin asked us to focus our attention to "searching out forms of *transition* or *approach* to the proletarian revolution."

For us, a country in which the tradition of struggle for democracy is strong and a dominant force in our history, the issue of our attitude to Parliament arose.

Again Lenin's thoughts here are of the greatest interest, for Lenin understood British conditions well.

In the famous discussion with the "left" in May 1918, when Bukharin referred to Marx's remark that under certain conditions, it would be more expedient for the working class to "buy off this gang" (the capitalists), Lenin discussed the basic relationship of

forces in Britain which made this possible.

"(i) the absolute preponderance of workers, i.e. proletarians, owing to the absence of a peasantry . . . (ii) the excellent organization of the proletariat in trade unions (England was at that time the leading country in the world in this respect); (iii) the comparatively high level of culture of the proletariat which had been trained by centuries of political liberty; (iv) the old habit of the well-organized English capitalists of settling political and economic questions by compromise. . . . These were the circumstances which at that time gave rise to the idea that the peaceful subjugation of the English capitalists by the workers was possible." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 369.)

The absolute preponderance of the workers in the population has not only risen since 1918, particularly since the war a community of interests between the working class and the middle sections of the population has grown as monopoly capitalism has grown. All this creates important new political possibilities of alliance between the working class and the middle sections. Trade union organization, particularly in the workshops, is stronger, Communist influence higher and an important now post-1945 phenomenon is the growth of *white-collar* trade unionism, again creating rich new anti-monopoly possibilities. As for our centuries of political liberties the developments since 1918, whatever the problems, have been to strengthen democratic institutions and particularly over recent years the criticism of the "establishment" has grown.

As for Lenin's fourth point, the English ruling class, of course, will compromise only to the extent that they are forced to compromise, no more: our case rests not on compromise but on strength.

But, of course, on the other side, we are also clear that the growth of militarism and the power of the state bureaucracy are an outstanding development in Britain since 1918.

These thoughts plus the changes in the total world situation gave rise to our fundamental presentation in *The British Road to Socialism*. The main ideas are well known and can be summarized.

BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM

First, our Program clearly stated the issue was that of political state power. "Political power must be taken from the hands of the capitalist minority and firmly grasped by the majority of the people, led by the working class."

The people of different countries had taken power into their hands in different ways according to conditions in their countries and in the world as a whole.

We then argued that whatever the different conditions, there were certain essential requirements for the advance to socialism

in every country including Britain:

"These are: that power must be taken by the working class supported by other progressive sections of the people; that there must be a Party based on Marxism and the principles of democratic centralism, capable of giving leadership in the struggle against capitalism and in the building of socialism. A Socialist government, backed up by the working class and the people, must take over the basic means of production, carry through the measures necessary to end exploitation, develop a planned socialist economy, raise living standards, prevent obstruction and sabotage by the capitalists and landlords, abolish national oppression, and consistently apply the principles of working-class internationalism."

Pointing out that more than a third of the world's population had taken the socialist road and the vast advance of national liberation, countries that now took the socialist path would have powerful allies and would no longer have to face single-handed a hostile capitalist encirclement, the Program declared:

"On this background, and with the increasing strength of the working class and progressive movement throughout the world, a transition to socialism without armed conflict is possible today in many countries.

"This is particularly true of our country, whose powerful Labor movement embodies the British workers' fighting ability and experience of struggle, and where there is a strong tradition of democratic institutions. At a time of mounting class struggle, when the entire working class is brought into action and is supported by other sections of the population, a general election fought on the issue of a socialist solution to Britain's problems could bring decisive results. It could return to Parliament a Socialist Labor and Communist majority and establish a Socialist government which, with the backing of the people, would begin to carry through a fundamental social change.

"In this way, using our traditional institutions and rights, we can transform Parliament into the effective instrument of the people's will, through which the major legislative measures of the change to socialism will be carried. Using the rights already won in the Labor movement's historic struggle for democracy, we can change capitalist democracy, dominated by wealth and privilege, into socialist democracy, where only the interests of the people count."

It is clear from all this that our argumentation was following Marx, Engels and Lenin. Working in our circumstances we must present the struggle to defend and extend democracy. It is along these lines that our path to socialism lies. This is the only realistic strategy which corresponds to our actual political circumstances.

Either the bourgeoisie wins the battle and destroys democracy, in which case violence will prevail, or the people win the battle,

in which case it will transform the bourgeois democracy into socialist democracy by peaceful means, imposing its will on the ruling class.

For the strategy of peaceful transition, for democratic advance to socialism, the question of alliances and the attitude to other parties, particularly the Labor Party, is of the greatest importance. Here arises, too, the connection between the present political situation in Britain and the future advance to socialism.

The characteristic of the present position in Britain is that the movement against the Tory government is on a very wide scale. The economic policy of the monopolies, wage restraint and so on is directed not only against the working class, but affects the professional and middle sections, the small shopkeepers, the farmers and the pensioners. There is growing concern about mergers and monopoly concentration and the threat to democratic rights. The imperialist foreign policy has brought into being wide movements going far beyond the working class, such as CND and the Anti-Apartheid Movement, wide cultural movements, united action on educational advance, etc. Politically all this is expressed in the widespread swing to Labor, the (still modest) advance of the Communist Party, and the Liberal revival.

In the immediate situation as we have argued at our 28th National Congress, the aim is a Labor and Communist majority in Parliament. We have pointed out that the battle for a socialist policy must be waged alongside the struggle to defeat the Tories. Our tactics now and the important political developments which can flow from them have a great bearing in creating the necessary political conditions for the alliance of forces required for an advance to socialism in Britain. On this what did our Program say?

It pointed out that the working class constituted fully two-thirds of the population. In addition, the professional sections, small businessmen and working farmers were hit by the monopolists and had a community of interests with the working class. A united working class could rally these sections into a broad anti-monopoly front on wages, peace and democratic rights:

"An alliance must be built up between the working class and these sections of the population in the fight for peace and social progress, and against all attempts to maintain capitalism at the expense of the national interests. Such an alliance, headed by the working class, is an essential condition for the establishment of a real Socialist government to build a Socialist Britain."

ATTITUDE TO THE LABOR PARTY

It is clear that the realization of this aim depends on the progressive development of the present political position in Britain

and above all on the development of working-class unity. A key question here for the Communist Party is its attitude to the Labor Party.

On this, the Chinese position is as follows:

"The social democratic parties are not parties of socialism. With the exception of certain left wings, they are parties serving the bourgeoisie and capitalism. They are a variety of bourgeois political parties. On the question of socialist revolution, our position is fundamentally different from that of the social democratic parties. This distinction must not be obscured. To obscure this distinction only helps the leaders of the social democratic parties to deceive the masses and hinders us from winning the masses away from the influence of the social democratic parties.

"However, it is unquestionably very important to strengthen our work with respect to the social democratic parties and strive to establish a united front with their left and middle groups." (*On the Origin and Development of the Differences*, p. 61.)

This quotation, however, really begs the question. The Labor Party, as at present led and constituted, is certainly not a party of socialism. It does serve the bourgeoisie and capitalism; for 40 years we have been pointing this out. But this does not make it just "a variety of bourgeois political parties." Why have the Labor parties a left wing with which the aim of Communists should be to unite? There is no aim to unite with any section of the Tory or Liberal parties.

Social democracy is essentially a product of the countries of Western capitalism. The imperialist conditions bred the conditions of social reformism which it expresses. It hardly exists in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But it is a central problem for the advance of social revolution in the major capitalist countries.

This matter, which has been a profound concern to us over these past 40 years, was thoroughly dealt with at our 27th Party Congress.

The right-wing-left-wing conflict in the Labor Party is inherent in its structure and its mass affiliated trade union membership. While formed to win independent working-class representation in Parliament, its dominant leadership from MacDonald onwards has in practice carried out typical reformist capitalist policies. The predominantly petty-bourgeois leadership plus the right-wing trade union bureaucracy over the years have maintained their grip over the mass working-class trade union membership by the trade union bloc vote. In its origin it was a federal union of the working class, bringing together the trade unions, the cooperatives, and the socialist societies. The British Socialist Party, a founding organization of the Communist Party, was affiliated to the Labor Party.

The aim of the continued campaigns of the Communist Party between 1920 and 1946 was to have the organized party of socialism, the Communist Party, inside the broad Labor Party to transform its character from reformist and capitalist policies to independent working-class policies and socialism. Equally, right-wing strategy in refusing affiliation, imposing bans and proscriptions, discipline and expulsions, was to transform it into a rigid Social Democratc Party on continental lines.

In 1946 the Labor Party Constitution was changed to rule out the affiliation of the Communist Party. Yet the trade unions remain the main mass membership of the Labor Party. The trade unions are united class bodies of the workers with different political views, whose elementary class interests conflict with the political aims of the right-wing Labor leaders.

The whole history of the Labor Party has been the history of the right-wing-left-wing struggle within it; the battle between the capitalist policies of the dominant right wing and the socialist strivings and anti-capitalist militancy of the left-wing forces. In all of this the Communist Party has played a leading part.

With a single mass trade union movement in Britain (and in the majority of trade unions the Communists enjoy equal rights), it is perfectly possible to change the balance of forces within the unions, to establish left progressive and Communist majorities. This can have a decisive influence on the future of the Labor Party and on its policies because of the decisive power of the trade union vote.

At the same time we see as an even more important issue the development of a *mass* Communist Party in Britain as the decisive socialist force in the Labor movement. We must not and cannot be satisfied with influencing the trade union movement only. We must win through to Parliament with Communist M.P.'s, and to the councils with Communist Councillors becoming a mass influence in British political life. It was a great achievement of our 27th National Congress that it ended all conceptions of a "ginger group" role for the Communist Party and both charted the course for a mass party and correctly stated the relations between the Party and the left in the Labor Party and put as one of the main aims the development of unity in the Labor movement.

But this perspective, too, also raises the question of future long-term aims. To this our 27th Congress gave an equally clear answer:

"The Communist Party has always striven and always will strive for unity and agreement with the Labor Party, not only in day-to-day struggle, but for the achievements of political power and socialism. The obstacle to this unity has always been the right wing and its policies. Today it is becoming increasingly clear that the struggle opened up by Scarborough must be carried forward to the final elimination of right-wing capitalist influence and

leadership in the Labor Party. This could bring about the victory of a united Labor movement in which the Communist Party, as the political class party of the working-class struggle for power and socialism, will fulfil its role in comradeship, partnership and agreement with all the advancing sections of the organized working class. For our part we look forward to a future when we shall be able to see the fulfilment of a united working-class party based on Marxism." (*Report of 27th National Congress*, p. 21.)

From this follow our proposals regarding the nature of the Socialist government put in *The British Road to Socialism*, of returning to Parliament "a socialist Labor and Communist majority and establish a Socialist government which, with the backing of the people, would begin to carry through a fundamental social change."

This is not an easy path. It bristles with problems, but it is the only realist political line for Britain. The actual situation cannot be treated by formulas. This is a policy which has grown out of our political experience and the reality of the position in the British Labor movement. Any other position would be mere revolutionary phrasemongering, the uttering of sectarian platitudes to cover up political bankruptcy, empty words to hids real isolation.

COMMUNIST PERSPECTIVES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Broadly speaking it is a position which has been taken up by all the Communist parties in Western Europe in the light of their experience. It corresponds with the call in the 1960 Statements to overcome the split in the working-class movement and establish some kind of working unity with the Social Democratic forces.

In their attack on the possibility of a peaceful transition, the Chinese single out Khrushchov for attack. It is denounced as "Khrushchov's revisionism."

The fact that Khrushchov and the CPSU boldly outlined these new possibilities at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was a great service to Marxism. It was part and parcel of the great historic role of the 20th Congress in removing the bane of the cult of the individual, rooting out the evils which had obtruded into our socialist system and opening out a great new period of creative development for our international movement.

But we are sure that the Soviet comrades will not take it amiss if we point out that many Communist parties in Western Europe were already arriving at this position on the basis of their own political experience. And they were doing this, not because they were afraid of armed struggle. The French and Italian Communist parties have an heroic record of armed struggle in the war against fascism in which they gained national stature among their peoples. So have the Yugoslavs and the Greeks. Even small parties like

the Danish and the Norwegian in the most difficult circumstances, have an heroic record.

Our own Party first adopted *The British Road to Socialism* in 1951, two years before Stalin died and five years before the 20th Congress of the CPSU. A number of Communist parties at the time, including the CPSU, showed considerable interest in what we were thinking when we were drafting *The British Road.* The main ideas advanced in the Program, particularly that of the possibility of peaceful transition in Britain, were discussed in detail in conversations Harry Pollitt had with Stalin at the time, who approved fully of our approach.

Following the adoption of the Program by our Executive Committee in January 1951, it was published in full in *Pravda,* again with Stalin's approval. The Soviet Communists have always given it general support since then. If Khrushchov is a "revisionist" on this matter, then so, too, was Stalin.

Above all, this line is being applied with increasing success by the Communist Party of France. The establishment of a wide alliance to defeat de Gaulle and re-establish a democratic regime in France is a task of the greatest importance, not only for France but for the whole of Europe. All the efforts to isolate and destroy the French Communist Party have failed. Communist-Socialist unity has already scored important successes. New perspectives are opening up. But the Chinese comrades simply dismiss this political reality with the cheap and ignorant sneer . . .

"Certain leaders of the Communist Party of France of whom Thorez is representative, have long been pursuing a revisionist line, have publicized the 'parliamentary road' in response to Khrushchov's baton, and have actually reduced the Communist Party to the level of a social democratic party. They have ceased to give active support to the revolutionary aspirations of the people and rolled up the national banner of opposition to U.S. imperialism. The result of their pursuit of this revisionist line is that the Communist Party, which once had great influence among the people, has become increasingly isolated from the masses and has deteriorated more and more." (p. 50.)

For anyone to claim that the French Communist Party is becoming increasingly isolated is either to display incredible ignorance or equally incredible spite.

The Italian Party likewise has won important gains for a similar line. And both French and Italian parties make clear that they want to establish a united front with the Socialist parties, not only for immediate demands, but also for the advance to socialism. The issue is to defeat and break the right-wing domination in the Labor movement, and win the battle for the left Socialist and Communist forces.

ATTITUDE TO BOURGEOIS PARTIES

This strategy also raises the question of the attitude of the Communist Party to the bourgeois parties. We are the inveterate opponents of Tory and Liberal parties. But we are out to defeat them by mass political means and not as our opponents allege by administrative means.

Even at the height of the controversy with Kautsky, Lenin wrote regarding the question of the restriction of the franchise to the bourgeoisie:

"One must study the question of restricting the franchise in the light of the *specific conditions* of the Russian Revolution and the *specific path* of its development. . . . It would be a mistake, however, to guarantee in advance that the impending proletarian revolutions in Europe will all, or for the most part, be necessarily accompanied by the restrictions of the franchise for the bourgeoisie." (*Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 143.)

A socialist government will deprive the monopolists of their economic and social power, but will not deprive them of their votes. As we say in our Program, "the right of other political parties to maintain their organizations, party publications and propaganda, and to take part in elections will be maintained providing that these parties will conform to the law." As we deprive the monopolists of their power, the economic and social mass basis of the Tory and Liberal parties will disappear. The battle to destroy the mass political influence of the capitalist parties will be long and fierce. The more resolutely a Socialist government acts against capitalism, the fiercer it will resist. But the point is, we will fight and defeat them politically and not by administrative action. It is not we who threaten democratic rights, it is the Tory Party and the monopolists.

PARLIAMENT

All this raises as a central issue our attitude to Parliament. It was a major development of our Party position in 1951 that we clarified our ideas of Parliament. The development of Soviets was an indigenous Russian development arising out of Russian conditions. Between the wars, the Communist International put the issue of Soviet as the expression of the aim of the working-class power to the forefront. But already at the famous 7th World Congress of the Communist International, fascist dictatorships gave rise in life to the task of the defense and extension of bourgeois democracy, of united front governments which, in Dimitrov's words, would be "governments of struggle against fascism and reaction." After the Second World War with the extension of socialism in Eastern Europe and in China, these countries in the event developed

their own governmental form, and not the Soviet form.

The Chinese comrades dismiss Parliament contemptuously in these words:

"Parliament is only an ornament and screen for bourgeois rule. To adopt or discard the parliamentary system, to grant parliament greater or lesser power, to adopt one kind of electoral law or another—the choice between these alternatives is always dictated by the needs and interests of bourgois rule." (pp. 33-34.)

The point they make is that the chief component of the state machine is armed force and not Parliament. We will deal with this aspect later, but first, let us deal with Parliament in Britain, which is our concern.

Far be it from me to defend the present parliamentary and state set-up in Britain. Our Party has consistently exposed bourgeois rule in Britain.* We have shown the actual domination of the monopolies in Parliament and exposed the role of the Lords and the Monarchy. We have shown the decline of Parliament *vis-a-vis* the Cabinet. We have denounced the undemocratic weighting of the electoral system. We have shown the complete capitalist class domination of the state machine and the judiciary, and that bourgeois democracy, like any other form of government, is based on force. Usually peaceful, in times of acute crisis, particularly strikes, the whole apparatus of Emergency Powers comes into use. Far from softening our critique since 1951 when we adopted *The British Road*, we have deepened and extended it because of the need to create the understanding of the nature of the problems involved in the strategy of *The British Road.*

But again, of course, this is only one side of the picture. Parliament in Britain is the product of a centuries' old struggle for liberty. That struggle was increasingly fought over the issue of the sovereign power of Parliament. Today the constitutional position is that Parliament is sovereign, it has power to pass what laws it likes. As we explain, it is the monopolies and the Tories who are attacking and seeking to limit parliamentary power. Of course, these powers of Parliament are at the moment dominated by the bourgeoisie and the fact that economic and social power is in the hands of the monopolies.

But is it correct for us to defend and uphold the sovereign power of Parliament and make our declared aim the democratic use of that power to legislate for the people and not for the monopolists? With the working class and its allies comprising 90 per cent, the overwhelming bulk of the population, and with universal suffrage, it is a standing political challenge to the working

---

*See John Gollan **British Political System.** James Harvey and Katherine Hood **The British State,** etc.

class and the Communist Party and the Labor Party to win the overwhelming majority of the votes for a socialist majority, and isolate the Tories and the monopolists. This is the reality of the stage of political development in Britain. The fact is that even the Labor Party has never won the overwhelming majority of votes in Britain, such is the grip and power of monopoly capitalism over the organs of public opinion and the bourgeois politics of the Labor Party.

We in Britain have no written Constitution. The Constitutional convention is the sovereignty of Parliament. Of course, these days it is almost considered political treason in some quarters to refer to any constitutional position, that by doing so one automatically becomes a revisionist. Why should we not refer to the sovereign constitutional position of Parliament? It was not the gift of a ruling class, but the product of the battle for civil rights in which the struggle of the people was the deciding factor.

Now the issue is—will the monopolists strip Parliament of its powers or will the working class fight to extend democracy and transform its content. Therefore, *The British Road* makes clear our stand for the Commons to become the sole national authority, the abolition of the Lords and the monarchy, and the democratic transformation of the electoral system, the abolition of the press monopoly, democratic control of broadcasting, television, etc.

Equally clearly *The British Road* prefaces all these measures by the need to break the economic power of the monopolies by the socialist nationalization of large-scale industry, banks, insurance companies, big distributive monopolies and the land of the big landowners.

The next stage in the Chinese argument is that as long as the bourgeoisie controls the state machine, the army and the police, the winning of a "stable majority in Parliament by the proletariat is impossible or this stable majority is undependable;" and further that with all the unfair restrictions of the bourgeois system and electoral laws "it is very difficult for them to win a majority of votes under bourgeois rule. And even if they win a majority of the votes, the bourgeoisie can prevent them from winning a majority of seats in Parliament by revising the electoral laws and by other means." The manipulation of the electoral laws in France is given as an example of this.

The Chinese comrades here are attempting to get us all ways, but throughout their arguments there is this air of inevitable defeat—it is always what the bourgeoisie will do. The mass movement and the mass struggle is never mentioned. But it is the mass struggle and the mass movement which is the essence of the question.

It is appropriate to recall here the way the 1960 Statement puts

the issue:

"Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity, given a united working class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament into an instrument serving the working people, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution. All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism."

THE MASS STRUGGLE

The whole emphasis here, correctly, is on the mass struggle. That struggle exists and is developing on peace, wages, housing, pensions, social issues and democratic rights. The point is that in the main it is an *extra-parliamentary* mass strugggle of demonstrations, sit-downs, strikes, agitation, etc. This struggle has developed in spite of the right-wing grip. Once that group is removed the democratic mass organizations and the popular struggle and initiative of the people will play an ever increasing role in our political life. The next stage in that mass movement is the defeat of the Tories and a Labor government with Communist M.P.'s. It must and can express itself in mass pressure on Parliament for progressive policies. Its further development, especially with the deepening of the crisis of British imperialism, will result in further political differentiation within the movement, the growth of the Communist Party and the left in the Labor movement with the aim of increasingly challenging and breaking the right-wing grip on the movement, leading to the stage of a Communist and Socialist majority in Parliament. Difficult? Yes. But impossible, No. The stability of the majority will depend on the power of the mass movement to break the right-wing grip. There is no magic short cut, only patient, systematic mass political work and struggle. It is legitimate to ask—if this cannot be done where is the perspective of an armed struggle, which is not empty words or putschism?

We have to start from where the people are. Developing the

mass struggle is a question of convincing people, of changing their ideas. It is playing into the hands of our enemies to be indifferent to democratic struggles and to the question of Parliament. In practice this would mean, under the cover of revolutionary phrases, to surrender the initiative to the ruling class and the right-wing social democrats.

Of course, the bourgeoisie may try to force a change of the electoral laws through Parliament or invoke emergency power. If they do it will be an expression of their political isolation which the mass movement will face and, we believe, can defeat. The Chinese comrades quote France. They do not quote Italy where the mass movement has successfully defeated all attempts to change the electoral laws. And in France the political possibilities based on a united mass movement are developing to defeat de Gaulle, end authoritarian rule and restore democratic life to France.

PARLIAMENT AND STATE POWER

The Chinese comrades then resort to a caricature of the position of the parties adopting the line of the 1960 Statement. "Khrushchov maintains," they write, "that if the proletariat can win a majority in Parliament, this in itself will amount to a seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machinery." And further:

"Even if in certain circumstances a Communist Party should win a majority of seats in parliament or participate in the government as a result of an electoral victory, it would not change the bourgeois nature of parliament or government, still less would it mean the smashing of the old and the establishment of a new state machine. It is absolutely impossible to bring about a fundamental social change by relying on bourgeois parliaments or governments. With the state machine under its control the reactionary bourgeoisie can nullify elections, dissolve parliament, expel Communists from the government, outlaw the Communist Party and resort to brute force to suppress the masses and the progressive forces." (p. 35.)

Let us examine these arguments stage by stage. Neither Krushchov nor any other Communists in their right senses have ever equated a parliamentary majority with state power. Our Party, in particular, year in and year out argued with the Labor masses just the opposite. We have shown that successive Labor majorities in Britain have governed for the capitalist class and have left untouched the complete domination of the state apparatus by the capitalist class. This has been our major criticism of reformism, our justification for our position of social revolution, and that social revolution not only meant the ending of the *economic*, but also the state power of the ruling class. We do not require to be reminded of Bernstein and Kautsky. We have had our own Bern-

steins and Kautskys, from MacDonald onwards, preaching the "non-class" character of British state power. The Chinese comrades may now think that we have succumbed to right-wing Labor ideology. That is their privilege. But they can only do so by "overlooking" our 40 years of teaching on the nature of the capitalist state which has earned us the inveterate hostility of the right-wing and the capitalist parties.

It is the same with the argument that a majority would not change the nature of Parliament or the state machine, and that it is impossible to win fundamental social change by relying on bourgeois Parliaments or governments. A Communist-Socialist majority in Parliament would be a product of mass struggle, would be supported by powerful mass organization and would act to change the whole bourgeois framework. It would be a government of the working class and the masses of the people determined to legislate for social change. More, it would be a government backed by a powerful mass movement outside Parliament, by the organized working class in the factories, railway depots, ports and airports, in the power stations, towns and villages. It would be a government which had won many of the rank and file of the army, large sections of progressive civil servants and lawyers. It would be a government which, in the words of *The British Road,* would take steps to consolidate "the political power of the working people by ensuring that those in commanding positions in the armed forces and police, the civil srevice and diplomatic services are loyal to the socialist government and increasingly representative of the people."

As for the final Chinese argument that the bourgeoisie, outvoted by the people, would resort to forcible suppression, again there is the note of finality and inevitability.

Our strategy of peaceful transition cannot guarantee peaceful transition. Both the 1960 Statement and our *British Road* follow Marx and Lenin in this respect.

The 1960 Statement declared:

"In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against the people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or other stage of the struggle for socialism."

In the same way *The British Road* also made clear:

"But the capitalist class cannot be expected to surrender its wealth and power without a struggle. The big capitalists, whose

interests are threatened by the advance to socialism, are likely to strive by every means in their power, constitutional and unconstitutional, to hold back the movement. At all stages in the struggle for progressive policies and for socialism, therefore, the working class and progressive movement needs to be vigilant, and if necessary to use its political and industrial strength to defeat any attempts by the big capitalists to restrict democratic rights or block the road to democratic advance.

"This will be of particular importance when the Socialist government is established and begins to carry through measures to break the economic and political power of the big capitalists. The extent to which the working class is alert and prepared to use its strength in support of the government's measure will determine whether the big capitalists accept the democratic verdict of the people or attempt to resist by force.

"But headed by the working class, a Labor and progressive movement which has been built up in struggle and inspired by the goal of socialism will have the strength and spirit to overcome all obstacles and ensure that the Socialist government carries through its program, opening up a new and glorious future for our country."

If the capitalist class, defying the electoral will of the people, resorts to force, they can only be answered by force. But this is not the argument. Our aim is to confront the capitalists with such overwhelming strength in all key factories, in transport, in the towns, villages and ports, and among the working-class forces comprising the bulk of the army, that they are compelled to accept the democratic verdict of the people. We are confident that these conditions can develop.

CREATE THE NECESSARY CONDITIONS

Lenin argued that a social revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation. He wrote: "Only when the *'lower classes' do not want* the old way, and when the 'upper classes' *cannot carry on in the old way*—only then can revolution triumph." (Lenin, *Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder,* Chap. IX.) In another passage (Chap. X) Lenin develops this, stressing that the conditions for successful revolution are that (1) the hostile class forces have sufficiently weakened themselves in a struggle which is beyond their strength; (2) the vacillating intermediate elements have sufficiently shown their practical bankruptcy; (3) there is a mass sentiment for revolutionary action among the proletariat.

What are the likely conditions for development of such a situation in Britain? In Lenin's time such a situation coincided with the aftermath of world war. This was the case, too, in the position in China and Eastern Europe. Because of this our enemies argue that socialist revolution is bound up with world war and is the by-

product of war. We utterly reject such an idea. Social revolution is the outcome of intolerable class tension and contradictions in capitalist society. The fact that these contradictions finally found their revolutionary solution in the aftermath of the war, was due to the fact that the war in these countries deepened these contradictions to breaking point. The war did not create these conditions.

Are we to await fatalistically for a third world war to bring about a new revolutionary situation in the countries of Western Europe? We say, no. Apart from the fact that such a war would be a nuclear war which in Britain would mean virtually an end to social existence, our whole strategy is aimed to prevent a third world war. We are convinced that the forces exist which can prevent world war. We aim to advance to socialism in conditions of peace. To prevent war means politically to defeat the war plans of British capitalism, to end conditions of the cold war, to impose policies of peaceful coexistence and disarmament, which in turn politically weakens the monopolists and reduces the militarization of the state. This creates more favorable conditions for the peaceful transition. The conditions making for a socialist revolution in Britain will arise out of the deepening of the social contradictions associated with capitalism and the crisis of British imperialism, the bankruptcy of bourgeois and right-wing politics, the growing contradictions of automation, the need for fundamental solutions to the social problems of our times. It is impossible to be schematic or dogmatic; there is no exact historical parallel to the period opening before us. We will work with Lenin's advice in mind to seek fresh new forms of transition or approach to social revolution.

But one thing is clear. We have to work to *create* the new possibilities by mass action, agitation and work for our socialist aims. The 1960 Statement did not put the issue as one of academic debate. It called upon us to "*create* the necessary conditions for the peaceful realization of the socialist revolution."

As we have said before, this is the line of our strategy and we should refuse to be deflected from it. To adopt any other would be wrong, would be to substitute revolutionary phrases for the real political mass struggle to build unity, win the Labor movement and the masses and rout the monopolists.

RESOLUTIONS* OF THE FIFTEENTH CC MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

I. THE FIRST YEAR OF THE ESHKOL GOVERNMENT

The year that has passed since the resignation of the Ben Gurion government and the advent to power of the Eshkol government, has demonstrated that no essential changes have taken place in the policy of Israel.

Our Party judges a government by its attitude to the following three main policy lines:

1) peace and non-alignment with the imperialist bloc;

2) guarantee of democracy and of the equality of the Arab population in Israel;

3) guarantee of the rights and interests of the working people.

The Eshkol government has done nothing to change the policy of its predecessor on these questions:

1. The Eshkol government stands for preserving the **status quo** with regard to the Palestine problem and pursues a policy of strength in the Arab-Israeli conflict; it does not recognize the legitimate rights of the Arab population of Palestine and refuses to negotiate on the rights of the Arab refugees on the basis of the UN decision; it carries on the line of making a deal with imperialist powers, especially with U.S. imperialism — the mainstay of the forces of war.

2. The Eshkol government continues to suppress the democratic freedoms of the people, especially of the workers and other working people; it carries on the policy of discrimination and national oppression of the Arabs, confiscates the land of Arab peasants and institutes military administration in areas inhabited by Arabs.

3. In economic, social and finance policy the Eshkol government continues zealously to serve the interests of foreign and local big capital; its policy leads to the further impoverishment of the working people in town and countryside; the government threatens to deprive the working people of the right to strike.

Using all means of class struggle — political, economic and ideological alike — the Communist Party of Israel has fought and continues to fight against the policy of the Eshkol government and

*Abridged from **El Ittihad**, July 20, 1964.

against any government which does not guarantee peace, a just solution of the Palestine problem, a policy of non-alignment with the imperialist camp, democratic freedoms and respect for the interests of the working people, and radical changes in the traditional Israeli policy.

However, the Communist Party reckons with the fact that the policy of the Eshkol government differs somewhat from that of Ben Gurion. For example, the pressure of the working people has forced a certain weakening of the pro-West German trends of Israel policy, although the general line of military, economic and political cooperation with Federal Germany has remained unchanged, as well as a moderation of the military and one-man dictatorship typical of the Ben Gurion government; fewer anti-Sovietisms are heard, although on the whole the anti-Soviet line is preserved.

These partial changes in policy should be viewed as a result of a certain lessening of international tension that followed the signing of the Moscow test-ban treaty and a number of agreements between the USA and the USSR, as a result of the struggle of the popular masses in our country, as well as a consequence of a certain weakening of the dominance of the ultra-Right militarist Ben Gurion wing in the MAPAI leadership.

However, these differences are slight, and hence they cannot alter our attitude to the Eshkol government. If our Party positively assesses some steps of this agreement, it does so in order to emphasize the failure of Ben Gurion's policy which was completely at variance with the interests of the masses, and also to promote the political consciousness of the masses and their realization of the need for radical change.

The struggle growing in the MAPAI party between the Ben Gurion, Eshkol and Lavon groups is a reflection of the crisis of the anti-national and anti-popular policy. Our Party has supported and will support all actions against the attempts of the ultra-Right Ben Gurion wing of MAPAI to seize all power. We hold that by pursuing the old-line policy the Eshkol government encourages the Ben Gurion group.

II. COMRADE KHRUSHCHOV'S VISIT TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC AND NEW CHANGES IN THE UAR

The Communist Party of Israel regards the visit of Comrade Khrushchov to the UAR as an event of extreme importance which has helped to strengthen the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and the UAR and broaden the united front against imperialism and danger of thermonuclear war; it considers that this visit has contributed to the development of the policy of coexistence and liberation of the oppressed peoples, strengthened the UAR's policy of

positive neutrality, and enhanced the role of the socialist world system.

The Communist Party acclaims the fact that the UAR has rejected the path of capitalist development. It hails the progressive nature of the socio-economic changes effected of late in the UAR, and its present development in the direction of socialism.

The Party follows with sympathy the struggle of the UAR working people who want their country to take the road of socialist development, and expresses its proletarian internationalist solidarity with it.

III. FOR WORKING-CLASS UNITY, FOR A NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC FRONT

The Communist Party of Israel maintains that working-class unity of action and a united national-democratic front are the best guarantees of effecting democratic transformations, which in turn can lead to new changes in the country in the future.

While advocating the cooperation of all national forces and the building of a national-democratic front, the Communist Party must preserve its independent line. Acting in this way, the Party has achieved a certain measure of success. For instance, thanks to the struggles of the working masses, to cooperation between the various forces, between politicians, workers and democratic-minded elements, to actions taken jointly with other groups in Parliament and Histadrut, the Communists have succeeded in dealing a blow to the policy of isolating the Communist Party pursued by the anti-Communists. While continuing to be on the alert with regard to the danger of sectarianism and opportunism, the Communist Party works to reinforce and develop its line of cooperating with all the national forces and of building the national-democratic front.

The wave of strikes with the participation of the various sections of the working people, who protest against capitalist oppression, against the policy of the government and even against the Histadrut leadership, bears witness to the growth of their political activity. In a way this process is also reflected in the sharpening of the internal contradictions and struggle in the Zionist-socialist parties of the bourgeoisie: MPAI, Ahdut Ha'voda and MAPAM.

The Communist Party supports any, even the slightest, Left trend in all the Social Democratic parties of Israel. At the same time, it has advanced, with a view to achieving a basic change in the existing state of affairs, the proposal for Socialist-Communist unity of action as the basis for the cooperation of the entire working class both today and in the future.

While championing joint action with other parties of the working class, the Communist Party is waging ideological struggle

against Zionism, clericalism and reformism, and for educating the working people in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

IV. PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AND ISRAELI PATRIOTISM

In its struggle the Communist Party is guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and Israeli patriotism. The strength of our Party and its ability to carry out its prestige among the working class and the people of our country on the basis of fraternal relations of the Jewish and Arab working people, on the one hand, and by the relations of mutual solidarity with the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the conclusions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings, on the other.

The Communist Party of Israel stands solidly with the CPSU, whom it regards as the vanguard of the world Communist movement, with its general line of consolidating world peace, building communist society and supporting the national-liberation movements of all the peoples.

The inviolable solidarity between the Israeli Communist Party and the CPSU has stood the test of developments in the international Communist and working-class movement, including the working-class movement in the Middle East.

Our Party is also linked by bonds of solidarity with all the Communist parties in the common struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The proletarian internationalism of our Party is in the best interests of the working people of Israel and of the majority of the population of the country. Hence proletarian internationalism is fully in accord with genuine Israeli patriotism. The struggle of the Communist Party against the pro-imperialist, reactionary regime, for a policy of peace, neutrality, democracy, progress, equality and fraternity of the Jewish and Arab peoples is a vivid expression of the patriotism of our Party. Its patriotism is also revealed in its love for the people and motherland, for the working class and working intelligentsia, for the progressive culture of the Jewish people, for the Israeli nation now in the process of formation, and for the Arab people.

The Israeli Communist Party opposes the existing regime, for it is concerned about the destiny of the people, the security of the country and its happy future. Combining support for international class solidarity with national patriotic responsibility is, and will be, for our Party the condition for winning over the masses and fulfilling the role of vanguard in the future united working-class and national-democratic front.

V. THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

The attacks launched by the CC CPC against the Communist movement have transcended the bounds of ideological discussion and developed, in fact, into open political struggle bearing the hallmark of slanderous campaign against the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The disruptive activity of the CC CPC is doing harm to the Communist movement. The Chinese leaders' proposal that a new international meeting of the Communist parties be postponed for a long time should be rejected because it is not conducive to overcoming the difficulties.

Every new advance in the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries and every new success in the development of the socialist system deals a blow at the erroneous theses of the Chinese leaders and proves the correctness and viability of the Leninist line of the Communist movement.

All the Communist parties are equal. According to the principles of the Declaration and Statement, they should decide in common the problems of the international Communist movement, and therefore we cannot agree with a state of affairs where one party seeks to prevent a new meeting or to dictate its own terms for convening it.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel considers a new meeting imperative and supports the initiative of the CC CPSU in proposing the immediate convocation of the 26-party drafting committee to prepare and hold the meeting.

Joint consultations on problems of the Communist movement is the solely correct method recognized by all Communist parties. This tried and tested method is a guarantee of the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

June 1964

THE CHINESE LEADERS AND BARRY GOLDWATER*

A strange figure to join the supporters of Sen. Barry Goldwater for President is a top-ranking Chinese government official. While he remains anonymous, it is reported that he is Marshal Chen Yi, Foreign Minister and Deputy Premier of the Chinese People's Republic. In an amazingly frank interview July 24 in Shanghai with Dr. Hugo Portisch, editor of the Vienna newspaper, Der Kurier, he declared that if he were a U.S. citizens he "would vote for Goldwater." His interview pushes to the extreme the present Chinese leaders' thesis of "the worse the better."

The Chinese leader thus joined the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian Crusade, the Minutemen and other ultra-Right groups in the U.S., along with the pro-Nazi and pro-fascist groups abroad, in backing Goldwater's candidacy.

But, in his interview, the Chinese official did not limit himself to backing Goldwater. He discouraged any notion that a struggle for civil rights could be of any use, declaring that for the Negro people, "Goldwater would not be bad at all." His argument appeared to be that at least, with Goldwater in office, there would be no illusion that the Negro people could win their civil rights now.

At the same time that the top Chinese leader was denouncing illusions about the present administration, he spread illusions about Goldwater's belligerency, claiming that if the Arizona senator became President he would not risk a world war by attacking China.

Behind all this, however, was the theme that the socialist countries, the non-aligned nations and the peace-loving peoples of the capitalist world could not influence the course of history, including the prevention of war. The Chinese leader stressed the idea that the decision for war or peace rested solely in the hands of American imperialism. He indicated, however, that the present leaders of the Chinese People's Republic would welcome a full-scale war scale war in Southeast Asia, and are not concerned about a worldwide war, or even any attempt to conquer China, citing the 180 years it took Britain to conquer India. He expressed contempt for atomic weapons as a major factor in war today.

Below are sections of the Chinese official's interview with the Vienna newspaper:

---

*The Worker, August 16, 1964.

GOLDWATER

"If I were in America, I would vote for Goldwater. He would be my candidate; I would vote for him. Goldwater would be good for the United States and he would be good for the world. He would, namely, push the internal situation in the United States. Twenty million Negroes are struggling bitterly for their rights. Kennedy introduced a civil rights bill in Congress. Has this changed anything in the situation of the Negroes in the United States? Nothing, absolutely nothing. They continue to be oppressed; they are still struggling for their rights. Therefore Goldwater would not be bad at all. He shows his true face."

NO WAR RISK

"We, however, do not believe that even Mr. Goldwater would risk an attack against China. Not even he. There is quite a difference between what one says in an election campaign and what one does later when one has been elected president. Therefore, we do not believe that Mr. Goldwater would carry out what he is now prophesying, although our friend Khrushchov believes this and is afraid of it."

U.S. WILL DECIDE

"They can achieve even less with atomic weapons. But even in such a case we would not be the ones to determine the scope of the war. Do not misunderstand me. The scope of such a war, too, would be determined by the Americans alone.

"If they want a small war, well, then a small war it will be. If they want a big war, then it will be a big war. It all depends on the Americans. We do not want any war whatsoever. But if it is forced upon us, then they will find us ready.

"The Americans threaten with atomic bombs, and my friend Khrushchov is also afraid of this. What do they want to achieve with atom bombs against China? They could destroy cities like Shanghai and Peking with atom bombs.

"But China? Do you know how big China is? Recently I was on a state visit in Pakistan. Premier Ayub Khan told me that the English needed 180 years to occupy the Indian subcontinent and then, finally, they pulled out. The Japanese tried with four million men to conquer China. They succeeded in occupying half of it, although, initially, they did not meet any resistance to speak of. And after eight years of war they were beaten and had to pull out. Do the Americans believe they could occupy China?"

WAR NOT BAD

"Naturally, a war in Southeast Asia would not be so bad, after

all. The situation there is like a cancerous growth. When it begins to grow it must be removed. It must be cut out. Thus, it would not be so bad after all if the situation were to be cleared up. Here you have our aggressive talk, as they say in Washington and of which our friend Khrushchov is always speaking."

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

23

Included in this Issue

WHY A NEW INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES
Interview with Waldeck Rochet

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Dezso Nemes

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 23

contents

STATEMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF LEBANON 5

INTERVIEW WITH KHALED BAGDASH
General Secretary, Communist Party of Syria 9

INTERVIEW WITH REZA RADMANESH
First Secretary, People's Party of Iran 15

STATEMENT OF POLITICAL COMMISSION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE 18

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE 25

PLENARY MEETING OF LEADERSHIP, COMMUNIST PARTY OF NORWAY 27

ELECTION MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SWEDEN 29

WHY A NEW INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES
Interview with Waldeck Rochet 32

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
Dezso Nemes, Member Political Bureau of Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party 37

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
OCTOBER 29, 1964

STATEMENT* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE LEBANON

AGAINST THE REVISIONISM OF THE CHINESE LEADERS AND THEIR SPLITTING ACTIVITY IN THE COMMUNIST, WORKING-CLASS AND NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The Lebanese Communists, together with the fraternal Communist parties, once more voice their strong protest against, and condemn, the splitting activity of the Chinese leaders in the world Communist and working-class movement and in the national-liberation movement, and are indignant at their attempts to isolate the liberated countries from their natural and sincere ally—the socialist system and its vanguard, the Soviet Union. The Chinese leaders try to counterpose the socialist camp to the national-liberation movement, which can but lead to isolating, weakening and dividing the national-liberation movement. Furthermore, they work to create splits in the ranks of the Communist parties and in the various mass democratic organizations, on both local and international level.

The Lebanese Communists resolutely condemn the feverish disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders directed against the unity and solidarity of the Communist parties in the Arab countries. They consider it their duty at present to expose to the whole world the activities of the Peking leaders in the Lebanon, where they establish contacts with dubious elements and renegades expelled from the ranks of the progressive movement and now in the service of foreign powers. They also contact Right-wing adventurers and some persons from among the supporters of the former pro-fascist "People's Socialist Party of Syria", in the hope of utilizing them in their disruptive and splitting activity against the national and progressive movement.

The diplomatic representatives of Peking accredited in the capital of a neighboring Arab country have of late been paying many visits to the Lebanon to meet these elements who have already exposed themselves. The Peking diplomats do not hesitate to bribe these persons and to supply them with money, inviting them to visit China and entrusting them with the task of distributing Peking propaganda publications. Moreover, these representatives publish articles, which they pay for, in the most reactionary and pro-im-

*Abridged from **El Nidaa**, August 18, 1964.

perialist newspapers, such as the mouthpiece of the Aflak Baathists. In these cheap and trivial articles, the Peking leaders and their agents direct slanders and insults against the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement and against the Lebanon and other Arab Communists. They openly call for factional activities and preach the inevitability of split. They publish statements against the Arab national-liberation movement, misrepresenting its history and distorting its experience. By all this they seek to sow confusion not only among the Communists but also among the democratic, national, and other progressive forces.

The Lebanese Communists hold that the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party has embarked upon the dangerous and pernicious path, which in the past was followed by their predecessors—the Trotskyites and other splitting elements. The Lebanese Communists realize the dangers resulting from the Chinese leaders' ideological and political revisionism and their factional activities which serve the enemies of socialism and peace, the imperialists and reactionaries.

Realizing the responsibility devolving on the Communists of the whole world in the struggle to safeguard the unity of the world Communist movement and to consolidate this unity on the basis of Marxist principles in accordance with the resolutions of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960, the Lebanese Communists declare their full support for the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the report of Comrade Suslov on the splitting activity and petty-bourgeois, neo-Trotskyite and chauvinist attitude of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and on the struggle for unity of the world Communist movement and for the unity of the essential forces in the world revolutionary process: the socialist camp, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement.

The Lebanese Communists avail themselves of this opportunity to extend a warm greeting accompanied by deep respect and esteem to Comrade Khrushchov, First Secretary of the CC, CPSU, a true friend of the Arabs and experienced Leninist leader whose selfless struggle for the victory of the cause of peace and socialism has won him the affection and admiration of millions of peoples in all continents. By his creative initiative in formulating the most important problems of our epoch and his principled defense of Leninism, Comrade Khrushchov has rendered the greatest services to the Communist and working-class movement and to the struggle of all the revolutionary liberation forces in the world. The Chinese leaders' attacks against Comrade Khrushchov are a logical result of their departure from creative Marxism-Leninism and of their hostile stand against the Soviet Union and the Party of the great

Lenin, as well as against the unity of the Communist movement and the interests of the national-liberation movement.

The Lebanese Communists voice their firm support for the resolutions adopted by the meeting of representatives of the Communists in the Arab countries last April, which denounced the revisionism of the Chinese leaders and their spliting, disruptive activity. They resolutely back the efforts made by the fraternal parties to expose and isolate the splitting and subversive groups which Peking artificially creates and tries to use, as obedient tools, in the struggle against the Communist parties to further the CPC leaders' drive for hegemony in the world Communist movement.

Like the overwhelming majority of the Marxist-Leninist parties, the Lebanese Communists declare once more their approval of, and attach much importance to, the idea of convening a world meeting of the Communist parties that will work on the basis of the thesis of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement for safeguarding the unity of the world Communist movement, promoting integrity and coherence on the victorous principles of Marxism-Leninism. They announce their complete agreement with the June 15 letter which the CC of the CPSU addressed to the CC of the Communist Party of China, concerning the importance and tasks of the new world meeting and the measures taken by the CPSU to start the preparations for convening this meeting in the middle of 1965.

The world meeting, besides being an effective and tested means of securing the unity of the Marxist-Leninist parties through frank and honest discussion, through collective efforts and joint search for the ways and means of overcoming the difficulties created in the world Communist movement, is also necessary in view of the important political, economic and social changes that have taken place in the world in the past four years since the last world meeting. These developments call for a new exchange of opinions and experiences in order to draw conclusions necessary for the world Communist movement as a whole. Among the most important new phenomena that have taken place in the world during the last few years, note should be made of the following: the considerable growth of the national-liberation movement and the new experience accumulated by many liberated countries in their struggle against old and new colonialism; and also as regards their advance along the paths of non-capitalist development and their march towards socialism. It is now necessary for all the Communist parties to study most thoroughly the new possibilities opened up by these developments and effectively utilize them in the struggle for safeguarding peace, averting the danger of a devastating nuclear world war, consolidating the policy of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems, for the further develop-

ment of the world revolutionary process and for reaching the common noble aim of the Communists: victory of the cause of peace, national independence, social progress and socialism in the whole world.

INTERVIEW* WITH KHALED BAGDASH

GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY OF SYRIA

Q. Instability has seemed to be the characteristic feature of the situation in Syria for some years now. Few countries have witnessed so many government changes in so short a time. How would you account for this?

A. I believe the reason can mainly be traced to the circumstances in which Syria won its national independence. As you know, independence came as a result of prolonged struggle in which the national bourgeoisie undoubtedly played the leading role, although the importance of the contribution made by all the popular and progressive forces, the Communists included, cannot be questioned. In the fight for independence the masses put forward the demand for democratic freedoms. The Syrian national bourgeoisie, which, it should not be forgotten, is economically relatively weak, could not keep the popular movement within as strict bounds as it would have wished, nor could it gain complete control over the state machine. As regards the working class, it was not advanced enough politically nor had it built strong enough alliances, in particular with the peasantry, to take over the leadership of the mass movement.

Under these circumstances the intermediate social strata—the army officers, intellectuals, etc. — naturally came to play an increasing role in the life of the country. But as we know, these intermediate sections are by their very nature indecisive and susceptible to internal and external influences. This, in our opinion, explains the instability you speak of.

Q. You mentioned the role of the army. Indeed, most of the power take-overs in Syria have been military coups. Could you, despite the diversity of these coups, give a general assessment of the political implications of army interference in public life?

A. The factors influencing the coups have indeed been highly varied. Some were the result of the intrigues of the imperialists and local reactionaries. Other, on the contrary, were an expression of patriotic aspiration.

Generally speaking, the army has often played a patriotic role. This has been the case whenever it took action together with the progressive and democratic forces. But it has also happened that the leaders of coups isolated themselves from the masses and

*L'Humanité, September 8, 1964.

became virtual cliques divorced from the people and causing grave harm to Syria.

Q. If we take Syrian developments during the past 15 or 20 years in balance, would you say that the overall picture is a positive one from the standpoint of social progress, regardless of the instability and the tragic ordeals your country has experienced?

A. Yes. In spite of everything, important progressive steps have been taken since the winning of national independence. Mention should be made, for instance, of the nationalization of all foreign enterprises, foreign and Syrian banks, the big textile mills, etc., and of the agrarian reform in which positive amendments have been introduced under pressure from the masses and the consistent and speedy implementation of which the people demand.

Q. The big problem facing Syria now is what way forward to choose. As in most former colonies, many public leaders in your country no doubt are for socialism. What in your opinion are the salient aspects of this problem?

A. Your question has a direct bearing on the main issue discussed by our Central Committee in June. To be sure, the Communists are not the only ones who are adovcating socialism. There are of course reactionaries who have picked up this slogan in order the better to betray it, but the sincere nationalists are really seeking to steer Syria along the socialist road.

All this testifies to the vast attractive power of socialism and the enormous influence of the successes in all spheres of endeavor achieved by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp. The striving towards socialism reflects the spirit of our time, the time of transition from capitalism to socialism.

It is patriotism that prompts so many of our non-Communist compatriots to demand, as we do, that Syria take the socialist way. They have every reason to believe that the capitalist way does not meet the national interest. The capitalists, understandably, prefer to invest their capital in branches which bring them the biggest profits in the shortest time, but these branches are by no means always those most needed by the country's economy. To allow the big bourgeoisie to sacrifice the economic interests of the country to their own class interests would mean risking a return, in one or another form, to colonialism. The socialist way, on the contrary, ensures national independence and makes it possible to achieve the economic and social progress the country needs.

That is why the broad masses want socialism. Hence the acts of nationalization, the creation and extension of the state sector in Syria's economy.

In a number of countries, such as Algeria, Egypt, Ghana and Burma, measures have been effected which have brought about

far-reaching economic and social changes—changes which may (I repeat, *may*) usher in the stage of transition to the building of socialism.

It should be noted that these changes have not been effected by a workers' and peasants' government, in other words, they were not preceded by the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the fact remains that they are the fruit of an alliance of all progressive forces—not only of the working masses and the Marxist-Leninist vanguard, but of all other national and democratic forces, including, we believe, the progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie not hostile to socialism.

How are all these forces to be united? This question held the center of attention at our last Central Committee plenary meeting.

Q. In what form does the Communist Party of Syria propose to bring about such an alliance?

A. We propose to build a broad national and democratic front uniting, without any discrimination, all parties, groups and trends inclined toward the socialist road.

But this naturally does not mean that we reject in advance any other form of alliance which might arise and which would accord with the situation in our country.

Q. The Communist Party of Syria has gone through severe trials. How has it withstood this test and what are the obstacles still preventing it from functioning freely?

A. Nothing has prevented our Party from carrying on the struggle. All attempts to destroy it have failed. Everybody in Syria knows how our Party fought against imperialism, what role it played in the winning of national independence, and how after independence it has worked to preserve and strengthen this independence, how it has fought for the democratic freedoms so urgently needed by the working masses, its fight for the demands of the workers and peasants, and the battles it has waged with tyrannical regimes. This is why all attempts to isolate it and remove it from the political scene have been in vain.

Today the rights of the Communist Party of Syria must be recognized. We demand this in the interest of Syria and all the forces favoring socialism.

Q. Comrade Khaled Bagdash, you yourself are still in exile, aren't you, although you have made some courageous attempts to return to Syria?

A. Yes, I have tried to return legally but so far I have failed. This, however, has not prevented me from going home secretly and carrying on work there for a long time. I hope that eventually I shall be able to return legally.

No Syrian law, not even the law on the state of emergency,

allows Syrians to be exiled. As for the decree on "civil and political isolation" which last year was applied to 150 people, including myself and other active Communists, it has been repealed. There are no legal grounds whatever for my continued banishment.

Q. What part does the Communist Party of Syria seek to play in the broad national and democratic front which you mentioned, and how is it preparing for this?

A. Our Central Committee has adopted a special resolution on this question. We believe that the actual conditions in Syria must be taken into account and that no hasty conclusions should be drawn from what has happened in other countries. In our opinion, our Party is destined to play an important, though not necessarily the leading role in the advance towards socialism, cooperating with all those who are working for socialism. We are preparing for this by strengthening the fraternal relations which we have established with broad progressive forces.

Q. The Communist Party of Syria supports Arab unity. How do you understand this idea?

A. The idea of Arab unity stems from the objective factors of common history, common language and the geographical situation of the Arab countries.

Q. You attach an anti-imperialist significance to this idea, do you not?

A. Of course. But with the development of the national-liberation movement the content of anti-imperialism, and hence also of the idea of Arab unity, has been enriched. For this unity to be realized on a sound basis and for it to be enduring, it must accord with the spirit of our time, that is, it must be based on the interests of the popular masses, of the working people.

Q. Hence it could be said that your concept of Arab unity has a class content?

A. Unquestionably, to the extent to which the interests of the feudal element and the big capitalists clash with the economic and social changes which are now becoming the main aims of the national-liberation movement.

I should like to add that for Arab unity to become a reality, the lessons of the past in this area and the objective conditions and specific features of each Arab country must be borne in mind at every step in this direction.

Q. What is your opinion of the views of the Chinese leaders on the national-liberation movement and their activities in relation to this movement?

A. The Chinese leaders close their eyes to the reality. They content themselves with repeating the formulas of the classics of Marxism concerning the paths of development even when these

formulas no longer accord with the changed situation. Nothing could be more alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

The policy of the Chinese leaders would lead to the isolation of the national-liberation movement, to cutting it off from both the socialist camp and the working class of the developed capitalist countries. This objectively plays into the hands of imperialism.

How can it be forgotten that the great victories of the national-liberation movement have been won on the basis of the victory of socialism after the October Revolution in 1917 and after the more recent establishment of socialism in many countries? The Chinese leaders ignore these incontrovertible facts of history.

The arguments they use to justify their erroneous positions find no response either in our Party or in our people. It should be noted, moreover, that the Chinese leaders are resorting to impermissible methods, seeking to cause a split in other parties, including those of Syria, the Lebanon, etc. This can no longer be tolerated.

Q. The Communist Party of Syria, then, is for calling a new world meeting of Communist and Workers' parties?

A. Yes, our Central Committee is in favor of such a meeting. We are convinced that only an international meeting can effectively carry out the following two important and urgent tasks:

1. To do everything possible to ensure the unity of the international Communist movement.

2. To assess the changes in the world since 1960, in particular as regards the national-liberation movement. Big changes have taken place, positive changes. No one Party or even a group of parties can lay claim to being able to assess these changes, to explain them and to draw the proper lessons. For this the collective effort of all the Marxist-Leninist parties is needed.

As a member of the 26-Party drafting committee, our Party will take part in the preparatory conference to be held on December 15 with a view to the convocation of an international meeting of parties. Such a meeting corresponds to the interests of both the world Communist movement and the national-liberation movement.

Q. You mentioned solidarity between the national-liberation movement and the working class in the capitalist countries and the support they render each other. How has this mutual support been manifested in the relations between our two parties and our two peoples, and how can we in France strengthen our solidarity with the people of Syria?

A. By supporting the Syrian people against the machinations of the neo-colonialists and the reactionaries, by helping them to forge ahead along the path of progress and socialism.

We Syrian Communists and all patriots in our country from the time of the Syrian uprising in 1925 to the present have been able

to count on the effective solidarity of the French working class and in particular of the French Communist Party, which has given us unconditional support in our struggle for national independence. These are things which are not forgotten, and that is why we cherish such feelings of fraternal friendship and gratitude for the French Communist Party. The name of Maurice Thorez is one of the most honored and esteemed in Syria.

There is not a Syrian patriot today who does not wish to strengthen friendly ties between the people of France and the Syrian and all other Arab peoples. All Syrians are in favor of extending economic relations with France on the basis of equality, relations free of colonialist motives and advantageous for both countries.

There is no doubt that the decisive forces of our time are the socialist camp, the national-liberation movement, and the working-class movement in the capitalist countries. We firmly believe that the solidarity of these three forces will be decisive for the destinies of mankind.

INTERVIEW* WITH REZA RADMANESH

FIRST SECRETARY, PEOPLE'S PARTY OF IRAN

Our Party has repeatedly condemned the splitting activities of the leaders of the Communist Party of China. Their efforts are aimed at sowing dissension and splitting the international Communist and working-class movement and undermining unity within the Communist and Workers' parties, the unity, which is the foundation of cohesion among all the national and democratic forces. These activities are particularly dangerous for the parties of the colonial and dependent countries which are fighting for complete political and economic freedom and independence. They are grist to the enemy's mill. In countries like ours where the Communist and Workers' parties are working in the conditions of illegality and terror, they are causing the greatest harm and creating additional difficulties.

Formerly the working-class and Communist parties in countries, such as ours were subjected to attacks and subversion only by the agents of imperialism and domestic reaction. Now the leaders of the CPC are doing the same wherever they can.

These leaders are seeking to use for their purposes the most unstable and faint-hearted elements as well as the traitors expelled from the Party. It is these who are setting up the so-called "genuinely Marxist" parties of the kind Peking wants.

As far back as 18 years ago our Party exposed the splitters in its ranks who had been working for the imperialists and the domestic reactionaries. And we shall continue to give a rebuff to such subversive activities, whether they be undertaken from the Right by the hirelings of imperialism and domestic reaction or from the "Left"' by the Chinese leaders.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet government enjoy deep respect and trust in Iran, as could be seen from the warm welcome accorded by the Iranian people to L. I. Brezhnev during his recent visit to our country. Consequently, few people lend an ear to the slander and invective levelled by Peking against the CPSU and the Soviet government. Such attacks only help to undermine the prestige of the Chinese leaders themselves. At the same time, despite the difficult conditions of illegality in which we work, we are trying to keep our membership and the public at large properly informed so that they might see for themselves

*Pravda, September 15, 1964.

that the Peking leaders have only one objective, namely, to establish their hegemony in the international Communist movement and give effect to their chauvinistic plans.

It will soon be four years since the last meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties. Even if no differences had arisen in the ranks of the international Communist and Workers' movement, it would be time to call a new meeting in order to exchange views, to sum up the work done and to pool experience. Life itself makes this necessary.

But now that the CPC leaders are interpreting the documents of the 1957 and 1960 meetings in their own way, openly flouting many of the basic principles of these documents and causing deep-going differences in the movement, the need for such a meeting is all the more obvious.

A great responsibility rests today on all the Communist and Workers' parties. They must exert every effort to put an end to the subversive activities of the enemies of the Communist movement. They must ensure the complete unity and cohesion of the world Communist and workers' movement and of all the revolutionary forces fighting against imperialism and domestic reaction.

In all its earlier declarations, including its 25-point statement published in June 1963 and its February 1964 letter, the Central Committee of the CPC spoke of the need to call a meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties.

Latterly, however, the CPC leadership is avoiding all contacts; it is opposed to calling a meeting of the drafting committee and to the international meeting itself, seeking to postpone them indefinitely.

Dealing with this question in a talk with representatives of the Japanese Socialists, Mao Tse-tung said that no blood was being spilt in the war waged within the ranks of the world Communist movement and therefore such a war could go on for years. One cannot agree with this irresponsible attitude.

The decisions of the 1957 and 1960 meetings, which were attended also by representatives of the CPC, empowered the CPSU to call future meetings. Accordingly, the CPSU consulted all the Communist and Workers' parties which took part in the 1960 meeting on this matter. The absolute majority of parties, among them the People's Party of Iran, fully agreed that it was necessary to convene the drafting committee in its previous composition, which, as is known, included the representatives of 26 parties. In view of the new situation, other parties might be included, since this would expedite its work and make it more fruitful. Under all circumstances our Party is prepared to take part in the work of the committee

and in any case, it will state its views and submit its proposals to the committee in due course.

The refusal of the CPC leaders to join in the work of the committee shows that they do not believe in the principle of collective work, that they are determined to deepen the disagreements and to divide the world Communist and workers' movement, regarding such a split as a "dialectical necessity" of our time.

The purpose of a meeting of representatives of the parties is not to legitimatize the existing situation or to expel any party from our Communist community. On the contrary, its purpose is to find ways of bringing the views of all parties closer together and to prevent the present disagreements from widening.

The disruptive activities of the CPC leaders affect our Party also to some extent. But the futility of their efforts is already obvious. Our Party has struck deep root in the working class and all other working people, in the democratic and progressive sevtions of Iranian society. It is the exponent of the revolutionary traditions of our country and is founded on Marxism-Leninism, and hence it stands for the finest aspirations of the peoples of Iran.

Our Party has never ceased to wage the struggle for freedom and justice. Though illegal, it is carrying on this struggle with tireless courage, undaunted by the terroristic regime imposed on the country after the August 1953 coup.

The prestige and influence of our Party has grown in recent years. It plays an important role in the national-liberation movement. In the present conditions, when the regime is in the grip of a severe crisis, our Party is working to unite all the progressive and democratic forces to defeat the forces of reaction. It is carrying on the fight under the banner of peace, independence, freedom, progress and better material and spiritual conditions of life for the working people. It is striving to make the cherished dreams of our people come true.

In recent years the ruling clique, fearing its downfall, has been compelled to retreat. For instance, it has had to take some steps in the sphere of agrarian reform. Our Party considers these steps inadequate, demagogic and in no way meeting the real needs of the people. Generally speaking, the ruling element, which is linked with world imperialism by thousands of visible and invisible ties, is incapable of effecting radical social changes. This can be done only after the country has withdrawn from military blocs, when the rule of the imperialists and domestic reactionaries has been overthrown, and when democratic freedoms, including the right of all parties to function freely, have been won and far-reaching social reforms carried out in the spirit of the Constitution.

Our Party, as before, will spare no effort and no sacrifice to achieve these aims.

STATEMENT OF POLITICAL COMMISSION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHILE

I

The elections of September 4 have failed to open up clear prospects of solving the vital national problems facing Chile. In conditions of a deep-going crisis, unemployment, growing impoverishment, sky-rocketing prices of prime necessities and increasing shortages, a government has been elected which has pledged not to nationalize the copper mines, has no anti-monopoly program and is pressured by the reactionary circles which have helped it come to office.

We maintain, as before, that the country needs a government by the people if it is to advance to progress and prosperity for the Chileans. The popular movement will continue the struggle for removing the feudal and finance oligarchy and the stooges of U.S. imperialism from power. A people's government alone will effect the vital reforms needed by the country—nationalization of our raw-material resources now controlled by the imperialists, abolition of the latifundia and of the semi-feudal production relations in the countryside, and suppression of the reactionary activity of the local monopolies — measures conducive to profound democratization, for only they will ensure the well-being of the people and the country's independent development. The desire to achieve these inspiring goals prompted about a million voters, representing between them more than three million residents of the country, to cast their ballots for Salvador Allende. The patriotic striving to restore the national independence of Chile will further cement the ranks of the popular movement and invigorate its struggle for every demand of the masses, which is essential for attaining the goal that has been set.

During the election campaign the popular movement consolidated its unity and extended new forms of cooperation. It grew considerably and did much by way of political education of the masses, who now realize the need for radical change. This led to the defeat of the anti-democratic front and its candidate, Julio Duran, whose election was fraught with the danger of establishing a terroristic dictatorship. At the same time the threat of a coup was prevented, the Rights were ousted from key positions in political life and had to take cover under the wing of Christian Democracy.

No ebbs and flows in our political life will stop the developing revolutionary process in Chile.

II

Chile will be unable to advance unless its economic, social and political structure is changed radically. In this respect the limitations of Frei's program and the impediments to its implementation are well known. Various forces are represented in his administration, but on the whole it is a bourgeois government. Nor is it homogenous. A struggle will be waged in it between groups adhering to paternalist positions and ready to make some concessions, and spokesmen for the finance oligarchy connected with the imperialists. The latter will do their utmost to impose on the government a line of state-monopoly capitalism, sacrificing the interests of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, chiefly those of small and middle businessmen, shopkeepers and farmers, and above all of the working class, office employees, peasants and the people generally.

The new government will certainly be influenced by the group of technical specialists led by Raul Saez, whose connections with imperialism and with the Alliance for Progress are notorious. Judging by press comments, those of *El Mercurio* in particular considerable weight will be wielded by the Edwards group, one of the most representative groups of the finance oligarchy. Its agents control or influence a large number of enterprises accounting for 21 per cent of the total capital of joint-stock companies.

The North American companies operating in Chile, especially those in the copper ore business, zealously supported the candidature of Frei and celebrated his victory as their own. It has been known for some time that the nomination of Frei highly pleased the U.S. State Department and that his candidature was recommended when the Goddwin-Moscoso mission visited Chile.

The national interests of Chile are absolutely incompatible with the interests of U.S. imperialism. In the course of 400 years, at the price of heavy sacrifices, a national capital of roughly $9,000 million has been built up in Chile, but in the last fifty years about an equal sum has been taken out of the country by the copper and saltpetre companies. In addition, we have lost several thousand million dollars as a result of unequivalent foreign trade.

It is clear already now that a one-party trend will prevail in the Frei government. At least at the initial stage it will be a one-party government which will strive to establish Christian Democratic rule in all fields of the national life.

III

As the September 4 elections have shown, the working class again constituted the backbone of the popular movement. The vote of the Popular Action Front (FRAP) increased in all working-class

centers. This means that most of Allende's supporters were workers. Allende scored impressive victories in such predominantly working-class areas as Lota, Coronel, Arauco province, Tome, Nogales, Calera, Tiltil, El Toco, and in the Aatacama and Coquimbo centers. A large number of workers voted for him also in Tarapaca and Antofagasta.

Salvador Allende polled most of the peasants' votes. The voting in the rural communities was good, and in some of them, very good, although there were some shortcomings, too. The election returns also showed that Allende had the support of the more advanced sections of the middle strata and of the national intelligentsia.

As regards the women's voting, some erroneous conclusions need to be refuted. In the men's vote Allende polled 606,356 votes as against 673,651 cast for Frei, and in the women's vote, 375,766 as against 744,450. Some people have drawn pessimistic conclusions from this fact. But the results of the women's vote should be viewed against the background of the previous presidential elections. In 1958 Allende received 24 per cent of the women's vote. This time the candidate of the people polled 32 per cent. This means that the percentage of women's votes cast for the Left has grown much more than that of men's votes.

We salute the Chilean women who regard the popular movement's program as the way to the salvation of the country and an earnest of the well-being of their families. We are confident that they will enhance their influence and persuade the majority of Chilean women to fight resolutely for a people's movement.

IV

Despite the fact that the working class is in the front ranks of the popular movement and despite the big vote for Salvador Allende in the proletarian centers, the elections have shown the strong influence of the supporters of the rightist candidate where reformist trends prevail among the working people. Large contingents of industrial and transport workers and especially the employees of small enterprises remain unorganized in Santiago, Valparaiso, Concepcion and elsewhere. On the other hand, at the Yarur, Sumar, Hilanderia Nacional and other enterprises the trade unions are of a paternaist character. These serious shortcomings weaken the proletariat; they are actively utilized by the reactionaries, and have to be overcome as soon as possible.

During the election campaign the reactionaries worked hard to reach the masses. Instead of providing work and decent living conditions they corrupted the poorest sections of the population with money handouts and the issue of food parcels provided by a

certain North American agency. In fact, this was an attempt to bribe these sections.

The reactionaries also pursued a policy of setting up mothers' and community organizations rivalling the existing ones.

It is essential to restore the atmosphere of fraternity in the communities, to thwart the provocateurs' attempts to incite enmity among the families or isolate them from each other. It is necessary to invigorate the activities of women's, youth and other organizations by ensuring the participation of all strata of the population in them.

Just as working people's organizations, public organizations should not be dependent on the state and the employers, or be appendages to political parties. They should be independent and serve their own interests in keeping with the traditions of the unity of our people.

Alarmed by the powerful upsurge of the peasants, the reactionary forces are seeking to contaminate them, too, with the spirit of corruption, disunity and venality. It is the duty of the working class to give greater support to the struggle of their brothers in the countryside.

The popular movement should resolutely champion the demands of every trade union and every group and combat any reformist trend limiting the revolutionary objectives of the struggle. The supreme task is to achieve the unity of action of every trade union, every federation and of the United Working People's Center. Trade union unity must be forged and cemented on the basis of the struggle for the demands of the working people and to prevent the working class from falling under the influence of bourgeois ideology.

V

Psychological terror unprecedented in scope was the chief instrument of the supporters of Frei. Fraud, lies, slander and other base means were unscrupulously used against the popular movement. Millions of escudos and dollars were spent on this campaign. People from all walks of life, and even children, were terrorized. Terrible pictures were drawn; shootings and violence were hinted at; slander was heaped upon the Soviet Union, the first socialist country of the world, and Cuba, the first socialist country of America. Renegades from other countries were invited to help; Chile was flooded with agents of imperialism; resort was taken to threats and blackmail, to slandering people's leaders personally. Taking advantage of the ignorance of certain sections of the population, bourgeois propaganda kept vilifying Allende, while almost all media through which he could reply to the campaign of slander, such as the radio

and the press, were denied him. This cynical campaign was directed by the imperialists. In fact, Allende was confronted with U.S. imperialism which spent colossal funds on this battle.

The popular movement and our Party are duty bound to expose the slander and fraud which were resorted to on a scandalous scale in the elections.

The struggle against psychological terror, moral pressure, lies, anti-communism and foreign, chiefly North American, interference in our domestic affairs must be launched without delay. By pointing to the real reasons for Frei's victory we must instil in all our citizens a feeling of repugnance towards Machiavellian practices and electoral swindle so as to prevent runaway corruption in the field of electoral law and civil rights.

The vast majority of the Chileans strive for revolutionary change. The million citizens who cast their ballots for Allende voted for changes and for the solution of pressing problems: for more bread, houses and schools, for the right to work and free medical assistance. These aspirations are shared by many of those who voted for Frei. Their realization calls for the unity of workers, peasants, women, young people and intellectuals. The reforms that may be carried out and the demands that may be satisfied under the Frei government will be the result of the people's unity, and we shall hail them as such, without hesitation and egoism.

As the finance oligarchy and imperialism consolidate their positions in the new government, they will strive ever harder to split the forces of the people and undermine their organizations in order to deliver blows at them. Since the subversive work started during the election campaign is continued, there exists a real danger of the spread of bourgeois ideology among the working class and of the ideas of anti-communism in the popular movement. We Communists will tirelessly and painstakingly, and in a fraternal way, explain our positions of democrats and freedom-fighters until the slightest doubt is dispelled among the people.

VI

There exist contradictions among the forces that ensured Frei's victory. These forces include representatives of the most diverse sections, from workers and Christian Democratic peasants to presidents of banks and monopolies, latifundists and even agents of U.S. imperialism.

The Rights from Frei's entourage and from other quarters who supported his candidature seek to utilize for their purposes the influence wielded by the Christian Democratic Party. Among them are the most reactionary groups, successors to those who signed the traitorous act of 1817 and deposed President Balmaceda in

1891. It was they who shed the workers' blood and who destroyed the Popular Front government in 1939. They are ultras always intent on conspiring against the people. To them also belong neo-fascist thugs who hide amidst the victors.

Thus, curtailment of civil freedoms and democratic rights can be expected. Following the September 4 elections, *El Mercurio* has been encouraging the anti-democratic forces. Therefore we urge the popular movement to display vigilance, defend civil liberties and political and trade union rights, and be ready to give the most resolute rebuff to any anti-democratic moves.

VII

The Political Commission of the Communist Party has made a profound and critical analysis of its activities and of the work of all Party organizations during the election campaign. Major successes were scored and considerable advance was made in the course of the campaign, but serious shortcomings also came to light. Each of these will be thoroughly examined.

The correctness of our political line has been proved. Our task today is not to revise this line but to enrich it in order to act in conformity with the new conditions. Our road to victory lies through elections, but it is not restricted to elections alone, and we shall not remain idle until the next elections. Our road is above all that of the masses, of struggle, of battles. It is a road of broad popular movements and it demands that we consolidate our forces, enhance the gains and organize militant actions of the working class and the people as a whole for their social, economic and political objectives. Every gain, every demand won must be the result of unity, organization and mass struggle. The people cannot limit themselves to supporting what they consider to be good and combating what they think is bad. Their attitude must be highly active and creative, that is, it must be the main factor of any action and be ever aimed at the intransient objectives of the popular movement. The profound crisis now bedevilling the country and the clear realization of the need for change make possible some positive measures. Our people can secure these measures through their struggle.

Our ideas are winning ever greater support among the people. Before and especially after the presidential elections many participants in the popular movement asked for admission into our Party.

In pursuit of our political line we must analyze how the work was done in every concrete instance. This will help us reveal the causes of our shortcomings that enable the reactionaries to retain strong influence over the people in the biggest cities of the country.

The Political Commission has resolved to call on September 24-26

a Central Committee meeting with this statement as the basis for discussion.

It has also decided to convene on October 25 a National Conference of the Party.

VIII

The Communist Party, our allies in the Popular Action Front and from independent organizations worked hard during the election campaign. No one lagged behind. An example of tireless work was set by Allende himself.

Today we must rectify the shortcomings and raise the popular movement to a still higher plane. On some occasions we tended to overestimate our own forces and underestimate the enemy forces. Sometimes we were solely on the defensive. Mass actions, too, were not always launched resolutely enough.

We shall continue to march shoulder to shoulder with our Socialist comrades, strengthening unity with the Socialists, the other FRAP parties and all the independent forces together with whom we battled on September 4. The main thing is to preserve this unity, to look more at the present and to the future than back into the past. We hold that today any discussion must deal with th ecomplex problems of the struggle and aim primarily at promoting the popular movement.

The FRAP parties have reaffirmed their determination to maintain unity in the struggle for the interests of the masses and against the enemy. All kinds of adventurers who tried to demobilize the masses during the presidential elections, who, invoking invented "Leftism", objectively contributed to the victory of the reactionary candidate, and who will keep trying to harm the popular movement, will continue to be used to undermine this line, this unity and this struggle. But it is becoming increasingiy obvious that the Chilean people need the unity of their parties and organizations and that the enemies of this unity are their enemies.

The popular movement has excellent opportunities for expansion, growth and consolidation. It must always proceed not only from the immediate interests, but also from the permanent interests of the working class, the people and the whole Chilean

Santiago, September 12, 1964.

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREECE

IN REPLY TO THE LETTER OF THE CC, CPSU OF JULY 30, 1964, CONCERNING AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES.

The CC, CPG welcomes the initiative of the CC, CPSU in the matter of convening an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties. It fully agrees with the CC, CPSU that:

1) such a meeting should be held in mid-1965;

2) preparations for it should be begun by convening a drafting commission on December 15, 1964, in Moscow;

3) this commission should consist of the representatives of 26 parties, as the case was during the preparation of the 1960 meeting.

The initiative of the CC, CPSU is in line with the decision of the 1957 meeting, which empowered it to call meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties after preliminary consultation with the fraternal parties. This initiative accords with the vital interests and needs of the world Communist and workers' movement. In view of the fact that the disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders have intensified of late, causing added difficulties and increasing the danger of a split in the international Communist and workers' movement, the need to call such a meeting is now more urgent than ever.

Recent flagrant acts of imperialist aggression, above all the actions undertaken by the U.S. imperialists against the peoples of Vietnam, Cuba, Cyprus, the Congo, etc., and also their intensified efforts to strike at the working-class, liberation and democratic movement and to split the socialist camp, show that the imperialists are increasingly seeking to take advantage of the differences in the ranks of the Communists in order to promote their aggressive plans, all of which greatly increases the danger of war.

A meeting is also essential from the standpoint of examining the big changes that have taken place since the 1960 meeting, studying and generalizing revolutionary experience, and elaborating common positions ensuring unity of ideology and action among all the vanguard detachments of the world working class.

The anti-Marxist line and disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders, who give every encouragement to anti-Party elements and traitors to Communism in Greece, are causing additional difficulties

for the people of Greece in their struggle against the local reactionaries and their imperialist backers, for the restoration and extension of democracy in our country, for the vital interests of the working people and in support of the liberation struggle waged by the fraternal Cypriot people.

The CC, CPG holds that the Chinese leaders' opposition to a meeting of the parties runs fundamentaliy counter to the interests of the Communist movement. Some time ago they were in favor of calling such a meeting, considering it timely. Now, when the situation they themselves have brought about makes the meeting even more urgently necessary and when an absolute majority of parties are in favor of convening it, the Chinese leaders are trying to prevent it on utterly invalid grounds. The stand taken by the Chinese leaders once again clearly shows that they have no desire to work together with the fraternal parties to strengthen the unity of the Communist movement, that they are out to continue their disruptive activities and to pursue and adventuristic policy aimed at establishing their hegemony and imposing their anti-Marxist line on the other parties.

The CC, CPG takes it for granted that the purpose of the meeting will be to overcome the differences in the world Communist movement and to cement its unity.

The basis and point of departure for the new meeting should be the documents of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960, whose line has been translated into revolutionary practice and confirmed by life itself. Drawing on later developments, the meeting should enrich the common political line and find solutions fo rnew problems. Even if this new meeting will be convened in a situation made difficult by the existence of sharp differences, the CPG believes that with the fraternal parties exerting every effort it will serve to uphold and strengthen unity on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Together with the other fraternal parties, the CPG will do its utmost to ensure the success of the meeting.

August 26, 1964.

PLENARY MEETING* OF THE LEADERSHIP, COMMUNIST PARTY OF NORWAY

THE COMMUNIST PARTY WILL CONTEST THE GENERAL ELECTION THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

A plenary meeting of the Central Leadership of the Communist Party of Norway was held on September 5 and 6 under the chairmanship of E. Lovlien, Chairman of the Party. Among other questions, the meeting discussed the convocation of a Congress of the Party and preparations for the general election to be held in 1965. The congress is to be held in Oslo on March 26-28, 1965.

The Central Leadership noted the growth of sentiment favorable to the Party and its policy, and stressed the need to exert every effort to return Communists to the Storting in order to strengthen the representation of the workers' parties in parliament.

Press reports that the CPN would put up candidates in only two or three constituencies are completely false. The CPN is a national party and as such intends to contest the election throughout the country.

The CPN considers it its main aim at the present time to promote working-class unity in the struggle against big capital. Hence it is prepared in the course of the election campaign to help the working-class movement find suitable forms of joint action to counter the efforts of the bourgeois parties to win the majority in the new parliament. This presupposes the cooperation of all three working-class parties.

The Central Leadership also discussed tasks connected with preparations for the coming Party Congress and adopted a resolution on strengthening the Party organizationally and promoting the circulation of the Party press.

The meeting also discussed the situation in the international Communist movement and adopted a statement on this question.

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL LEADERSHIP OF THE CPN CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Central Leadership of the Communist Party of Norway discussed the situation in the international Communist movement at a plenary meeting held on September 5 and 6, 1964. The Central

*Friheten, September 7, 1964.

Leadership reaffirms its previous statements setting forth the Party's attitude to the principal ideological questions now being debated and also its views on the steps to be taken to put an end to the harmful forms the discussion has assumed. As always the CPN is prompted by concern for the unity of the international Communist movement.

In order to restore unity it is essential that all parties agree to meet to discuss the problems at issue. Although the debate in the international Communist movement has latterly grown extremely sharp, the CPN cannot concede that a split is inevitable. The Central Leadership holds that in the circumstances it is essential not only for the CPSU and CPC but also other parties to display initiative and undertake constructive steps. Avenues for restoring unity should be sought primarily in bilateral and multilateral contacts and talks between the other parties with a view to a new initiative capable of bringing all parties together in positive negotiations. In spite of everything, what unites us far outweighs anything that might disunite us. Above all it is necessary to ascertain the issues on which there is agreement and on which, consequently, cooperation is possible. In this way the solution of disputed issues can be gradually approached. The CPN is prepared to support and to take part in any initiative capable of restoring unity in the international Communist movement.

ELECTION MANIFESTO* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SWEDEN

TOGETHER WITH THE PEOPLE AGAINST BIG CAPITAL

The economic situation in our country is highlighted by a high level of business activity and employment, growing exports and increasing labor productivity. There is every condition for securing a general rise of the living standards of the working people and strengthening their confidence in the morrow.

The steady growth of the prices of goods and services, which hinders successful advance, is not an inexorable law of economic development but merely a consequence of the domination of big capital in the economic life of the country, of free profiteering and of the fact that the government is doing very little to channel the economy in a direction beneficial to society.

The growing prices of goods and services, high rents, the demands to spend more on social security in compensation for the decline of the purchasing power and the increasing public expenses put on the agenda the question of running the state, not together with big capital, but against it.

The growth of prices must be arrested through the necessary public measures. Prices should be fixed through negotiations based on public control over changing costs of goods and services. It is necessary to lower the high interest rate which is largely responsible for the soaring prices and rents. This could be accomplished by the establishment of a special government-run credit institution which will grant moderate-interest loans for housing construction and for investments involved in it. Speculation in land must be stopped, and profits obtained through unwarranted increases in prices of land must be confiscated for the benefit of society. The suspension of inflation also signifies a suspension of the growth of government and communal expenditures. Taxes on the lower-paid categories of working people can be cut while heavier taxes levied on the growing big properties and profits. A more equitable distribution of taxes in keeping with the economic possibilities of the various social sections must become the main line of the tax policy.

The growth of the national revenue and the new sources of the state income, to be obtained through strict taxation of properties,

---

*Ny Dag, August 24, 1964.
At the elections to the Second Chamber of the Riksdag (Parliament) held on September 20, the Communists won 8 seats, 3 of them being gains.—Ed.

profits and speculatory operations, can add substantially to the public resources. The latter should be used for:

—an active policy of correct distribution of industrial enterprises, with the stress on the development of key state-owned enterprises;

—greater assistance in rationalizing agriculture and establishing strict price controls in the sphere of the processing and distribution of agricultural produce with a view to promoting the production of cheaper foodstuffs;

—bigger effort in building more and cheaper houses through setting up a government-owned credit institution as well as publicly-owned building organizations founded on large-scale production and on the principle of maximum utilization of the advantages of big enterprise in matters of planning and technology;

—measures aimed at radically improving the opportunities for women to get paid work, increasing the funds for the construction of creches and preparatory schools for children of pre-school age, and lowering the fees in these schools;

—rapidly increasing state grants to families with many children up to 1,200 kronor, along with extending to them the rule regulating wages in accordance with the cost-of-living index and introducing special grants for families with three or more little children, as the first steps aimed at radically improving the conditions of families with many children;

—higher pensions and special steps to lessen the difference in the conditions of old-age pensioners and those on a long-service pension;

—allocating more money for extending the health system, training doctors, nurses and other medical personnel, and generally improving the medical service;

—more funds for the vocational training of the youth, for athletic and other youth organizations.

Other pressing social reforms are: introduction of sick benefits beginning with the first day of illness, and adoption by the Riksdag in 1965 of legislation on a five-hour working week.

Nor should the democratic reform of the Constitution be postponed. The aim of the reform should be to establish a republic and form a one-chamber Parliament elected through direct, proportional suffrage with a just distribution of seats and franchise at the age of 18.

The policy of neutrality to which our country adheres is approved by the overwhelming majority of the people, who also support Sweden's active contribution to the cause of peace and her no small assistance to the developing countries. Public opinion in our country is increasingly coming out against atomic armament, for a slash in military expenditure, for international disarmament and

peaceful coexistence between all countries and peoples regardless of their social systems.

The Communist Party of Sweden works for a socialist regeneration of the country's policy. This means that social development should be determined by the interests of the people, that democracy should be introduced in the enterprises and in economic life, that social security for all should become a law of society, and that priority should be given to the interests of the people, not of big capital.

The Communists have advanced many proposals in the Riksdag, landstings and the communal councils, and actively worked for their implementation. The proposals for many reforms would never have been carried into effect had the organizations and individuals not rallied around them. The Communist Party advances a socialist alternative in Swedish policy.

That is why your support for the Communists will be a vote for a higher standard of living and a better future.

Board, Communist Party of Sweden.

WHY A NEW INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

WALDECK ROCHET, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY, INTERVIEWED* BY *L'HUMANITE*

Q. Could you comment on the letter signed by you on behalf of the Central Committee, in which the French Communist Party supports the initiative of the CPSU for calling an international meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties?

A. Deeming it necessary to hold the meeting as early as possible —and this also follows from the speeches made by the delegates at our 14th Congress and from its resolution—we immediately supported the proposal of the fraternal Communist Party of the Soviet Union to convene such a meeting. At the meeting in 1957 the Communist and Workers' parties unanimously authorized the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to convene international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties after consultations with other fraternal parties. It was along these lines that the 1960 meeting was convened. And today the absolute majority of the fraternal parties have declared for the earliest convocation of a new international meeting. Hence it is only natural that, in keeping with their will, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will convent the meeting at the earliest date.

Q. But the meeting is planned only for the middle of next year. Why?

A. Preparations take much time. It is necessary, in particular, to draft documents on which it will work. And to do this, the views and experiences of a definite number of parties must be compared. The drafting committee of the 1960 meeting consisted of representatives of 26 fraternal parties. It took them a month to cope with their task. It will take the drafting committee for the 1965 meeting perhaps as much time and certainly even longer, considering the serious differences in the international Communist and working-class movement brought about by the attitude and activities of the Chinese Communist leaders.

Q. On what principle are the parties selected to the drafting committee?

A. Prior to the 1960 meeting an agreement was reached that the

*L'Humanité, August 23, 1964.

committee should include the parties representing the revolutionary movement in the main groups of countries, i.e., the parties of the socialist countries, the developed capitalist countries, and the developing countries and those fighting for their independence. In the conditions that have taken shape today the composition of the committee to prepare the future meeting could in itself become a subject of controversy, hence it was found expedient to use the committee which we had jointly formed in 1960 and with the work of which we were satisfied. In our letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union we pointed out that we consider this decision correct and that our Party will be represented in the committee by Comrades Raymond Guyot, Roland Leroy and Jean Kanapa, who will arrive in Moscow by December 15.

Q. This letter says that the situation that has developed in the world Communist and working-class movement "is very alarming." And further: "The serious difficulties that have arisen in the world Communist and working-class movement in recent years have been aggravated to such an extent that they may hamper the development of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces all over the world. Clearly, this can only benefit imperialist reaction. . . ."

A. Yes, we are concerned, as all Communists are. The line adopted by the Chinese leaders in opposition to the line laid down by the 1957 and 1960 meetings is an erroneous one fraught with extremely grave consequences and endangering the struggle for socialism and in defense of peace. Relying on the facts, the 1957 and 1960 meetings defined the contradiction between capitalism and the socialist world system as the main contradiction of our time. This analysis, which is being constantly reaffirmed by developments, has been replaced by the Chinese leaders with the theory of the "intermediate zone," alleged to include France, West Germany, Britain and other capitalist countries. On what grounds are de Gaulle and the Bonn revenge-seekers portrayed as fighters against U.S. imperialism? According to this theory, we French Communists are supposed to support the strike force and accept the policy which ruins our country and may lead to a world conflagration! You attended our 17th Congress and heard the comrades from various federations. They showed that, had our Party adopted this absurd hypothesis and followed the counsel of the Chinese leaders, this would mean giving a free hand to the one-man rule; leaving the working class and all who suffer from the monopolies to the mercy of the monopoly bourgeoisie; severing the Party from the masses; creating a gulf between Communists and Socialists instead of building an alliancen between them. This would undoubtedly narrow the possibilities of arriving at socialism in France. Theories of this kind ignore reality. The hostility of the

Chinese leaders to the policy of peaceful coexistence is equally erroneous and unrealistic. The peoples want peace, and socialism will have increasing appeal to them if it brings them peace. . . .

Q. The Chinese people evidently want peace no less than other peoples, don't they?

A. Naturally, they want peace and happiness. But theories readily admitting the possibility of a conflict can hamper the development of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces all over the world. They can also damage the gains of the Chinese people themselves. This situation is served by the Chinese leaders' efforts to encourage trends that favor their theses inside the world Communist and working-class movement, and organize inside individual fraternal parties, using big sums of money whenever necessary, factions opposed to the general line of the Communist movement and to the policy of their own parties. These attempts to achieve a split are inadmissible in the relations between Communist parties. They cannot but hamper the struggle against the capitalists and imperialists, who rejoice at seeing their enemy divided and, hence, weakened. An end should be put to actions which benefit no one but the enemies of socialism and peace.

Q. In this connection, can a lesson be drawn from the recent crises, in particular from the events in the Gulf of Tonkin?

A. Needless to say, the differences in the international Communist and working-class movement encourage the imperialists, primarily the U.S. imperialists, to take such actions which they would never risk were they sure that they would encounter forces united and resolved.

Moreover, it is quite logical that imperialism, which by its very nature strives for war, seeks to provoke it by taking advantage of the differences on the problems of war and peace and of the Chinese leaders' hostility to the policy of peaceful coexistence. The increased aggressiveness of the imperialists by no means implies that this policy is wrong. On the contrary, it has always been and remains the main obstacle to their schemes. Even though they do not like this, they are compelled to accept peaceful coextence because of the might of the socialist camp and the world forces of peace, in conditions when the economy of the socialist countries is developing at a rapid pace, when the system of socialism is growing and ever new peoples are winning national independence.

As regards the lessons of the recent crises, most observers of the capitalist press have learnt from them. See *Figaro*, for example, or *Paris-Presse*, or *Le Monde*: they have had to admit that the attitude of the Soviet Union, which acted firmly and calmly to limit the risk of war on the basis of respect for the rights of

peoples, has won it sympathies and growing prestige, whereas the prestige of the United States has further declined owing to its bellicose actions. . . . As a matter of fact, not only the events of recent weeks testify to this. Since the 1960 meeting Cuba has consolidated its positions as the first socialist state of the Americas, and the United States has not been able to crush it. New states have won independence—Algeria, for example, not to speak of others. All this is added proof of the correctness of the conclusions of the 1960 meeting.

Q. If the principles of 1960 stand correct, what then is the purpose of the 1965 meeting?

A. Life has not been marking time since 1960. More than four years after, it will be useful to sum up the results and once again, more clearly and resolutely, to reaffirm the general line, the absolute correctness of which has been proved by the experience of these years. It is all the more imperative to do so since the correctness of the line has been called in question. Furthermore, the 1965 meeting should analyze the changes that have occurred since 1960. Among these, note should be made, on the one hand, of the indisputable success of the policy of détente, the advance of socialism, of the national-liberation movement and of the working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist countries, and and, on the other, the existence of dangerous hotbeds of war and the alarming spread of militarism and racism in the United States in connection with the Goldwater campaign supported by influential circles . . . We have never said that peaceful coexistence between states in itself precludes the possibility of maneuvers against peace or the emergence of a threat to peace . . . On the contrary, we have tirelessly warned that the peoples should take action in order to compel the imperialists to retreat, to impose peaceful coexistence upon them. The changes that have taken place also include the altered attitude of the Chinese leaders. The meeting will have to take stock of all these and many other problems for the international Communist and working-class movement to set the principal objectives, for the attainment of which the parties will work through concerted, united actions. . . .

Q. The capitalist press has alleged that the actual purpose of the meeting is to "legalize" a split in the Communist movement. Of course, one should not attach much importance to these contentions, and yet, is there no danger that the meeting, with which the Chinese leaders do not agree, will deepen the differences and, in fact, lead to a split?

A. Quite the reverse, it is the preservation of the present situation that may lead to a split — a situation in which instead of a serious ideological discussion conducted on the basis of the

principles of Marxist-Leninist theory and a strict analysis of the realities of our time, one is, unfortunately, confronted with calumny and invective against the fraternal parties, and with attempts to divide their ranks. It is this which is dangerous, and not a frank discussion which, without obscuring the differences, would help to overcome them. That is why an international meeting is an urgent necessity. Not to do anything and not even to try to do anything would be tantamount to reconciling ourselves with the existing elements of division and, in effect, "legalizing" them. But you are correct: the capitalist press is bound to be disappointed in its calculations. For the aim of the 1964 meeting is not to excommunicate anyone from the international Communist and working-class movement or to provide a rostrum for accusations against one or another party, but to bring out everything that we have in common, everything that unites us, and can serve as the basis for a common, concerted policy. It is in this light that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal parties demanding its convocation regard the meeting. I have already spoken about the danger with which a split in the international Communist and working class movement is fraught not only for the movement itself, but also for all the peoples, for the cause of peace, and for the advance of socialism. This shows the enormous significance the 1965 international meeting will have not only for the Communists, but for all people.

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT*

DEZSO NEMES, MEMBER, POLITICAL BUREAU, SECRETARY, CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY

In our time the world Communist movement and its problems hold the attention of people the world over. The chief reason for this is that the Communist movement has become the mightiest political movement in history. The world socialist system owes its birth and development to the ideas of communism. Communism today is an integral part of the struggle for peace, freedom and a happy future for mankind, the struggle against the terrible danger of nuclear annihilation. This accounts for the steadily growing interest and sympathy of the peoples for the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, which are exerting a decisive influence on historical development. Hence the present debate and the disruptive activity launched by the Chinese leaders have aroused the serious concern of the working people everywhere and have naturally kindled certain hopes in imperialist quarters.

★ ★ ★

The international Communist movement is developing against the background of a struggle between two world systems, the growing strength of the world socialist system, and the powerful upsurge of the anti-imperialist movement the world over.

The debate in the international Communist movement has assumed sharp forms within the socialist world system. To be more exact, it originated inside the system and spread out from there. But despite this undesirable polemic, the positions of the socialist countries continue to grow stronger. Industrial production in these countries has trebled in the past ten years, from 1953 to 1963; the share of the socialist countries in world industrial production increased from 24 per cent in 1953 to 33 per cent in 1958. In 1963 it amounted to approximately 39 per cent, and in 1964 it will be in the region of 40 per cent or even higher.

The growing strength of the socialist system, its increasing share

*Report delivered at Political Academy of Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, June 3, 1964. Abridged.

in world production is a highly important factor enhancing its influence on the course of developments. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which are pursuing a Leninist policy have been able, precisely thanks to this policy, to ensure the uninterrupted advance of the new world system. Unfortunately, the Chinese leaders underestimate this fact. They view with disapproval the improvement of the living standard in the more advanced socialist countries, regarding this as evidence of "embourgeoisement."

The struggle between the two world systems is influenced substantially also by the changes taking place in the capitalist countries, changes conditioned by the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and caused above all by the inexorable process of distintegration of the colonial system.

After the Second World War colonial and semi-colonial domination was abolished on an area with a population of more than 1,500 million people; more than 50 new states came into being. Thirty of these, with a population of approximately 200 million, have since won political independence. At the present time only 50-55 million people live in countries which still have colonial regimes, but there too the struggle is going on and the days of colonial domination are clearly numbered.

The peoples recently liberated from colonial and semi-colonial dependence have greatly augmented the world front of anti-imperialist forces, and the states they have established are playing an increasing role in international life. The Western powers, using new methods and resorting to diverse forms of neo-colonialism, are seeking to preserve their economic positions in these countries in order to exert political pressure on them.

Now and again they succeed for a time. But the national forces are steadily gaining ground in the liberated countries, and with the support of the socialist countries are successfully combating the diverse actions of neo-colonialism and upholding their national independence.

As the general crisis of capitalism deepens, the situation within the advanced capitalist countries also changes. The unequal development of the capitalist countries which is characteristic of the epoch of imperialism has changed the balance of forces between them. The United States is still the leading capitalist country but its superiority is no longer absolute. The share of the United States in the total industrial production of the capitalist world has declined from 53 per cent in 1953 to 43 per cent in 1963.

The industrial production of the capitalist countries between 1953 and 1963 developed unevenly and increased by approximately 60-62 per cent. However, competition on the world capitalist mar-

ket is growing keener as the capitalist countries are finding it increasingly difficult to find markets for their goods. The struggle between the United States, the Common Market and the countries of the free trade zone is becoming more fierce.

Another factor affecting the relations between the Western powers is the weakening of their military alliance, NATO. Instrumental here is the growth of economic contradictions between the NATO countries. However, the rulers in the NATO countries, which keep the monopolies supplied with huge war orders, are doing their best to preserve their aggressive military bloc and are proceeding with their plans for a new war.

★ ★ ★

In view of the economic situation in the capitalist countries, the growing market difficulties and the search for new markets, business circles in the capitalist world are evincing an increasing interest in trade with the socialist countries. Our countries are always ready to expand trade ties on conditions of mutual advantage. This is an integral part of our policy of economic cooperation within the framework of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Development of economic contacts naturally implies improvement in political relations between states. At the present time there is a growing tendency on the part of the Western powers to normalize these relations. We can only welcome this development. However, it has its negative aspect, for besides purely business interests, the Western powers have other aims in view.

Of course, the predatory nature of imperialism has not changed. But the changed balance of forces on the world arena has compelled the imperialists to find new ways of carrying on their hostile activity against the socialist countries. The purpose of these new methods, or "fragmentation" tactics as their authors and proponents call them, is to weaken the ties between the USSR and the other socialist countries and to undermine their social systems in order to prepare the ground for imperialist aggression against these countries. An important role in the "fragmentation" tactic is assigned to ideological penetration.

It is no surprise to us that the imperialists have concentrated their efforts on "fragmenting" the socialist countries, on undermining their social systems, as the main weapon in their struggle against the world socialist system. However, we cannot afford to limit ourselves merely to registering this fact. We are duty bound to bring it constantly to the attention of the Party and the people, and to do everything possible to counteract these moves.

How is this to be done? Should we return to the old policy of extreme seclusion as in former years, and reject any scientific or

cultural contacts with the capitalist countries? This of course would be one way of reacting to the "fragmentation" tactics of the Western powers. And on the face of it, it appears rather formidable and bellicose. In reality, however, it would be tantamount to a retreat in that ideological war which is inevitable in conditions of peaceful economic competition between the two world systems. It is not by retreating that we shall win, but by boldly engaging our opponents in the ideological battle. While developing ties with the West, we must be prepared for a sharpening of the ideological struggle.

A serious trump card of Western propaganda is the fact that at the present time the developed capitalist countries are richer than ours. Their economic might has been built up in the course of many decades and even centuries at the expense of the exploitation of other nations. A substantial role in this enrichment was played by the colossal profits garnered by the United States during the first and second world wars. The peoples of the socialist countries, on the other hand, are promoting their economies by their own efforts; without any outside help, without any "Marshall plans" they repaired the colossal damage wrought by the war and emerged onto the high-road of economic growth. Our achievements are proof of the advantages of our social system. And, historically speaking, the day is not far distant when our countries will surpass the more developed capitalist states in material benefits. And it is precisely the revolutionizing influence of our achievements that the capitalists fear most.

In the course of the ideological battle which accompanies peaceful coexistence the class struggle between the world systems takes specific forms. Our society no longer has exploiting classes, nor is there any appreciable social strata whose basic interests clash with those of the people's government, with the socialist social system.

In pursuing their "fragmentation" tactics, the imperialists devote particular attention to the intellectuals on the assumption that people like engineers, doctors, scientists, artists, teachers, writers and other cultural workers are more susceptible to the influence of Western propaganda than other sections .The expansion of cultural ties with the Western countries and the development of tourism does indeed create more opportunities for the penetration into our countries of the ideas and morality of the capitalist West.

However, we are perfectly capable of coping with the additional problems presented by the expansion of ties with the capitalist countries. We are not afraid of them, for the broadening of such contacts helps us to expose the numerous falsehoods spread about our countries by Western propaganda; it also helps to dispel the illusions cherished by some people about the capitalist world, and

it is useful also for those who, owing to the weakness of our propaganda, have too superficial and simplified a conception of the capitalist conditions and hence are prone to underestimate the problems confronting us in peaceful competition with the capitalist world.

★ ★ ★

It is not surprising that the capitalists and their henchmen pin certain hopes on the differences that have arisen in the Communist camp, in the community of socialist countries. They hope to take advantage of these differences to distract people's attention from the far more serious and steadily worsening contradictions in their own countries or between their various countries. They are beginning to hope that the differences will improve their chances in the competition between the two world systems.

Ever since the advent of the first socialist country in the world, the ruling classes in the capitalist countries and the proponents of the capitalist way of life have cherished the hope of seeing capitalism restored there.

The capitalist world hoped that the colossal destruction caused by the Second World War would put the Soviet Union out of the running for many years and prevent it from helping the peoples of the countries it had liberated to build their own future. However the capitalists were doomed to be disappointed.

The advent of the world socialist system, its rapid development shattered the illusions cherished by the West about the possibility of restoring capitalism in this part of the globe. They are now placing their stakes not on the "embourgeoisement" of the socialist countries but on ideological penetration to slow down the pace of our development and revive counter-revolutionary tendencies. It is from this standpoint that they are making propaganda capital out of the polemic in the Communist camp. Their palaver about "embourgeoisement" and "liberalization" is also designed primarily to serve the purpose of ideological penetration into the socialist countries.

In the present situation the imperialists are able to use for propaganda purposes the false allegations circulated by the Chinese leaders about the socialist countries they have branded as "revisionist."

A major factor in the development of the socialist world system and the accomplishment of the historical tasks confronting it is the economic unity of the fraternal countries, including the development of international division of labor and coordination to the advantage of all the socialist countries. A cardinal role in this respect is played by the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance.

This international socialist economic organization has now en-

tered a new stage of its development, a feature of which is cooperation not only in the sphere of trade, but in the sphere of production Evidently this need is felt first of all in coutries with a limited domestic market.

Hungary is one of those countries which experience a pressing need for more effective international division of labor. That is why we rebuff the attempts of the Chinese leaders to impede the development of these processes.

The imperialists rejoice at the differences that have emerged among socialist countries and attach great hopes to them. But they do not agree with one another in their evaluation of these differences. They would very much like to equate them with the contradictions between the capitalist states. They hope that in the end their wish will be fulfilled. But if they were to examine the sources of these contradictions, to analyze their nature, they would find that neither the Sino-Soviet relations nor the relations between any of the other socialist countries bear the slightest trace of that bitter struggle for markets and spheres of investment characteristic of the relations between the imperialists.

One may find ideological differences in the contraversy between the socialist countries, one might detect a recrudescence of nationalistic tendencies inherited from the past, one might witness outbursts of great-power chauvinism as in the case of the Chinese leaders. But whereas the contradictions between the capitalist countries, including nationalistic contradictions, spring from antagonism of their vital interests and are an expression of these antagonistic interests, the differences between the socialist countries, on the other hand, run counter to the essentially identical interests of our countries.

Our parties, our peoples have one common objective, namely, to *win in the contest with capitalism, to build socialism and achieve communism.*

The divergence of views, the serious contradictions which are reflected in inter-state relations, concern problems of strategy and tactics in the struggle against imperialism, assessment of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries and the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle, and also some important aspects of cooperation and intercourse among the socialist countries. The aggravation of these differences damages the common interest to no small degree. This, however, cannot alter the fact that socialist countries share the same basic interests and objectives. The blind subjectivism of the Chinese leaders can conjure up anything in their imagination. In their view the Central Committee of the CPSU is not leading the country to the building of communism, but to the "restoration of capitalism." All this,

however, merely shows that ther judgment is as remote from reality as their behavior and their deeds from the common interests of the socialist countries.

We are convinced that in the dispute that has arisen in the international Communist movement as well as in the matter of cooperation among the socialist states, the identity of the fundamental, vital interests of the socialist countries will prevail over views stemming from subjective blindness. The unity of the socialist camp will be restored. This will be another blow at imperialist plans to "fragment" the system of socialism, and will give new impetus to the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples all over the world.

★ ★ ★

In 1959 the Chinese leaders embarked on their policy of isolating the CPSU, laying claim at the same time to the leadership of the socialist camp of the international Communist movement as a whole.

The meeting of the representatives of 81 fraternal parties in November 1960 was convened primarily in order to discuss the disputed issues and the dangerous meaning of the statements made by the Chinese leaders, and to uphold the general line of the international Communist movement.

The Statement issued by the 1960 Meeting reaffirmed the line of the international Communist movement, which in our opinion is the only correct line at the present stage of the struggle between the two world systems. The Statement was signed by the Chinese comrades as well. We hoped that this would be the beginning of efforts on their part to rectify their serious political mistakes. It soon transpired, however, that the Chinese representatives disagreed with many of the fundamental premises of the Statement. They had signed the joint document because they could find no support at the gathering for their dissenting views, and did not want their isolation to come to the knowledge of world opinion. Evidently this would have interfered with their plans at that stage.

They signed the joint document, endorsing for the sake of appearance its thesis that no fraternal party has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of another party. Actually, however, the Chinese leaders were already at that time planning to spread their disruptive activity. The logic of their behavior led them this February to proclaiming it their "revolutionary duty" to organize and support activity aimed at dividing the fraternal parties which rejected the Chinese views.

In defending the cult of the personality of Mao Tse-tung, and his methods of leadership of the Party and the country, the Chinese leaders seek to rehabilitate the Stalin cult. But the abolition of the Stalin cult has enabled the majority of the Communist parties to arm themselves ideologically and politically against the danger

of any revival of the personality cult. This was achieved at the price of a bitter political struggle.

It is a well-known fact that in Stalin's lifetime the imperialists and revisionists made wide use in their propaganda of the negative phenomena associated with the personality cult. After Stalin's death they took advantage of the Leninist criticism of the personality cult, and also of the temporary moral and political perturbations which the Stalin case evoked in the camp of the Communists and their sympathizers. It required a stubborn ideological struggle to ward off the attacks of the imperialists and overcome the embarrassment caused by the revisionists. The fraternal parties won that battle, eliminated the danger of revisionism and, thanks to extensive explanatory work, dispelled the ideological and political confusion in the ranks of the sincere adherents of communism. They have had enough of the personality cult and have no desire to see a revival of the dogmatic and sectarian policy engendered by the personality cult.

Today in connection with the intensification of the cult of Mao Tse-tung and its consequences in the international Communist movement the "Left" danger has once again emerged. And it is perhaps only now that we can properly appreciate the great service which the Central Committee of the CPSU and Comrade Khrushchov personally rendered the international Communist movement by launching a relentless and consistent struggle to eradicate the Stalin cult.

The actions of the Chinese leaders have created a situation in which their disruptive activities have now become the gravest danger to the world Communist movement, threatening its unity, and diverting much of its efforts from the struggle against imperialism.

The erroneous position adopted by the Chinese leaders is characterized primarily by ultra-leftist, dogmatic and sectarian views combined with what is essentially a revisionist attitude. Suffice it to read the 25-point letter of the CC of the CPC published (in Hungary too) in June 1963. This document is a systematized summary of the special policy adopted by the Chinese leaders in the international Communist movement. Inasmuch as the Chinese leaders show no inclination to end the public debate or to discontinue their divisive activities, we shall continue to discuss their views and activities openly as the need arises.

★ ★ ★

To begin with, let us examine the question of the contest between the two world systems. The Chinese letter states on this score: "Certain persons have one-sidedly exaggerated the role of peaceful competition between socialist and imperialist countries in their

attempt to substitute peaceful competition for the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations."

Peaceful competition between the two world systems and the participation of the socialist countries in competition with the capitalist states is the only way to avert the danger of a new world war. How, then, can the significance of this premise for all mankind be exaggerated?

It is the historical duty of the socialist countries to enter into peaceful competition with the capitalist states and to surpass them. He who tries to counterpose the idea of peaceful competition to the struggle of the oppressed nations against their oppressors, is counterposing that struggle to the cause of world peace.

The socialist countries do not engage in the export of revolution. They contribute to the development of the revolutionary process through the international influence of their constructive effort. This is the most effective way of influencing and development of the world revolution. This is the conclusion, in conformity with Lenin's teachings, that was arrived at in the Moscow Statement. We still consider it the correct one. And with a feeling of conscious pride we have embarked on the fulfilment of the grand task—to surpass the most developed capitalist countries in per capita production.

We continue as before to adhere to the principles laid down in the Moscow Statement which stresses that the peaceful coexistence of the two world systems will create the most favorable conditions for the conduct of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and for the extension of the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries. That this is indeed the case is confirmed by developments of the past decades when the peoples of more than 30 countries have won their freedom, both through mass political actions and by armed struggle and have established independent states.

A favorite method of argument used by the Chinese leaders is the following: they ascribe incorrect views to us in order to be able to reject them as erroneous. For example, in the above-mentioned letter they maintain that we hold the absurd view that the contradictions between the two world systems will in the course of the "economic competition" automatically disappear, and a new world of "all-round cooperation" will emerge. This contention is too ridiculous to merit denial in a debate between Communists. But perhaps the Chinese leaders think that by resorting to such tactics they will be able to distract attention from their underestimation—to put it mildly—of the historical significance of the competition between the two world systems?

On the question of the possibility of peaceful or non-peaceful victory of the socialist revolution the 1957 Declaration and the

1960 Statement emphasized that the revolution can win by non-peaceful means, i.e., as the result of an armed uprising, or by peaceful means, i.e., without an armed uprising. We believe that the Communist parties in the capitalist countries are alone competent to decide whether the peaceful transition to socialism is possible or not in the conditions of their countries, whether the revolution can or cannot win by peaceful means. The efforts of the Chinese leaders to impose decisions on this question on the parties fighting for power, is an act of gross interference in their internal affairs and violates the principle of equality and sovereignty to which they profess to subscribe.

The article published in *Jenminjihpao* on March 30, 1964 openly declares that the Chinese leaders do not agree with the theses set forth in the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement on this question, and that they approved these theses only for the sake of unity. The article reminds its readers that during the Moscow Meeting of 1960 the Chinese leaders repeatedly discussed with representatives of the CPSU the question of the possibility of peaceful or non-peaceful victory of the revolution but could come to no agreement. However, the article states, "in view of the general wish of fraternal parties that a common document should be hammered out at the meeting, the delegation of the CPC finally made a concession on this question again and agreed to the verbatim transcription of the relevant passages in the 1957 Declaration into the 1960 Statement, again out of consideration for the needs of the leaders of the CPSU."

This statement is, to say the least, inaccurate, and does not conform with the facts. The discussion took place at meetings of the committee composed of representatives of 26 fraternal parties which drafted the document. Had the majority of these representatives shared the views of the Chinese representatives, the latter would hardly have agreed to "consider the needs of the leaders of the CPSU." What happened was that the overwhelming majority of those who took part in the discussion rejected the views of the Chinese delegations and reaffirmed the theses of the 1957 Declaration. Moreover, it was rather difficult for the Chinese leaders to depart from these theses inasmuch as at that time they were posing as champions of the 1957 Declaration.

The *Jenminjhpao* article also refers to the Hungarian revolution of 1919, declaring the statement of the CPSU leaders that "in 1919 the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary was established by peaceful means," to be a "sheer distortion of history." If this is a "sheer distortion of history," then Lenin too was guilty of the same offense because he gave precisely the same assessment of

the seizure of power by the Hungarian working people on March 21, 1919.

In March 1919 the socialist revolution in our country did indeed win by peaceful means. This was due in large measure to the fact that the Communist and Social-Democratic parties joined forces on the principle of proletarian dictatorship and its program of action. This alliance of the two working-class parties made the proletariat so strong that in the conditions prevailing at that time reaction was incapable of preventing the proletariat from taking power into their own hands.

Lenin not only recognized the peaceful character of the Hungarian revolution of 1919 but he highly appraised its significance. Speaking of the events in Hungary, he said on March 23, 1919: ". . . the bourgeois conciliatory (in relations to the Entente—D.N.) government resigned . . . thus recognizing that there was no alternative but to hand over the power to the working people. . . . But whatever the difficulties that undoubtedly still lie ahead for Hungary, we have here, besides the victory of Soviet power, our moral victory. The most radical, the most democratic and conciliatory bourgeoisie recognized that at the times of the gravest crisis . . . there can be no power other than the power of Soviets, other than the dictatorship of the proletariat." He spoke of this on more than one occasion. For instance, in the article "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers" of May 27, 1919, he wrote: "The Hungarian proletarian revolution is helping even the blind to see. The form of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary is altogether different from that in Russia: voluntary resignation of the bourgeois government, instantaneous restoration of working class unity, unification of the socialist movement on a Communist program."

The crux of the matter of course lies in the seizure of power by peaceful means, which was facilitated by the resignation of the Berinkey government and the voluntary abdication of President Mihaly Karolyi.

If the Chinese leaders were to study objectively the circumstances of the victory of the March revolution of 1919 in Hungary they would not have stooped so low as to accuse the CPSU leaders of "distorting history" for their appraisal of events, an appraisal which accords with the facts and which coincides with that given by Lenin. It coincides also with our own appraisal which is based on a detailed study and a thorough knowledge of the historical developments in Hungary.

A question of cardinal importance for the future of our society is that of the state of the whole people. This question is dealt with in the new Program of the CPSU. At first the Chinese leaders referred to it as "a great national program" of the Soviet people. At

that time they merely questioned the international character of this important document. Later, however, when they unleashed their anti-Soviet campaign, they went so far as to denounce the program for the building of communism as a document directed toward the restoration of capitalism. One of their main arguments in this respect centered around the question of the state of the whole people.

In their 25 points the Chinese leaders state that Marxism knows of no classless or supra-class state. This is quite true. But who claims that the Soviet state of the whole people is a classless or supra-class state? "Certain people," we read in one of the 25 points of the letter, "may say that their society is already one without classes."

Actually, however, the "certain people" (or, according to a more recent and less veiled expression—"Khrushchov and his revisionist group"), i.e., the leaders of the CPSU who drew up the new Program, and the Congress of the Party which unanimously endorsed it, never said anything of the kind. These "certain people" declare —and this incidentally is recorded in black and white in the new Program of the CPSU—that there are no antagonistic classes in Soviet society, but that there is the working class and also the collective-farm or cooperated peasantry which is a separate class. The distinction between these two classes will only disappear when the building of communism is complete. In the new CPSU Program the "certain people" write that the working class continues to play the leading political role throughout the period of the building of communism as well, i.e., until such time as the boundaries between the classes will be erased.

We believe that the question of the state of the whole people is only one of the many questions of major importance for all socialist countries building socialism. Studying the course of development of our own society and state, we have come to the conclusion that a characteristic feature of development of the Hungarian People's Republic at the present time is the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people. The Chinese leaders may brand us too as "restorers" of capitalism for such views. Needless to say the transformation of our Republic into a state of the whole people has not yet been completed.

The development of this process in Hungary was accelerated by the socialist reorganization of agriculture. Permit me to observe in this connection that at the very time when the debate in the international Communist movement imposed on us by the Chinese leaders first arose, we "revisionists" accomplished the major task of reorganizing the countryside along socialist lines.

To maintain that the dictatorship of the proletariat remains after

exploiting classes have been abolished and the socialist society built and despite the political unity of the whole people achieved in the course of the building of socialism and communism, is to assert the need to employ measures of coercion internally. Knowing what methods of leadership were used at the time of the personality cult, we are not surprised that the Chinese leaders should hold such a view. Nevertheless, we reject it as basically incorrect and fraught with harmful and often tragic consequences.

Democracy, socialist public self-government, the establishment of national unity of the masses on a socialist foundation are cardinal and characteristic features of our society. The Hungarian people will never allow anyone to divert it from this path.

At one point during the debate with the Chinese leaders the question of whether Yugoslavia is or is not a socialist country became a vital issue. In the latter part of 1957 the Chinese leaders did not question the fact that Yugoslavia was a socialist state. However, half a year later they declared that Yugoslavia, especially after the adoption of the new program of the League of Yugoslav Communists, was no longer a socialist country. We all know, however, that the nature of a country's system is determined by the political and economic relations therein. And the situation in Yugoslavia in the latter part of 1957, and up to the spring of 1958, did not undergo any change; the state system, the economic system remained socialist as before, whatever the Chinese leaders might say to the contrary. Since then Yugoslavia has scored further success in socialist construction, the socialist character of that country has become even more clearly delineated. This is a source of genuine satisfaction to our peoples, and of irritation and dismay to the dogmatists.

The question of Yugoslavia for some time held pride of place in the propaganda activities of the Chinese leaders. However, the attacks against Yugoslavia were something in the nature of a flanking maneuver. While fulminating against the "Yugoslav deviationists," the leaders of the CPC were in reality attacking the CPSU and other parties which refused to declare Yugoslavia a "capitalist country," and the League of Yugoslav Communists, a traitor to the socialist cause. On these grounds the Chinese leaders accused the CPSU and the other fraternal parties of "fraternizing with traitors" and hence themselves embarking on the path of "betrayal."

In the end the tactic of attacking by criticizing the "Yugoslav deviationists" was relegated to the background, and Chinese leaders concentrated on their anti-Soviet political campaign, levelling the most outrageous accusations against the leaders of the CPSU, alleging that they had "joined forces with American imperialists," "against the Soviet people," "against the Chinese people" and

"against the peoples of the whole world." The subjectivist blindness of the Chinese leaders, manifested in this instance in their appraisal of the Yugoslav system, reached its logical culmination.

★ ★ ★

The behavior of the Chinese leaders has evoked bewilderment everywhere. People ask themselves: what is the root of the Chinese leaders' views, what object do they pursue? What is the purpose of that unbridled campaign which the Chinese leaders have launched and are conducting with mounting frenzy against decisions they themselves previously approved, and also against the parties who firmly adhere to the agreed policy?

Searching for explanations for the differences many conclude that all this is the result of the objective conditions that have taken shape in China, a result of that great economic backwardness which revolutionary China inherited from the old semi-colonial China and the elimination of which demands a tremendous tension of effort and a long period of time.

Naturally China today is behind other countries economically, and this objectively engenders a lack of self-confidence. But, after all, this economic lag was even more pronounced before 1958. Yet the policy pursued by the fraternal Chinese Party prior to that time was on the whole correct.

The source of the erroneous views of the Chinese leaders is to be found in their lack of faith in the possibility and the prospects of the economic competition of the two world systems. China indeed will not be able to catch up with the more developed capitalist countries like the U.S., for example, in 10 or 20 years in per capita production.

It is in their assessment of this highly important point that the Chinese leaders swing from one extreme to another—a failing common to people with a pretty-bourgeois, intellectual mentality. When they proclaimed their "Big Leap" policy (in the second half of 1958), they set themselves the aim of putting China ahead in the economic competition between the two world systems in a brief space of time. However, it soon became obvious that this target was unrealistic, that China could not possibly play a leading role in the economic contest between the two systems. Whereupon the Chinese leaders, obsessed by the desire for hegemony, began to search for another way. Minimizing as much as possible the significance of the economic competition and once again overestimating the real possibilities, they advanced their present policy which they are now trying to impose on the fraternal parties as the "quickest" way to the victory of the world revolution.

In order to make the new course more acceptable, the Chinese leadership is attempting to justify it by "argument" that the op-

pressed peoples "cannot wait" for the socialist countries to win in the economic contest with capitalism. And all this is presented as if any of us were really exhorting the oppressed people to wait. They are trying to question the fact that the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the economic development of the countries that have won political independence has been and is still being facilitated primarily by the development of the world socialist system.

They are also striving to minimize the important role played by the working class in the developed capitalist countries and its Communist parties in counteracting the attempts of the imperialist powers to crush the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples.

The *Jenminjihpao* article of February 4, 1964, which is full of of false accusations against, and abuse of, the CPSU leaders, contains curious "ideological" disquisitions to the effect that the CPSU can no longer play the vanguard role in the Communist movement and that it must be deprived of that role. The article states that the Bolshevik Party became the leading party of the international working class movement at a time when the center of the revolutionary process had shifted from Western and Central Europe to Russia. Now, they aver, this center has shifted again, this time to the East. And consequently the vanguard role must pass to others. Moreover, the CPC leaders make it quite clear that the dominant role must be played by their own Party.

In reality the leading forces in the struggle of the international working class is the socialist world system and its most powerful country, the Soviet Union; and the most experienced party in the international Communist movement remains the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At the same time, the development of the international Communist movement has reached the point where no single party, neither the CPSU, nor the parties of any other socialist country, can exercise leadership in the struggle of the working masses in Western Europe, Africa or Latin America. The responsibility for the conduct of this struggle rests wholly with the Western European, African or Latin American Communist parties themselves. They know best of all the conditions in their own countries and hence it is their historic duty to take the lead of that struggle.

The Chinese comrades talk a great deal about equality and "complete independence" of the parties. But when they insist on their obsolete thesis that the most developed Party should lead the other parties, they are, in effect, laying claim to that role themselves. By asserting that as a result of historical changes the revolutionary center has "shifted" to China, the CPC leaders are seeking to dictate their will to the other fraternal parties.

The Chinese leaders have passed from ideological discussion to political struggle against the CPSU and the other fraternal parties. They have openly proclaimed their intention to work for a split in the international Communist movement. Under these circumstances everything must be done to put a stop to their disruptive activities, to uphold Marxist-Leninist ideas and the agreed policy of the international Communist movement.

Another meeting of Communist parties is required to resolve the differences that have arisen. Formerly we were of the opinion that before such a meeting could be held, the public debate must be terminated. This would have created more favorable conditions for the success of the meeting. However, it has become apparent that the Chinese leaders are determined to take advantage of any postponement of the meeting to continue their disruptive activities. In view of this, having weighed all the pros and cons, we consider it necessary to support the position taken by those fraternal parties who previously proposed calling an international meeting, and the sooner the better. At this international forum of fraternal parties it will be necessary, on the one hand, to review the experience of the past years, and on the other, to discuss the cardinal question of defending the unity of the Communist parties on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles.

The November 1960 meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties authorized the CPSU to convene a new meeting should the need arise. In its letter of May 7 of this year, the Central Committee of the CPC in dictatorial tones demanded that the meeting be postponed for four or five years, and crudely threatened to accuse the CPSU of precipitating a split should it venture, in defiance of the Chinese ban, to convene such a meeting. These threats are addressed to the CPSU, but they apply to all parties which are in favor of convening the meeting and are ready, despite Peking's veto, to send their representatives to it.

We consider it our duty to rebuff the latest dictatorial sallies on the part of the Chinese leaders and their efforts to impose their will on the other fraternal parties, once again ignoring the need for comradely consultation. No Party, no Central Committee can arrogate to itself the right to forbid the convocation of a meeting if the majority of the fraternal parties consider it to be necessary.

Our Party and our people, who have had bitter experience of the policy of the personality cult period, its manifestations and consequences all the way to a counter-revolutionary putsch, have come to see in the past seven and a half years the correctness of the present Leninist policy elaborated in the course of a struggle on two fronts. Hence they emphatically reject and condemn the erroneous views and the disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders.

This, however, does not imply that we believe the struggle against the "Leftist" views of the Chinese leadership to be of minor importance. Such a struggle is necessary and important because experience acquired in the course of struggle against harmful views and disruptive activities will raise still higher the level of ideological work in our Party and its political preparedness. It is important also because there still can be found, if rarely, individuals in our ranks who have not learned the lessons of the past. They look back nostalgically to the days of the personality cult, to the time when they were "important persons." Most of these have been expelled from our Party. They view with sympathy the vociferations of the CPC leaders and are awaiting further developments.

Here, too, we regard ideological and educational work and comradely assistance to these people to be our chief task. This form of work is one of the most important aspects of our Party's activity. At the same time, we must not forget that there can be no place in our ranks for liberalism with regard to Party members who express and circulate views running counter to the principles and the policy of the Party.

We must always remember that reactionary elements are cherishing diverse hopes in connection with the disruptive activity of the Chinese leaders. They are not only passively waiting for the consequences of the dispute between the Communists, but are seeking to make use of it in order to sow confusion in our ranks. Revisionist-minded elements are out to utilize our criticism of dogmatic views for their own ends. They are supporting the "fragmentation" tactics of the Western powers. Naturally such sallies must be given a resounding rebuff.

Continuing the polemical struggle against the erroneous views, upholding the general line of the international Communist movement, we are unswervingly advancing along the road of socialist construction. This is our contribution to the defense of the correct policy of the international Communist movement, to the further consolidation and development of the socialist world system. Pursuing this policy, our Party is fulfilling its revolutionary duty both to its own people and to the international Communist movement, helping to overcome the present deep-going differences in the world Communist movement, and to cement the unity of the socialist countries and the entire international Communist movement.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

Put Monopoly Under Control

A New Economic Policy for Canada

By TIM BUCK

This new 78-page booklet spells out in detail the Communist Party's economic policy for Canada. It deals with jobs, economic growth, Canadian independence, curbing of the monopolies and placing them under public control or nationalization; and the bringing of the benefits of automation to the people.

75 CENTS

Automation and Labor

By WILLLIAM KASHTAN

The meaning of automation for the labor movement, its effects on collective bargaining, the structure of the trade union movement and the need for a new labor policy are dealt with in this pamphlet.

15 CENTS

Now Available from

PROGRESS BOOKS / 44 STAFFORD ST. / TORONTO 3

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

AUTUMN 1964

is completely devoted to the theme

AUTOMATION

prospect and policy

Here are some of the features:

Automation and the Leadership of the Nation
By Tim Buck

Life on the Assembly Line By An Auto Worker

The Changing Structure of the Working Class and the Technological Revolution By William Kashtan

Canadian Farmers, Technological Change and the Monopolies By William Beeching

Automation and the Social Character of Production
By George S. Wheeler

Single Copy 50 cents

Available now from

PROGRESS BOOKS 44 STAFFORD ST. TORONTO 3

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

24

Included in this Issue

RESOLUTION OF AKEL (Cyprus)

POSTWAR TURN IN FINNISH POLITICS
Ville Pessi

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

FILE COPY

information bulletin - 24

contents

DOCUMENTS OF THE ENLARGED 2ND MEETING OF CC, MEXICAN COMMUNIST PARTY 5

FOR A MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES
Francois Billoux **16**

BROADER DEMOCRACY IS THE MAIN ISSUE IN OUR ELECTION CAMPAIGN
Ernest Burnelle **23**

VAIN EFFORTS
Karl Muller **36**

THE POSTWAR TURN IN FINNISH POLITICS
Ville Pessi **40**

RESOLUTION OF AKEL CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING **46**

INTERVIEW WITH MOHAMED ENNAFAA
Leading Tunisian Communist **51**

MAO'S AGGRESSIVE PLANS AND EXPANSIONIST POLICIES **55**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS. Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
November 5, 1964

DOCUMENTS* OF ENLARGED 2nd MEETING OF CC, MEXICAN COMMUNIST PARTY

RESULTS OF THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE PARTY

The Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party elected at the 14th National Congress of the MCP, held its Second (enlarged) meeting on August 15-17. As the first point of the agenda, the meeting heard and discussed the report of Comrade Manuel Terrazas on the results of the recent election campaign and the immediate tasks of the Party and adopted the following:

RESOLUTION

1. The CC meeting approves the report of Comrade Manuel Terrazas and recommends the Presidium to publish it without delay for all the Party members to study and utilize in carrying out the policy of the Party.

2. The Party's decision to take part in the election struggle and nominated its candidates, independent of the state authorities, adopted by the 14th National Congress which supported the candidature of Comrade Ramon Danzos Palomino for the post of President and the national list of candidates for senators and deputies nominated by the Electoral Front of the People, was absolutely correct. This was confirmed by the course of the election campaign which was marked by a spirit of democratic opposition. The chief results of the Communist Party's participation in the election campaign can be summed up as follows:

a) We made progress towards a democratic coalition independent of the bourgeoisie and its state. Although failing to unite the parties and trends of the democratic camp, some of which objected to participation in the struggle while others supported the government, the Party succeeded in winning the sympathies of broad strata of the peasants, workers, students, teachers, etc., who joined the Electoral Front of the People and thereby turned it into a mass political organization.

b) We also made progress in the general task of accumulating forces and making our organization a party of action, a party of struggle. We have done so by routing the sectarian concepts and practices of those inside and outside the Party who sought to

---

*La Voz de Mexico for the second half of August 1964.

convert it into a secluded group divorced from the masses and taking no part in the big political actions of our people.

c) We have largely defeated the intentions to isolate our Party and, thanks to open struggle, maintained respect for its legality. The active struggle for the release of the political prisoners and for the repeal of the "social sedition" law made this national problem a subject of discussion during the election campaign. Thereby we decisively contributed to achieving the release of some political prisoners, among them Comrades David Alfaro Siqueiros, J. Enacarnacion Perez, Alejandro Perez, Hugo Ponce de Leon, and others.

d) By pursuing our political line we secured intensification of the pressure of the masses on the policy of the ruling circles.

Nevertheless, these are limited successs, for our Party made mistakes which should be rectified as soon as possible. Along with the successes, we should consider our mistakes and shortcomings, among them the following principal ones:

a) There were deficiencies in the political content of propaganda and agitation during the election campaign. The tactical line of our party was insufficiently popularized in the sense that we should advance by realizing the program of the immediate demands of the toiling masses and the people in general. Insufficient attention was paid to some international issues, such as universal peace, peaceful coexistence, and others. The outset of the election campaign witnessed the spread of some tactical concepts differing from the line of our Party. That was corrected chiefly in the course of the campaign itself.

b) We have not used all the opportunities for recruiting as many comrades as possible into the Party.

c) Many citizens who joined the Electoral Front of the People were not properly organized and the structure of the leading bodies of this political alliance was faulty.

Nevertheless, the achievements prevail and constitute the basis for continued advance in the vital matter of organizing the masses in the spirit of independence and democracy and accumulating the revolutionary forces. This calls for active organizational consolidation of the Electoral Front of the People, a political democratic mass organization set up to take part in the election and not to replace the Communist Party or any other organization. The masses who have joined the front should be given revolutionary education to ensure that no one could influence them in favor of Right or Left opportunism and that they should consider as their own and defend the correct revolutionary line flowing from the present situation in the country and in the world.

3. The correctness of the political line charted by the 4th National Congress of the Party was confirmed by the development of the election campaign and by other important events in the life of

the country and in the matter of organizing the masses. The Congress's definition of the government as a government of the big conciliating bourgeoisie with the participation of the section of the bourgeoisie which is intermedate between U.S. imperialism and the national bourgeoisie itself, as a government pursuing a reactionary and anti-democratic policy, remains in force. Despite some positive steps taken by it, the government continues to defend the interests of the ruling classes.

It is impossible to deny the positive significance of the government's stand on the recent Ninth Foreign Ministers' Conference in Washington and its refusal to comply with the decisions of that conference directed against the fraternal Republic of Cuba and infringing on the national sovereignnty of our country. They are very important and deserves the unreserved support of the working class, the peasants, all our people and the Mexican Communist Party. This fully accords with proletarian policy.

The government's greater respect for democratic freedoms should also be taken into consideration. This made it possible to hold, without fear of police reprisals, revolutionary meetings such as the July 26 mass meeting in Mexico to express solidarity with the revolutionary people of Cuba and support the government's stand at the Washington conference. It would be better if not only our Party and some of its allies organized such meetings, but also the other democratic forces rallied and displayed the readiness to act jointly, instead of submitting to the demand of the government which does not want such mass meetings because it fears the masses themselves.

However, the government's position at the foreign ministers' conference and a certain let-up in the reactionary repressions do not signify a fundamental change in official policy. The government remains within the orbit of U.S. imperialism and continues a policy of conciliation. As far as respect for democratic freedoms is concerned, it is well known that political prisoners are still serving monstrous terms imposed under the still operating fascist-like law on "social sedition."

The positive changes in the government's policy are primarily due to pressure on the part of the Mexican people, who support the Cuban revolution, oppose repressions and insist on freedom for political prisoners. They are also the result of the grievous economic position of the country (the industry operates at about 50 per cent of capacity; development of production is almost at a standstill; there is a tremendous trade balance deficit, etc.). All this compels the government to search for economic and commercial contacts with other countries, including those of the socialist camp. These changes are a consequence of the fear the Mexican ruling bourgeoisie quite justifiably feels in connection with the

character U.S. policy is assuming under the influence of the Republican Party's nomination of the fascist-like candidature of Goldwater.

The Mexican people and the revolutionary forces of the country cannot fail to take into account the origin of the candidature of Diaz Ordaz and the character of his election campaign and of the forces that supported him. All this gives no reason to expect his government to make essential changes in the policy of the ruling classes. If, however, the masses continue independent actions it will be possible to win reforms and very important concessions favorable to the masses and ensure the solution of some major problems, although this would not mean a radical change in official policy. That would call for revolutionary transformations which would be possible as a result of struggle, organization of the masses and a fundamentally new correlation of forces.

4. The present political situation and the outlook for its development determine our Party's tasks for the nearest future, such as promoting the consolidation and growth of the Electoral Front of the People; fighting for the National-Liberation Movement to carry out its program and grow stronger with new forces, enhancing the activity of the organizations supporting it, taking counsel with them, adopting resolutions unanimously, searching for new forms of unity with the other democratic forces and recognizing the official representation of our Party in its leadership; consolidating organizationally, from top to bottom, the Independent Peasant Center, where Communists hold important positions; holding a National Women's Congress with a view to establishing a new national women's organization of a democratic and anti-imperialist character; strengthening the Communist Youth Organization organizationally, ideologically and politically and win new members from among the young workers and peasants (without forgetting about strengthening the democratic movement, the Party and the YCO should work to convene in the nearest future a Communist Youth Congress); setting up unity-of-action movements on the basis of the trade unions and uniting them in the National Committee for Trade Union Coordination, bearing in mind that independence and democracy in the trade unions are essential in the struggle to change the correlation of forces; to hold an extensive ideological campaign to defeat Right and Left opportunist deviations which are gravely harming the vital interests of the working class, the peasants and the entire Mexican people.

5. In order to mobilize the popular movement to act for concrete realistic goals, the Communist Party will fight for reforms and immediate demands; it will have to take appropriate organizational measures so as to make this fight possible and bring it to a victorious end. The reforms and the immediate demands are as follows:

1) an independent foreign policy and active struggle against

foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the peoples, for self-determination and national sovereignty; affirmation of Mexico's position with respect to the aggression of the Organization of American States and imperialism against Cuba; consolidation of relations and solidarity with the Republic of Cuba;

2) effective steps to stop the penetration of U.S. imperialism into the national economy and its plunder of it, such as: a law on foreign investments into vital branches, nationalization of public utilities, mines and the sulphur industry now in the hands of foreigners;

3) effective exercise of constitutional rights, repeal of the "social sedition" law, and release of all political prisoners;

4) respect for the right to strike and an end to the government's interference in trade union affairs hampering the restoration of democracy in them and of their independence;

5) an overall increase in wages, salaries and pensions. Establishment of an adequate minimum wage and a progressive wage scale. Modification of the law on distribution of profits to provide a say in the financial affairs of the enterprises for the workers' representatives and in the distribution of a share of the profits among the workers;

6) elimination of Aleman's reactionary amendments to Article 27 of the Constitution* and adoption of a new code of agrarian laws worked out with the direct participation of representatives of the chief peasants' organizations, a code which would ensure the implementation of a radical agrarian reform needed by the peasants and the entire nation;

7) a law to deal effectively with the housing problem, reduction and freezing of the rent, and a nationwide program of building houses for working people and low-income families;

8) a radical electoral reform to guarantee the political rights of the people and respect for their will expressed in elections.

6. The immediate problems confronting the working class, peasants, students, teachers, women and the masses as a whole can be solved positively only as a result of concrete actions planned in accordance with the current situation. This means that satisfaction of the immediate demands of the working people and the masses in general will be possible only given unity of action at the bottom and in the leadership of the people's organizations.

Unity of all the democratic forces is indispensable in the struggle for anti-imperialist and democratic demands. This unity can only be achieved provided the emphasis is placed on what unites us and the liquidation of all manifestations of sectarianism among us,

---

*In 1946, during Aleman's presidency, Article 27, providing for the confiscation of landlords' land in favor of the peasants, was amended to exempt from confiscation holdings up to 100 hectares and in some cases up to 800 hectares.—**Ed.**

and among our present and potential allies. To eliminate sectarianism is essential for progress towards the unity of the democratic forces.

7. The major tactical objectives of independence and democracy for the masses conforming to the need for the accumulation of revolutionary forces, and the unity of all the democratic forces for the sake of the strategic aims of the National-Liberation Democratic Front cannot be achieved without the organizational, ideological and political consolidation of the Communist Party. Hence the great importance of rectifying the errors in the work of all the leading bodies of the Party. Guidance must be effected on a high political level.It is necessary, for this, to study and systematically discuss the major political problems and the questions agitating the masses, above all the working class and the peasants. Discussion of political problems is essentially a matter of collective leadership which, while stressing the individual responsibility of every leader, presupposes a struggle against any violation of methods of collective leadership and of the fundamental principle of democratic centralism, against authoritarian methods of leadership.

The maximum effort to carry out the tasks, strict Party discipline, and enhancement of the political activity of all Communists and every individual Party member should result in greater proletarianization of our ranks which is to be reflected both in the class composition of the Party and in a more profound adoption of Marxist-Leninist ideology. All this leads us to the necessity to have both a general plan of work and local ones, taking into account our forces and possibilities and aimed at fulfilling the basic tasks of the moment.

Special attention should be paid to Party building. Unless our Party grows in numbers it will fail to cope with the big tasks it has set itself, to live up to its great responsibility to the working class and the people of Mexico, to the proletariat and the world Communist movement. The work to recruit new members must be conducted first and foremost among the workers of the main industrial centers, taking the necessary measures to guarantee the safety of the comrades who join the Party or set up workers' cells. These comrades should be protected against victimization and against traitors to the proletariat. The meeting resolves to launch a Party building campaign, to begin on September 15, marking the 45th anniversary of our Party, and end on December 31. The meeting instructs the Presidium to issue a special appeal in this connection.

By improving the methods of political leadership, and the work of the leading bodies, proletarianizing the composition of the Party and raising its ideological level, strengthening discipline and enhancing the responsibility of the Communists, we

shall be able quickly to turn our Party into an organization strong in its links with the masses and the numbers and quality of its membership.

The remarkable opportunities opening up before us will be carried into life by persistent work inspired by the great invincible ideals of communism which have become a reality in a large part of the world and play the decisive role in world development.

ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Having discussed the Presidium's report delivered by Comrade Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo as the second item of the agenda, the Second (enlarged) meeting of the MCP Central Committee resolves:

1. Fully to approve Comrade Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo's report, considering that:

a) it correctly explains and emphatically condemns the chauvinstic stand of the leaders of the Communist Party of China and their campaign to split the socialist camp and the world Communist movement, conducted from sectarian dogmatic positions;

b) it points to the need to fight for the unity of the international army of Communists, to defend the principles of the Declaration and the Statement adopted by representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960.

c) it exposes the adventuristic character of the small groups in our country serving the divisive ends of the CPC leaders;

d) it urges all Communists to spare no effort in popularizing and defending our Party's correct stand on this issue.

2. The meeting recommends to all Party organizations and members to publicize this report as widely as possible.

3. The meeting unanimously resolves to come out once again in favor of convening in the nearest future a conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties; it declares its support of the measures being taken to prepare such a conference.

Having discussed the different opinions stated by some fraternal parties, the Central Committee expresses its own standpoint, which is that the forthcoming conference will generalize the experience accumulated since the 1960 conference and make a major contribution to the unity of our movement and to the search for ways of ensuring, if not the coincidence of opinions, then at least effective forms of unity in the struggle against imperialism and international reaction.

We consider that in this instance, as in any other, a discus-

sion of problems cannot be useless and negative. The Central Committee considers it desirable, of course, that representatives of all the Communist and Workers' parties should take part in the conference. But even if this does not materialize we hope that the decision of the international forum of Communists will help cement the militant unity of our movement to uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism and ensure the victory of the cause of peace, national liberation and socialism.

APPEAL TO ALL THE PATRIOTIC, DEMOCRATIC AND ANTI-IMPERIALIST FORCES OF THE COUNTRY

The Second (enlarged) meeting of the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party addresses all the patriotic, democratic and progressive forces with the proposal to establish unity of action, taking into consideration the following:

The country's independent economic development is constantly hindered by the imperialist monopolies, chiefly those of the United States. Moreover, it can be said that the national economy has entered a period of stagnation and that crisis phenomena are developing in some of its branches, resulting in unemployment, low wages and impoverishment of the toiling masses.

All the patriotic, democratic and progressive forces must join to put an end to the interference of foreign monopoly capital into our economy and ensure the complete economic independence of Mexico. The immediate task is to restrict foreign investments and subsequently to prohibit them in branches which have nationalized enterprises and which have a bearing on the country's independent economic development.

In addition, our country is constantly subjected to pressure and attacks on the part of Yankee imperialism, of which the salinization of the Mexicali Valley is the most recent and brutal example. This aggression will be stopped only if the most consistent and determined anti-imperialist forces are in the vanguard of our people.

Unity and action on these issues could be based, in our opinion, on the following minimum program:

—restriction of foreign capital investments;

—control over currency exchange and consecutive restriction of the export of profits and dividends by foreign investors;

—nationalization of the principal foreign monopolies operating in the key branches;

—removal of imperialist monopolies from the nationalized sectors (oil, electrical power, railways, etc.);

—expansion of foreign trade for the purpope of establishing

trade contracts with all countries without exception, especially if they favor equal trade and offer profitable terms;

—a new foreign loans policy to ensure national sovereignty and independent development;

—immediate and comprehensive solution of the problem of the salinization of the Mexicali Valley.

The patriotic and democratic forces agree that the economic development of Mexico is retarded by the fact that vast areas of the land are in the hands of a small number of landlords, whereas millions of peasants do not even have a tiny plot and live in dire poverty. The peasants who do have land are no better off. The overwhelming majority of them cannot obtain credits or are victims of profiteering. They are denied water for irrigation and are paid the lowest prices for their produce.

Unity of action on this issue must be aimed at liquidating all latifundia and all semi-feudal forms of land exploitation. The urgent need for an agrarian reform imperatively calls for amending Article 27 of the Constitution and working out a new agrarian law providing for the transfer of the land to the peasants, easy-term credits to them, water to irrigate their fields, markets for their products, fair prices and other indispensable reforms in favor of the broad masses of peasants.

Unity of action must also be aimed at establishing an atmosphere of peace and tranquility in the countryside which is lacking today because of repressions on the part of the landlords' private police and the state authorities' support of the landlords.

Super-exploited, the workers are not paid enough to meet the barest necessities, with the resulting serious contraction of the domestic market.

The struggle for higher wages and other important demands of the working people is hampered by official and employers' interference in trade union affairs and by the absence of democracy in the majority of trade unions, which affects general democratic development in the country. Militant trade union unity can be achieved in the struggle:

—for higher wages, salaries and pensions and for other demands of the working people;

—for raising the minimum wage, for punishing violators of the corresponding laws, against the high cost of living;

—for complete independence from the government and the employers, for democracy and full respect for the freedom of convictions of the trade unionists.

These problems are growing increasingly acute because of the serious restrictions imposed on democracy in the country.

All upright and patriotically-minded citizens of Mexico are alarmed by the existence of the "social sedition" Article No. 145

of the Federal Criminal Code which has been used as an instrument of repression against the people and outstanding revolutionary fighters.

Unity of action must be aimed at securing the repeal of this article and the immediate release of all political prisoners and trade-union, peasant and student leaders.

The election campaign has demonstrated all the imperfections and injustices of the system which, relying on a discriminatory electoral law, denies representation to a large segment of the population, refuses to register its parties, ignores the will expressed by it, and employs thousands of devices to block its civil rights.

The recent changes in the electoral system, far from resolving this problem, actually fortify the positions of the extreme reactionaries, as is borne out by the fact that the National Action Party will be the only party to increase its representation in both chambers on the basis of the so-called "party deputies" principle.

Hence the unity of action of the patriotic, democratic and anti-imperialist forces must be aimed at securing a democratic electoral reform to guarantee genuine and proportionate representation and remove the obstacles to the free exercise of civil rights, especially those connected with the complicated procedure of registration of the parties. An end must be put to any government interference in the election process.

Another problem causing deep anxiety is the constant interference in the field of education, painting, descriptive arts in general, music, dances and historical monuments, from which national culture suffers.

As far as this problem is concerned, unity of action must be aimed at defending national culture against imperialism and its degenerate perversions, and upholding art and culture which would express our best traditions and national character, help our people in the struggle for national and social emancipation, and assimilate the best in the culture of other peoples.

In their joint struggle the patriotic, democratic and progressive forces should bear in mind that the chief enemy of our people and country is U.S. imperialism, which bases its policy and relations with other peoples on oppression, aggression and war.

In view of the aggressive plans of U.S. imperialism against the fraternal Republic of Cuba and of Mexico's stand in the OAS for non-interference and for the Cuban people's right to be free to decide their destiny, the various patriotic forces of our country are unanimous in their support of the Mexican government. They realize that this position signifies defense of the national independence, sovereignty and independent development of all the Latin American countries, Mexico included.

This attitude of the democratic, patriotic and progressive forces

proves the possibility of their unity of action if they are interested in the solution of problems common to all. Mexico's history abounds in examples of such unity, which has enabled us to uphold our sovereignty and national independence.

The imperialist pressure with which our people and government are confronted will be intensified if the upper hand is gained in the United States by the ultra-reactionary and pro-fascist trends which have been manifested in the current election struggle in that neighboring country.

This makes it imperative for the patriotic, democratic and progressive forces to unite and act jointly:

—for peace and peaceful coexistence;

—for the right of the peoples to choose the mode of living and the system of government they find fit ;

—in support of the Cuban revolution and to defend it against any aggression;

—in support of the Mexican government's independent actions for peace and for the principle of self-determination and non-interference.

The Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party realizes the difficulty of achieving complete unity on all the issues, but it considers that there exist important points of agreement providing a good basis for the unity of action of the various democratic and progressive forces. We, for our part, are ready to apply every effort to attain this great goal—unity.

This appeal contains only general propositions. The details and the methods of realizing these propositions can be specified jointly with the other parties, organization and individuals recognizing the need to work in common and the urgency of a joint discussion of a plan of action.

Central Committee,
Mexican Communist Party

FOR A MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES*

Francois Billoux

MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU, FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

An analysis of the situation in the world shows that we are witnessing a development of all the contradictions inherent in capitalism.

The working class and all the non-monopoly sections generally are stepping up their struggle in the economic, social, political and ideological fields. The national-liberation movement continues its advance in Asia, Africa and America. Inter-imperialist contradictions are growing more acute, as is evidenced, for instance, by the position of de Gaulle, who represents the special interests of the big French monopolies.

FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The principal role, however, is still played by the fundamental contradiction between socialism and capitalism. Unless we see this essential factor of our time, we may fail to take the best advantage of the objective opportunities that have opened before us.

Why is it necessary to stress the decisive role of the socialist world system?

Will not this generate a wait-and-see attitude and demobilize the masses?

Is it really a potent argument? Is it true that the socialist world system plays the decisive role?

That is precisely so, no matter what the Chinese leaders, who give priority to the national-liberation struggle, may say. We are far from underestimating the latter, but is not this struggle greatly assisted by the growth of the socialist world system? Moreover, it has become clearer than ever that the Chinese leaders differ with us not only ideologically.

The question, "why do they behave that way?," can be answered more clearly now that their territorial claims to the Soviet Union,

---

*France Nouvelle September 16-22, 1964.

Mongolia and other countries have revealed their nationalist great-power aspirations, their claims to hegemony.

To stress the decisive role of the socialist world system does not at all mean to temporize—on the condition, of course, that we do not limit ourselves to the mere registration of facts. Such a danger always exists.

For instance, in 1942-44 it would have been absurd to say that there was no point in fighting the Nazi invaders in France because the Soviet Army was delivering decisive blows at the Hitler war machine.

Communists have never been passive onlookers. Just as in 1942-44 the objective situation created by the Soviet victories favored the intensification of the struggle on our own territory, so today the successes achieved by the socialist camp facilitate the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries, the struggle of the peoples to win and consolidate their independence, and the struggle to preserve world peace.

Marxist-Leninists do not indulge in wishful thinking. Nor do they turn away from reality, from whatever is good and bad in it.

They take the facts as they are, and not only in their superficial aspect. Consequently, they can make the best use of a definite situation in the interest of social progress, democracy, peace and socialism. The decisive role played by the socialist world system largely facilitates our work in France. It helps us to measure up to our responsibility to the whole world.

This is one of the reasons why the French Communist Party declared for convening at the earliest date an international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties and immediately gave a positive reply to the proposal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to convene, on December 15, the 26-Party Committee to prepare the conference of all the parties due to be held in mid-1965.

ANALYSIS OF NEW DATA NECESSARY

Should the conference be called to "excommunicate" the Chinese Communist Party and, possibly, other parties? It would be absurd to pose the question that way. Such an idea has never occurred to us. Yet, it should be noted that those who ascribe this intention to us without any grounds whatsoever either know that this is not our desire and deliberately misinterpret it, or know us poorly, and in this case they would do well to make a better study of our policy before giving advice to us.

Do the propositions contained in the documents adopted by the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960 remain in force? Yes, they do, and we shall firmly abide by them.

Have events taken place since 1960 that requïre analysis by all

the parties? No doubt about it. Events have occurred which, without questioning the analysis of 1960, call for bringing it into conformity with the present situation.

In the socialist countries, which have gained fresh experience, new elements have appeared both in the building of socialism, in the relations between them, and in the Soviet Union's advance to communism.

There are new features in the national-liberation movement, in which positive changes have taken place. There are plenty of examples; suffice it to recall Algeria.

New developments are to be observed in the capitalist countries as well. In France, for instance, the situation is not what it was in 1960, when we were, in fact, the only party opposed to one-man rule. Mention can also be made of the United States, where the most reactionary elements headed by Goldwater have captured the Republican Party, increasing their pressure on U.S. policy.

There are new elements in the relations between the imperialist countries, characterized, as Europe's example shows, by the difficulties experienced by NATO and by European organs such as the Common Market.

Would it be useful for the Communist parties to discuss all this? We think it would; if they did not, grave harm would be done to every party in the fulfilment of its national and international tasks and to the entire Communist and working-class movement and, in the long run, to the cause of peace and socialism.

BILATERAL OR REGIONAL MEETINGS NOT ENOUGH

But wouldn't it be better to do that at bilateral or regional meetings or conferences limited to the discussion of some of the problems? This idea was advanced in the recent memorandum of the Italian Communist Party. We believe that such meetings can and should be arranged whenever necessary, but on the condition that they are not devoted to discussing everything and, in the final count, nothing. Meetings of this kind are good for exchanging experience, for planning common or coordinated actions.

In recent years the French Communist Party has organized or taken part in many such meetings. For instance, last spring we had a meeting with the Working Peoples' Party of Vietnam; it was arranged in the interests of our two parties and in conformity with the common or special responsibility they shoulder both in their own countries and in Southeast Asia. Likewise, the Communist parties of the six Common Market countries can get together, as they have done already, to discuss certain tasks to be carried out.

Nevertheless, such meetings, however useful and necessary they may be, cannot replace an international conference, for they cannot

provide a complete answer to the common questions posed by life before the international Communist movement. Bilateral or regional meetings do not make it possible to be able to ascertain what tasks face the entire movement and its own responsibility. It goes without saying that every party should have this in view in elaborating its own independent policy.

OURS IS A FRENCH POLICY

In this connection we do not understand why such great emphasis is laid on the autonomy and independence of the parties. We have long since been shaping and pursuing a French policy based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and making it possible closely to link French patriotism with proletarian internationalism.

We did so back in the 1930s when, having taken into account international experience and the international situation, the experience of the French working-class movement and the domestic situation, we put forward our united action policy with the Socialist Party, our Popular Front policy expressive of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry and the urban middle strata.

We did so in the Resistance and liberation periods, and after the liberation.

We did so in 1956 when, assimilating what was universally valuable in the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, we rejected pressure from both those who were content with bigoted dogmatism and those who would force us to give up fundamental class positions.

Suffice it to look at those in France who lost ground under their feet in November 1956 in connection with the Hungarian events—and who failed to regain it—to see where the absence or abandoning of principles leads.

And if many of those who prematurely buried us in 1958 when de Gaulle's one-man rule was established are compelled today to speak with respect about the French Communist Party, we owe this to our French policy, worked out and pursued in conditions of full independence. Still unable to realize this, they say and write absurd things about us.

Just as the preceding congresses, the 17th Congress of our Party occupied itself with elaborating an independent French policy which will enable the French Communists to contribute, in alliance with other forces, to planning actions unprecedented in their scope aimed at replacing the present one-man rule with a democratic regime.

NO PARTY CAN BE HEMMED IN BY ITSELF

We realize full well that all the parties, ours included, have to solve their own special problems. No party can lay claim to deter-

mining the policy of another fraternal party, not to speak of a group of parties. Each must take into account the objective conditions and the traditions of the working-class, political, trade-union and other movements in its own country.

Nevertheless, no party can be confined within itself, both in its own country, in its relations with the masses, and in the world Communist movement. In addition to having to draw upon the experience of others and to share its own experience, no matter how insignificant it may be, every party shoulders international responsibilities which can be correctly determined and fulfilled only as a result of joint discussion and joint action.

Take, for instance, the struggle for peace. Depending on whether or not France encourages the revival of German militarism; whether or not she proceeds with the building of the strike force which facilitates the proliferation of nuclear weapons and hampers progress towards general disarmament; whether or not she pursues a colonialist policy in either old or new forms — the cause of universal peace gains or loses. Conversely, the struggle for a French policy of peace is greatly facilitated when the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence is advanced everywhere as by the joint actions of the socialist countries, the newly-emergent countries, the international working class, and the peoples of the world.

It is our duty as French Communists, patriots and internationalists to display solidarity with the peoples who have freed themselves from the colonial yoke and the peoples who are fighting to cast it off. Nobody will do that for us. We strive to fulfil this duty with respect to the Vietnamese people, the Algerian people, the African peoples and the peoples still under colonialist oppression. And, of course, we can and must discuss these questions with representatives of these peoples, and we do so.

INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY

We are fighting against our French "interventionists" who not only want to deprive the newly-free countries of any assistance and credits, but also interfere—sometimes with the use of force—in their affairs. Here, too, we and other parties can do much more thanks to the participation of the entire world Communist movement.

And if it is necessary constantly to be on guard against lapsing, as the Chinese Communist Party leaders have done, into great-power chauvinism, nationalism in the shape of narrow national interests and parochialism is also a shortcoming Communists should beware of, just as they should beware of a departure from the correct national positions and of falling into national nihilism.

Joint discussion of the international situation and of the common responsibility of the world Communist movement will enable each

party to determine and specify — in the best possible way and independently — its own responsibility.

This is the main, decisive argument in favor of an international conference.

In these conditions the argument: "you run the risk of consummating and accentuating the split," to say nothing of the blackmail the Chinese leaders resort to ("You will consummate the split"), holds no water. We could say to the Chinese comrades: "Look at yourselves."

Who is working hard to engineer a split, having no scruples about the means and employing unstable, embittered, sometimes corrupt and often adventurist elements for the purpose?

DEFENSE OF THE UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Irrespective of whether the conference will take place or not the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party will be trying to continue their splitting, disruptive activities. They are doing so under the pretense of being the sole proponents of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. This enables them to sow discord and confusion among the politically less experienced. Their efforts will be facilitated unless all the parties which denounce their splitting activities and do not share their erroneous political and ideological concepts, say that to them clearly and unequivocally—and at the world conference as well.

Thus, it is normal for the Communist and Workers' parties to discuss these questions not in order "excommunicate" any one, but to work out jointly a common line. We must face the truth squarely and see it as it is. We have to deal with splitting activities which are even worse than those of the old Trotskyites, for, regrettably, the Chinese leaders are using the machinery of state for this purpose.

UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT AND FULFILMENT OF OUR TASKS

Is there any danger that the efforts we have to make to preserve and strengthen the unity of the world Communist movement may divert us from the concrete tasks facing the Communist parties?

Leninist experience shows that the more firmly we adhere to positions of principle the more courageous we are in political practice. That was an important merit of Comrade Maurice Thorez.

We would certainly prefer not to engage in debates with our Chinese comrades when we have so many other things to attend to — all the more so since their Left phrase-mongering benefits primarily our common enemy — imperialism, and the U.S. imperialists in particular. After all, did they not hope, in their provoca-

tive activities in Southeast Asia, to capitalize on the differences in the world Communist movement?

The debate goes on, whether we want it or not. From this moment on we must continue it so that the parties and Communists should emerge from it ideologically more hardened. But at the same time we shall not allow ourselves to be detracted even for a moment from the political and practical tasks in our own country. Besides, those remaining loyal to the ideas of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement will have an opportunity to make an important contribution to the forthcoming international conference which, in turn, will help the world Communist movement and every party to score fresh successes in the common march to social progress, democracy, national independence, peace and socialism.

BROADER DEMOCRACY IS THE MAIN ISSUE IN OUR ELECTION CAMPAIGN

REPORT* BY ERNEST BURNELLE, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BELGIUM, AT A PLENARY MEETING OF THE CC, CPB, SEPTEMBER 5, 1964.

The municipal election campaign is now under way. For us and for the labor movement generally the most important thing is correctly to assess the political situation and to conduct the campaign accordingly. We discussed this at the CC meetings held in January and March of this year. Noting the characteristic features of the situation, we dealt with the political preparations for the elections, pointing out that the class struggle had grown sharper and that this had created additional difficulties for the ruling groups of the bourgeoisie. It will be no exaggeration to say, we stressed at the time, that reaction will find itself in a blind alley, considering the number and urgency of the issues which it is powerless to solve despite the favorable economic situation. The reactionaries are no longer able to represent their involvement in the Atlantic policy as a result of peace, for the pitiful role Belgium is playing in the world arena is apparent to all.

EVENTS HAVE CORROBORATED THE ASSESSMENT WE MADE AT THE JANUARY 1964 MEETING OF THE CC

Developments in recent months have borne out our assessment of the situation. Driven into an impasse, the reactionaries are trying to deal new blows at the working-class and democratic movement, and this greatly increases the responsibility resting on the latter. Our country is faced with an alternative fraught with grievous consequences.

Defense spending has again been increased despite the vacillation of the government expressed, among other things, in the postponement under public pressure of the proposed renewal of the tank force for another year. The Arendonk military base has been occupied by the Bundeswehr. The government is directly interfering in the internal affairs of the Congo, dispatching Belgian troops there on the pretext of rendering technical aid. This, however, is nothing but military intervention in a country, a substantial part

*Abridged from **Drapeau Rouge**, September 11, 1964.

of whose population has risen against a puppet government headed by an individual rejected by the Congo and all of Africa.

No serious steps have been taken to halt inflation and the steady rise of the cost of living. The Ministry of the Economy continues to speculate on economic indices. Hastening to the aid of the reactionaries, the leaders of the Socialist Party claim, flouting facts obvious to public opinion, that there is no reason for alarm inasmuch as the cost of living has allegedly gone up only 7 per cent whereas wages have increased by 20 per cent—from which *Le Peuple* concludes that there has been a 13 per cent growth in purchasing power in three years. But who can believe this?

At a recent press conference Finance Minister Dequae cited figures showing to what extent Belgium's financial situation has deteriorated. Indeed, since the Social-Christian and Socialist government took over, the state debt has increased by 43,000 million Belgian francs, i.e., at a rate of more than 1,000 million a month!

Early in August the Common Market Commission released data characterizing the social picture in the European Community. The document seeks to make a case for the campaign the money magnates are now conducting in our country in an effort to prove that the workers' wage demands are the main cause of the inflationary process to be observed throughout Western Europe. And the other day the Belgian government urged the trade union leadership to "moderate" the workers' demands.

AN ULTRA-REACTIONARY DANGER LOOMS

The reactionaries are stepping up their offensive all along the line. During the doctors' "strike" a new danger emerged — that of "ultras" entering the arena. From the very beginning this "strike," which was condemned by public opinion, acquired a very definite political tinge; it was permeated with anti-parliamentary sentiment and a striving to curtail social security. It soon became clear that most of the "strikers" were pawns in the hands of the extreme Right-wing organizations which sought to use them as a "striking force" against democratic institutions — the very same organizations which in recent years have rallied behind the most nefarious causes, beginning with support of the West-German revanchist claims and ending with the encouragement of racism and active aid to colonialist and neo-colonialist machinations.

True, at present the ultras are not numerically strong, at least in our country. But they are supported by the so-called Freedom and Progress Party. This party, whose program is the most diehard reactionary of all the platforms of the so-called traditional parties, not only prides itself on being the farthest to the Right among the bourgeois parties, but also seeks to unite all the scum associated with fascist groups such as the Anti-Communist Movement, Young

Europe, etc. It plays into the hands of all the ultra-reactionary, anti-democratic and anti-parliamentary trends, which reaction seeks to use to bring pressure to bear on the government and push it still farther to the right.

It should be noted that the ultras are raising their heads in all the capitalist countries. A glaring example is that of Goldwater in the United States. This is not merely a matter of another reactionary current, of which there have been so many in that country, entering the scene. Goldwater is the spokesman of a strong fascist-type trend expressing the interests of influential financial groups and oil and steel trusts which have made a profitable business of the cold war and are doing their utmost to aggravate it to the extreme.

It is noteworthy that his inflammatory outbursts are widely utilized by U.S. reaction whose pressure on President Johnson and his group explains the dangerous situation in Vietnam and the crude aggression carried out by the Johnson Administration against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

THE CHOICE TODAY

Our country today is faced with a growing danger of Right-wing extremism. As things become more and more difficult for the reactionaries generally they will no doubt seek to resort to all manner of subterfuges to suppress democratic freedoms and will increasingly support the ultras.

There is no doubt that the working class and the working masses generally will not allow themselves to be deceived. As before, they will give a fitting rebuff to the reactionary sallies. But the situation in Belgium will hardly be marked by a relative equilibrium when blows delivered by one side will merely be parried by the other. It is bound to develop either towards the Right or towards the Left. Either the working people and democrats generally will bar the way to reaction and ensure continued progress, or reaction will triumph with all the anti-democratic consequences this will entail.

THE WORKING PEOPLE CANNOT COMBAT REACTION THROUGH COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE SOCIALIST AND SOCIAL-CHRISTIAN PARTIES

Such, then, is the basic alternative confronting us. Large numbers of working people are aware that the policy of class collaboration pursued by the leaders of the Socialist Party plays a negative role, inasmuch as it fetters this party to a government with a questionable record which is discrediting parliamentary institutions. The deal made by the Socialist Party with the Social-Christian Party in the Lefebvre-Spaak government damages the struggle of the working class inasmuch as it holds this struggle responsible for the

consequences of the growing military spending, for soaring prices and manipulations with economic indices, for the adoption of anti-strike laws, etc.

DIRECT DEMOCRACY THROUGH UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

Many working people are beginning to realize that the class collaboration policy of the Socialist Party leaders offers them no defense against reaction. Hence they are becoming suspicious of reformism. They are awakening to the need to change this policy.

But these changes in workers' thinking constitute only one of the conditions for an effective search for a new orientation that would enable the working people and democrats generally to play the leading role in the country, to seize the initiative from the ruling circles and to impose their own solutions to unsolved problems.

We are unquestionably right in proposing a program of peace, social progress and democracy which can be realized provided unity is achieved among the Socialists, Communists and Christian Democrats, with the trade unions playing an important role in implementing it. We are undoubtedly right in pointing out that the way to the realization of this perspective lies through the factories, residential neighbourhoods and workers' organizations, through united action for peace, immediate demands and democracy. But we cannot confine ourselves to merely outlining the perspective.

DIFFICULTIES ON THE WAY TO UNITY

The program we offer is aimed primarily against the negative aspects of government policy. It is highly concrete when it comes to things that must be done away with, added or amended in the interests of the people. But as regards the deeper implications of the new policy we propose, these may not be sufficiently clear to the masses.

It should be borne in mind that the working people fully realize the need for heavy cuts in military spending. But they will not be equally unanimous when it comes to assessing the basic foreign policy trends which should replace the policy of subordination to NATO.

There is widespread sentiment against the domination of the monopolies and their methods of rule. In other words, the idea of structural reform has already struck root in broad sections of the population. But opinions differ as to the substance of these reforms.

The same can be said of a great many other urgent problems. In Flanders as well as in the Walloon districts the economic backwardness of some areas and the decline of others is a cause of public concern but there is not enough unanimity as to what should be done about it.

The working masses, then, are by and large agreed that things

cannot continue along the lines pursued for nearly 20 years by successive governments. But there is still no agreed opinion as to what other path to choose at the moment.

We hold that no workers' or other democratic organization can, or would wish to, impose its views in this matter on other organizations. With the present growth of critical thinking among the working class it is indeed out of the question for any working-class organization to force all other organizations to follow a line it considers the best.

Hence a prolonged comparison of views is essential in order to work out a clear-cut positive program capable of becoming the program of a broad anti-monopoly front.

But this by no means precludes the necessity of having our own views and disseminating them.

DEMOCRACY IS A WEAPON THAT CAN DEFEAT REACTION

What, in our opinion, is the path which the Belgian working-class movement should take in view of the number and complexity of the problems confronting our country? On what basis can general agreement be achieved and a positive program elaborated within a reasonable space of time?

The chief thing is to clearly outline the main direction of our policy with a view to strengthening and extending the struggle for working-class unity and thus ensuring the collectiv elaboration of a program. This direction can be defined only by thorough study of the urgent problems facing our working-class movement.

Take government policy. Is there a connection between its various negative aspects? Unquestionably. Although the ways in which the government is encroaching on the interests of the working class are numerous and complex, they nevertheless follow one common pattern.

The various actions taken by the government all tend towards restriction of democracy and flouting the will of the people. And this trend is being accentuated under pressure from the reactionaries. It is gradually becoming the dominant trend in the political activities of the monopoly bourgeoisie, in its efforts to use the state machine against the working masses. Drawing on the support of the ultras, of the "wild men," this trend cannot but give encouragement to these elements. Consequently, it represents the main danger with which the working-class and democratic movement has to contend. And this makes it incumbent on the working people of our country to attach the utmost importance to the problem of democracy, for it is essential not only to defend the existing freedoms, but to work out a democratic perspective, a positive program without which their struggle will lack the necessary coordination and inspiration.

THE MEANING OF THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY TODAY

The struggle of the Communists and the trade-union Left for democracy is aimed primarily at helping the workers to express their opinion on all questions of interest to them and their country as a whole, both on the plane of economic demands and on a general political plane.

The fight for democracy today implies also a fight for the right to be informed, i.e., for access to the sources of information in all areas of public life so as to enable the workers to take consistent and effective action from their class positions. We consider it particularly essential to be fully informed on questions such as production costs and the monthly retail price indices. The workers' representatives in the factory councils should have access to all the details of management so as to give the trade unions an authoritative say in the operation of the enterprises.

THE NATION-WIDE REFERENDUM

Democracy implies the right of the people to voice their opinion through a nationwide poll whenever necessary, and hence to fight for democracy means fighting for the recognition of the plebiscite by law as a constitutional principle. The need for this is patent from the parliamentary experience of recent years which has shown that many deputies considered as representatives of the working pople readily fall in line with the reactionaries.

In short, we believe that a fight should be waged for what might be called direct democracy.

We believe that this idea could play a decisive role in the political scene, bringing the Left forces closer together and facilitating the joint elaboration of a political program by the anti-monopoly forces.

Due credit must be given to the Walloon Popular Movement for advancing last year the idea of a nationwide referendum as a method offering a democratic solution to the problem of the communities.

We all remember how 650,000 Walloon democrats supported this proposal. It is a new idea born in the course of sweeping democratic struggle, one that could have far-reaching consequences. The reactionaries have evidently already estimated the losses they would incur were this idea to be realized; they know full well that they would be defeated in the referendum and hence they are doing their utmost to prevent it.

Writing the plebiscite into the Constitution would provide an avenue for the unequivocal expression of the people's will. A referendum would at once show the support given by the population to a federal structure; indeed, there is no other effective solution to the problem of Flemish-Walloon relations.

THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IDEA OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY

Let us now examine the vast opportunities struggle for direct democracy would open for the Belgian working-class movement. As a matter of fact, on closer examination it will be seen that this struggle is a continuation of the struggle for universal suffrage, that it complements the latter, imparting to it a more modern content and greater weight.

Direct democracy is not the antithesis of democratically functioning parliamentary institutions. Its purpose is not to supplant the latter, but to eliminate their shortcomings, to lend them an an effectiveness and influence corresponding to the requirements of democracy in our time.

The direct democracy we advocate is essential not only now as an instrument of struggle against the dictatorship of the monopolies; we believe that it will be employed also by the democratic anti-monopoly government towards which we are striving inasmuch as such a government could fulfill its mission only together with and relying on the people.

We unequivocally declare once again that the principle of respect for the will of the majority is for us an inviolable principle, that as the working-class and democratic movement forges ahead towards power we Communists shall not seek to impose on others any decision that has not been approved by the majority of the population, and that even after the working class and democracy have triumphed over the monopolies strict observance of the principle of consultation and direct democracy is essential for the implementation of a genuinely democratic policy.

THE BIG ISSUES OF THE MOMENT

It is in the context of the overall policy outlined above that we define our objectives in the coming municipal elections. Needless to say, the Communists are sure to register gains in these elections. On this we are all agreed. However, already several months ago we warned our activists against bargaining too much on this, against complacency, against a tendency to underestimate the importance of the municipal elections and to divorce them from the struggle around the big issues of the moment.

We want to make these elections a political campaign which would help in the building of working-class and democratic unity, in the elaboration of a program facilitating the unification of the Left forces, in ensuring the triumph of the idea of direct democracy.

All the urgent issues facing us today will remain after the elections. As a matter of fact, they may be expected to become sharper. Consequently, there is no doubt that if we work well with due political foresight the municipal elections can become a point of

departure for intensifying the popular struggle and preparing for the next parliamentary election better than in previous years.

The government is clearly apprehensive that the municipal elections will turn the spotlight on the major national issues. It is aware that it is in a difficult position. Together with the growth of popular opposition, its own internal difficulties are also growing. The parties in government are in the grip of a crisis, as is evident from the increasing tension between the conservatives and the Christian-Democrats in the Social-Christian Party, and from the near split between the Right wing and broad sections of the Left in the Socialist Party, especially the Left forces in the trade unions.

The government is doing its best to prevent the municipal elections from having too direct an effect on the general political situation; it is trying to play them down and minimize their importance. The leadership of the Socialist Party, for example, decided to concentrate its campaign efforts on narrow local administrative issues, instructing its activists to steer clear of the national issues in which the popular opposition trends are interested.

Hence we should highlight in our election campaign the impact of national problems on municipal government, since to promise sensational gains on the municipal plane at a time when the government continues to pursue a policy increasingly restricting the opportunites of the local authorities would be tantamount to abusing the confidence of the electorate.

Consequently, we must persistently bring it home to the public that the struggle for the democratic solution of national issues should not be isolated from struggle around municipal issues. The creation of conditions for sound administration and democracy in the municipalities depends largely on the general political struggle.

OUR FIGHT FOR A JOINT TICKET

It is our object to help in every way to strengthen popular resistance to the plans of the reactionaries. We want the popular demands on the municipal plane to be realized. Therefore from the beginning of this year we have placed the emphasis on putting forward joint lists of candidates including the Left Socialists, trade unionists and Communists. We would like these lists to become the forerunner of the broad anti-monopoly front which is taking shape and which we believe to be inevitable. Our Party has campaigned widely for joint lists, and wherever this work has been carried out with conviction and perseverance—as, for instance, in the industrial Walloon districts and also in areas like Flanders where the struggle for unity is more difficult—our proposals have almost invariably been well received by the people.

The consultations and opinion-soundings in which our Party has engaged for some months now with the help of comrades from

the Left wing of the Socialist Party as well as trade unionists, represent an important aspect of work which should be continued in various forms. The number of positive answers obtained in the course of these consultations and polls has astounded even some of our own activists; the response has shown how widespread is the desire for unity and how the perspective we offer in this respect corresponds to the aspirations of the working masses. The Right-wing forces in the Socialist Party cherish no illusions on this score. Their annoyance at being forced in some places to break the conspiracy of silence and to come out openly against the growing gravitation towards unity is indicative indeed. They are aware of the dangers with which the idea of unity is fraught for them since they have no other political perspective to offer than continuation of their present alliance with the Social-Christian Party.

The work done by our Party and the Left elements in the Socialist Party to popularize the idea of a joint ticket has unquestionably produced fruit. In a number of municipalities joint lists of candidates will be put forward, though the ways in which these lists have been drawn up vary. Some—especially in the smaller communities where the Socialists and the Communists have long cooperated from time to time to defeat the Right majority—have been compiled in the traditional way. Here joint lists present no problem for they have long been the regular practice. But there are also joint lists of a new type, based on a program calling for a break with policies that have always met with opposition in the municipalities, a program aimed at linking the struggles fought within the framework of local government with the general struggle of the working masses. These lists include Left Socialists, Communists and trade union functionaries. Needless to say, this is only the beginning in the building of unity of action, but the initial results are encouraging.

One of the obstacles we have to contend with is that many Socialist Party activists still believe the joint lists would harm their party. Hence their hesitation to join with us and the trade union Left. We wish to make it clear once again, however, that in putting forward the idea of a joint ticket we are not seeking to cause a split in the Socialist Party. If there is a danger of the party splitting, it originates in its Right wing, which is opposed to the Left militants expressing the will of the Socialist working people.

Discussion of our proposals for unity in the Socialist Municipal Union revealed that wherever the organizations of the Socialist Party approach the question as the working people would wish and establish contacts and work together with the Communists, these organizations are not threatened by split or losing strength. Confrontation of views can weaken only the Right-wing splitters in the leadership of the Socialist Party, for it is they who are

engaged in disruptive activity; it is because of them that there are such heated debates and clashes of opinion.

Another new form of joint action is the inclusion of Communists in Socialist lists with the understanding that they will conduct their own campaign in their own name and on the basis of their own program. This form of joint ticket emerged in the course of open discussion between the Socialists and the Communists, especially discussions initiated by the Left Socialists at meetings of the Socialist Municipal Union.

These are some of the things which claim our attention and which indicate how popular the idea of unity has become.

THE FIGHT FOR URGENT DEMANDS AND THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The coming election campaign is only one of the important problems requiring extensive intervention by the working masses. We must be able to link these issues with the municipal elections.

AGAINST FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN THE CONGO

Above all there is the need to combat imperialist, in particular, Belgian, intervention in the affairs of the Congo, intervention designed to prevent the Congolese people from taking their destiny into their own hands.

Our Party has already come out against intervention. Our members of parliament have made strong representations to the government in this matter, as have the Socialist deputies. The trade unions, the leadership of the Municipal Workers' Union, the Liege Iron and Steel Workers' Federation and several workers' meetings have come out against intervention. We consider the struggle against imperialist interference in the internal affairs of the Congo to be the most important aspect of the fight for peace at the present time. Not a single enterprise, not a single workers' meeting, not a single youth, Socialist or Communist organization, not a single peace organization can remain outside of this struggle.

Despite the election campaign, our own organizations must contribute their share to this struggle which is rapidly gaining momentum.

THE FIGHT FOR IMMEDIATE DEMANDS AND THE "INCOMES POLICY" HOAX

The election campaign should not be allowed to overshadow the fight for the workers' immediate demands.

The reactionaries are trying to deceive the working people by propounding what they call an "incomes policy" — a policy ostensibly designed to prevent inflation but actually serving the capital-

ists as an instrument for combating the workers' legitimate wage claims.

The working people, however, will not be deceived. The "incomes policy" theory will not solve the problem. Its purpose is to put off the moment when the working people will intervene in price control and make the capitalists answer for the consequences of soaring prices. The monopolies are also seeking to unite their efforts within the framework of the Common Market in order to use the "incomes policy" theory against the trade unions.

This theory has been opposed even by trade unions under Right-wing leadership, such as the unions affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. But the monopolies have chosen to ignore this opposition. Consequently, clashes are inevitable.

OUR PARTY SUBSCRIBES TO THE EIGHT CONDITIONS OF THE WALLOON POPULAR MOVEMENT

The third problem facing the working people is that of relations between the Flemish and Walloon communities. Judging by the "round-table" talks on the subject, it will undoubtedly be settled in a one-sided and reactionary way since the reactionaries are clearly determined under all circumstances to ignore the justified demands of the Walloons in apportioning the seats in parliament.

In view of this, and in connection with the election campaign, we must once again underscore the importance of the initiative taken by the Walloon Popular Movement in circulating its eight-point pledge among the candidates.

One of the eight commitments which the candidates are asked to undertake is, in our opinion, of exceptional importance at the present time. The Walloon Popular Movement formulates it as follows:

"I agree that it is essential to consult with the people before the elections as regards the possible results of the preparatory 'round-table' conference on revising the Constitution. I shall do my utmost to have this consultation conducted by the local authorities among the population of their communities."

This point hits hard at the reactionaries and the Rights in the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party leadership has already reacted by instructing the Socialist candidates not to subscribe to these commitments. This has understandably caused some consternation among most of the Socialist candidates who approve of the position taken by the Walloon Popular Movement. The fact is that all eight points are fully justified; they were all approved by the public generally and the above-mentioned point was ratified by a referendum in which 650,000 Walloon democrats voiced their opinion. All these points are acceptable to every democrat; they place in a difficult position only those who cling to positions of class collabo-

ration and sacrifice the interests of the working class to those of the reactionaries.

The Walloon working people are eager to bring the eight conditions set forth in their letter to the attention of the broad masses and to win for them the support of as many candidates as possible, including those running on the Socialst ticket.

Our Party as a whole and our federations have already publicly declared their support of the conditions put forward by the Walloon Popular Movement.

COMMUNIST PARTY CAMPAIGN

Our Party is thus determined to conduct a spirited, well thought out and effective election campaign. We shall bring our positions home to the public through the medium of leaflets, the press, posters and meetings. We shall spare no effort to elucidate these positions.

We must give a rebuff to the subversive activities of the groups of splitters and slanderers headed by Grippa, which are doing their utmost to fight our Party and seeking to sow confusion by circulating materials in which they shamelessly use the name of our Party for their disruptive purposes.

Grippa and his forgers have no illusions as to the outcome of their campaign. They do not expect to make any gains at the polls. They merely count on using the election atmosphere to spread anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander and their sectarian slogans, thereby supporting the campaign waged by the reactionaries and the Right-wing disrupters from the Socialist Party against our Party.

While we have been working to put forward joint lists of candidates, the Grippa group have supported the manipulations of the Right-wing leaders and all those who have been trying to curry favor with them. The opponents of unity are justifying their rejection of our proposals on the grounds that there are allegedly two Communist parties.

The reactionaries, the Right-wing disruptive elements and their press are trying to instil the belief that there are two Communist parties in Belgium, a "pro-Khrushchov" party and a pro-Chinese party, one being the "orthodox," the other, the "unorthodox," and to make it appear as if our Party is directed from abroad. We repeat that there is only one Communist Party in Belgium, and that its program is elaborated by the Belgian Communists and working people generally. Our Party is a legal party, it functions openly. It holds regular congresses which are attended by representatives of the press, radio and cinema. That our sympathies are with the noble struggle carried on by Comrade Khrushchov and the leaders of the fraternal parties is common knowledge. But this does not make our Party "pro-Khrushchov," pro-French, or pro-Italian,

"orthodox" or "unorthodox." The political positions adopted by our Party on internal and foreign policy are the fruit of lengthy discussions within our organizations, and are dictated solely by our desire to serve the interests of the Belgian working people and at the same time the interests of the international working-class front in the struggle against the reactionary and imperialist forces.

We are not fanatics. Our convictions are not founded on blind belief in some gospel, we are not bound by dogmas and sectarian practices.

We derive our convictions from the struggle of the working class and all democrats, from our revolutionary efforts to change the world, from our study and perception of the realities.

We believe in our ideas and in our strength because our present struggle is an integral part of the great movement which is leading humanity to a new society, to socialism.

VAIN EFFORTS*

Karl Muller

All Marxist-Leninists in common with peace-loving people everywhere were shocked to learn of the annexationist claims made by the Peking leaders on neighboring socialist states, and vehemently rejected such claims. However, the Peking leaders at once launched a new reprehensible maneuver. This time they unscrupulously made use of Comrade Walter Ulbricht's speech at the Seventh Session of the People's Chamber and the projected visit of Comrade Khrushchov to the FRG to attempt to sow discord among the fraternal socialist countries and disrupt the close ties of friendship between the GDR and the Soviet Union. Needless to say their efforts have been in vain.

On September 8 the newspaper *Jenminjihpao* published a dispatch and commentary from the Bonn correspondent of the Hsinhua Agency full of deliberate distortions and lies aimed at misinforming the Chinese people. Distorting the facts and the true content of Comrade Ulbricht's speech, the Chinese leaders impute to the Soviet comrades an attitude of disdain for the interests of the GDR and a desire to use it as an "object of barter." By the simple device of misquoting passages out of context and using the reports of Western press agencies, they deliberately try to create the impression that differences exist between the Soviet Union and the GDR.

This latest attempt to disrupt the friendly relations between fraternal socialist countries is demagogically served up as "support" of the GDR. In reality the policy of the Chinese leaders, who pose as defenders of the interests of the German people, is aimed at splitting the socialist camp and serves anything but the interests of the GDR.

The population of the GDR has for some time now been following with deep concern the policy pursued by the Chinese leaders and their attempts to put their "intermediate zone" theory into practice. Are they really seeking an alliance with the European imperialist powers and imperialist Japan against the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries? There are a number of facts which shed some light on this question: Mao Tse-tung's statement to the French parliamentarians in which he expressed himself in favor of an alliance between the Chinese People's Republic and the

---

*Neues Deutschland, September 20, 1964.

imperialist states of Western Europe and Japan; the interview given by Mao Tse-tung to Japanese socialists in which he advanced annexationist demands with regard to the fraternal countries and virtually opposed the Oder-Neisse frontiers; the use of West German Secret Service channels for circulating Chinese materials attacking the policy of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the fraternal parties; and lastly, the slanderous reports drawn from the most rabid West German revanchist and militaristic press sources and reprinted by the Chinese press.

Nor is it fortuitous that though they reprint any amount of calumnious reports culled from the Western press, the Chinese newspapers give little or no space to information about the policy of the GDR government, about the progress of socialist construction in our republic, the proposals to realize the principles of peaceful coexistence in the relations between the two German states, the consistent anti-imperialist struggle and support of the national-liberation movement.

As before, we openly declare to the Chinese leaders: your latest attempt to provoke discord between the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the GDR and the other fraternal socialist countries, on the other, and to sow distrust between them, is doomed to failure as are the speculations of the Bonn "ultras" about "buying the GDR."

While the Peking leaders are trying to form a "third force" with leading imperialist powers, including NATO-member West Germany, the Soviet Union is consistently championing the interests of the GDR, the German working class and all peace-loving Germans. As the leading force of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, the Soviet Union made an invaluable contribution to the defeat of Hitler fascism and the liberation of the German people from fascism. From the very beginning the Soviet Union has consistently striven to facilitate the fulfillment in East Germany of the Potsdam agreements which accord with the interests of the German people as well. The Soviet Union helped the anti-fascist forces in the Eastern part of Germany to set up an anti-fascist democratic system. From the very inception of the GDR we have been bound to the Soviet Union by ties of fraternal friendship. The CPSU and the Soviet government, headed by Comrade Khrushchov, have in word and deed supported our republic in its effort to eliminate the consequences of the Second World War, to conclude a German peace treaty, as a basis for achieving a settlement of the West Berlin question.

The recently concluded Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Cooperation between the GDR and the Soviet Union strengthened the fraternal ties between our two states still further. Even the Western press was forced to recognize this fact. On September 7 the West German DPA agency admitted that such political reali-

ties as the agreement between the GDR and the USSR have refuted the speculations circulated among others by the Chinese leaders in connection with the projected visit of Khrushchov to the FRG.

The above treaty formalizes on the basis of international law the actual situation that emerged after 1945, and reaffirms the sovereignty of the GDR. It states clearly and unequivocally that the inviolability of the state frontiers of the GDR is one of the basic factors of European security and that any encroachment by militarist and revanchist forces on these frontiers will encounter a stern rebuff.

All these are facts which the Chinese leaders do not choose to recognize. That the policy of peaceful coexistence between the two German states is the cardinal prerequisite of security in Europe and an elementary condition for the future reunion of Germany does not fit into their great-power chauvinistic conceptions.

The doctrine of peace in Germany, defined by Chairman of the G State Council Walter Ulbricht and consistently supported by the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and also the treaty of friendship between the GDR and the USSR—two documents ignored by the Chinese leaders—point the way to the solution of the German question. As Comrade Ulbricht said at the Seventh Session of the People's Chamber:

"Today the majority of the nations support the proposals made by the Soviet Union and personally by Comrade Nikita Khrushchov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, for a policy of peaceful coexistence of peoples and states with differing social systems, for a consistent policy of safeguarding peace through gradual universal and complete disarmament. The actions of the political adventurers at the head of a certain party who regard war as a means of achieving social progress are repudiated not only by the majority of the Communist and Workers' parties, but the peoples as well.

"The policy of peaceful coexistence is especially essential for Germany where, as a result of the Second World War, two states with differing systems of alliances, have been established. Today one-third of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, has become a bastion of peace. Our German Democratic Republic, has become a loyal ally of all peace-loving men and women, of all peace-loving nations and states the world over. The existence of the GDR is a reliable guarantee that in Germany too the forces of peace shall prevail."

The government and the population of the GDR welcome the forthcoming visit of Comrade Khrushchov to the FRG inasmuch as this visit can only serve to promote the cause of peaceful coexistence and relaxation of world tension, and thereby accords

with the interests of the German Democratic Republic and of all peace-loving people.

All those who still cherish illusions about "buying the GDR" — whether they be the West German imperialists or those who give orders to the hack writers in Peking—would do well to remember once and for all: the GDR is not for sale, and never will be.

THE POSTWAR TURN IN FINNISH POLITICS*

Ville Pessi
GENERAL SECRETARY, COMMUNIST PARTY OF FINLAND

Twenty years ago Finland broke with Nazi Germany and concluded an armistice with the Soviet Union. The people of our country entered a new stage in their history. The political course steered until then by the ruling sections of the bourgeoisie which had spelt so many misfortunes for the nation had led to debacle, and the ruling circles had to embark on a new course of democratic development and peace. Previously the decisive word had rested with the extreme Right, which often resorted to dictatorial methods. The will of parliament was often ignored when vital issues were in question. The forces of reaction, relying on the support of the Schutzkorps and similar organizations, trampled on the rights of the working people. Freedom of speech, assembly and the press were practically non-existent. Thousands of Communists ond other opponents of the policy of war and reaction were thrown into prison. The reactionary politicians sacrificed Finland's national interests to Hitler Germany's insane plans of world domination and reduced its economy and finances to a state of utter bankruptcy. For the country to be steered along different lines new forces had to come to the fore.

The defeat of fascism awakened these new forces in Finland as in many other countries. They now entered the political arena. The Communists were freed from prison and the freedom of speech, assembly and the press was restored. After 26 years underground, the Communist Party became a legal party. In order to unite all the forces in the working-class movement, both individuals and organizations, that wished to promote democratic and progressive policies in all areas of public life, the Finnish People's Democratic Alliance was founded, taking in the Communist Party and more than 100 Social-Democratic organizations. By the end of 1944, other big organizations, such as the Democratic Women's Union and the Socialist Unity Party, were formed, and they too affiliated with the Alliance. The demand for a new course was voiced more and more emphatically in other parties as well. Thus the positions of the champions of democracy grew stronger and the influence

*Kommunisti, August 1964.

of the reactionaries notably waned. For the first time since 1918 an opportunity appeared for implementing a democratic policy. The first and second Paasikivi governments, and especially the Pekkala government which succeeded them, differed radically from all earlier Finnish governments. They included the Communist Party and the Democratic Alliance. But since these were in the minority, the measures taken to promote democracy were half-hearted and inconsistent. But for all that many new features made themselves felt in economic and general domestic policy, not to speak of the new peaceable foreign policy whose foundations were laid in those years.

The central foreign policy issue was that of relations with the Soviet Union. From 1918 to the end of the war these relations were marked by suspicion and hostility. The feature of the new stage that was now ushered in was a striving towards mutual trust and the laying of a solid foundation for a policy of friendship.

Our Seventh Congress held in 1945 noted the significance of these new relations with the Soviet Union.

"Our Party," it pointed out, "holds that the policy of friendship with the Soviet Union is in the vital interest of Finland. Hence our Party is doing everything in its power to educate the popular masses in the spirit of respect and trust for the Soviet Union as the champion of freedom and equality of nations."

All the forces of the People's Democratic movement came out solidly in support of strengthening the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. In the other parties, however, differences arose. Many political leaders who in socio-political questions had adhered to bourgeois, and, in many cases, even reactionary views began to drift away from those Right-wing diehards who continued to oppose any rapprochement with the Soviet Union. In the immediate post-war period this process developed slowly and found little reflection in the press since a substantial section of the bourgeois and even Social-Democratic press remained in the hands of rabid proponents of the old foreign-policy line. But already then some bourgeois political leaders approached foreign-policy issues from the standpoint of Finland's real national interests and not from positions of blind hatred of communism as was the case with the spokesmen of the Right.

Paasikivi, who headed the first postwar governments and was elected President in 1946, was the spokesman of the realistically thinking circles. At a dinner given in honor of A. A. Zhdanov, Chairman of the Allied Control Commission, Paasikivi called the transition from war to peace a "genuine step toward a sound policy." "Let this step toward peace and friendship between our countries be this time final and purposeful," he said. "After everything

the industrious people of Finland have experienced they do not wish to repeat the fatal mistakes of past years."

The agreement which was concluded among the three biggest parliamentary groups in 1945 likewise stressed the need for a new foreign-policy line: "The foreign policy of our country must in the future be guided by the interests of the entire people and not narrow group aspirations. The aim of our foreign policy should be durable peace and lively trade and cultural intercourse with all progressive countries, above all with our great neighbor, the Soviet Union, and also with the Scandinavian countries."

The broad democratic movement of the people proved a reliable support and champion of the new line of foreign and home policy. In signing the armistice, Finland committed itself to guaranteeing democratic rights to its citizens. This stipulation was more specifically set forth in the Peace Treaty concluded in 1947. Article Six of this Treaty states: "Finland undertakes to take every step to ensure that all persons under Finnish jurisdiction, irrespective of race, sex, language or religious affiliation, enjoy all rights and basic freedoms, including the freedom of speech, the press, religion, political convictions and public assembly."

Finland thus committed itself to do everything to prevent the restoration of a reactionary state system of the kind which had prevailed for more than twenty years and had deprived part of the people of their democratic civil liberties and rights. But democracy does not develop of itself. No sooner had the armistice agreement been signed than the reactionaries and the top military leaders proceeded to obstruct progress along the new lines, seeking to prevent the working masses from enjoying democratic rights and winning economic gains, and, in the sphere of foreign policy, to hinder the improvement of relations between Finland and the Soviet Union. Assessing the new stage at its Seventh Congress in the autumn of 1945, our Party pointed out that the "main feature of the new situation is the continued clash between the forces of democracy and reaction," and that democracy "can develop only to the extent that the democratic-minded part of the population will fight jointly to extirpate fascism and reaction in all spheres of political, economic and cultural life."

A stubborn struggle had to be waged every step of the way. Under the impact of mass pressure and the Peace Treaty the pre-1948 governments began to prosecute war criminals and to remove the more rabid fascists from the state apparatus. However, the resistance to these measures on the part of the Right enabled the reactionaries to retain their positions. The big capitalists, concerned as always with multiplying their profits, took advantage of compensation payments for war expenditures to line their pockets, while the main burden of the expenditures had, as before, to

be shouldered by the working people. Needless to say, the reparation payments to the Soviet Union covered only a negligible portion of the damage inflicted on it by Finnish military action. It should also be borne in mind that in 1947, for example, "internal war compensation" paid to the capitalists by the state exceeded the external indemnities fourfold. Yet the ruling element complained of the excessive burden of external reparation payments. But in spite of these payments, the resettlement of displaced persons and other additional outlays, the Pekkala government was able to put Finland's economy on a solid footing and even to improve the living conditions of the workers and smallholders. It was necessary, however, to build up a mass movement in support of the working people's demands inasmuch as the employers resisted any improvement of their conditions. This broad mass movement supported the initiative of the ministers representing the People's Democratic parliamentary group, the Communists and People's Democrats, and achieved significant results: the law on annual vacations was extended, family allowances instituted, legislation on working hours improved, etc.

The Communist Party and the People's Democratic movement general also worked to improve the conditions of the smallholders and to strengthen the alliance of the workers and farmers. Our Seventh Congress declared: "The farmers and the workers constitute the backbone of society, the overwhelming majority of the population. If the workers and the farmers are divided, the finance magnates will find it easy to exercise their domination over the people and to exploit them. But if there is an alliance of workers and farmers, and if this alliance is supported by the democratic-minded intellectuals, the reactionary finance magnates are doomed to defeat."

We tirelessly stressed the importance of unity of action among all progressive and democratic forces. In working to promote democracy our Party laid the emphasis on strengthening peace and friendship with the Soviet Union, democratizing the state machine, nationalization of the monopolies and banks, land reform, increasing real wages and promoting national culture.

During the first two or three post-war years a firm foundation was laid for a radical change in the thinking of the broad masses in questions of peace, democracy and socialism. But the reactionaries did not lay down arms or relinquish their hopes of staging a comeback. In 1948, when the People's Democratic movement, under heavy fire from the Rights, lost seats in parliament as compared with the 1945 elections, the reactionaries scored what appeared to be a victory. Taking advantage of this as well as of the reactionary offensive in the international arena, the Right-wing groups succeeded in ousting the People's Democrats from the government.

As regards other official posts, the democratic forces had been discriminated against even before, but now this discrimination became more pronounced. But the reactionaries had won a Pyrrhic victory, as was evidenced by the mass response, unprecedented in Finland, to the 30th anniversary celebrations of our Party in August 1948. Since then the People's Democratic vote has been stadily growing, topping the half million mark in the 1962 parliamentary election. Finnish-Soviet friendship has struck deep roots among our people, and all attempts to encroach on the democratic and economic rights of the working people meet with vigorous resistance.

From the standpoint of the activity of the People's Democratic movement and the Communist Party, the past 20 years have been years of powerful upswing. Our organizations have grown in numbers and strength. If the votes cast for us in the 1945 elections were prompted above all by an instinctive desire for a change and in protest against the reactionary policy of the past, today people vote for us because they have seen for themselves that the Communist Party and the Democratic Alliance are champions of their interests and the interests of the entire nation. And therefore the most vicious attacks and unceasing smear campaigns levelled against us and deliberate misrepresentation of our aims are powerless to produce the results desired by the Right. On the contrary, our influence is growing and our economic, social and peace slogans are accepted by a large section of the rank and file of the other parties. This helps to bring about solutions to many questions of vital importance for the working people since the leadership of no party can afford completely to ignore the views of their members and supporters.

Developments since the war have proved the correctness of the political line defined by our Party congresses, a line which accords with the principles set forth at the international meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties. Hundreds of thousands of working people support the Communist Party and the People's Democratic movement for they have seen for themselves that the policy of our Party corresponds to their interests and aspirations. Hence under no circumstances can we agree with the line propounded by the Chinese leaders, for to do so would divert our Party from the reliable road of scientific socialism, of Marxism-Leninism.

The past 20 years have in many respects marked a turning point in the history of our people. The reactionaries are active as before and are exerting an influence through diverse channels on people's outlook. But their influence is steadily declining, whereas the cause of peace and Finnish-Soviet friendship is finding ever new supporters and active proponents. The number of people wishing to take part in constructive activities aimed at improving the life and increasing the income of the working class and all other working

people and at extending their social and democratic rights is steadily growing. Our main task is to promote and strengthen united action among all working people in both the present and future interests of the people. We are seeking to improve the work of our Party and other People's Democratic organizations. What we said in our first leaflet legally put out in the autumn of 1944 holds good today as well: "We are ready to work together with all who are sincerely desirous of promoting the interests of our country and people. The interests and aspirations which we stand for and uphold coincide with the interests and aspirations of the entire working class and all other working people."

RESOLUTION* OF AKEL CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING

For nine months now the people of Cyprus have been resisting the aggressive schemes to enslave them and dismember their country. Progressive and peace-loving men and women the world over follow with admiration their valiant struggle.

This outstanding exploit is the result of the unity of the people in the face of imperialism, their loyalty to the government, their ardent patriotism, and powerful support from all their friends and above all the Soviet Union, the bulwark of the struggle for the freedom of the people.

The Anglo-American imperialists and their gendarmes in Ankara, age-old enemies of Cyprus, employ all forms of blackmail against the Cypriots. In their desperate efforts to break the militant spirit of the Cypriots and impose new spurious solutions on them they do not scruple to take recourse to barbarous napalm bombing. But they have come up against the unbending will for victory of our people and their determination to fight in unity for freedom, all sacrifices and suffering notwithstanding.

VIOLENCE AND CONSPIRACIES

Still bent on fulfilling their criminal plans, the sworn enemies of Cyprus maneuver, launch new schemes and use new methods to blackmail and deceive the Greek and Cypriot government, split the unity of Athens and Nicosia, abolish the Cypriot state and its government, divide Cyprus and turn it into a NATO base.

As the day when Cyprus will apply to the United Nations is drawing nearer, the imperialists are stepping up their activities aimed at dividing Cyprus under cover of *enosis*.** The Anglo-American imperialists continue to stick to the enslavement plan proposed by Acheson, who has stopped intriguing against Cyprus in Geneva only to resume his intrigues elsewhere and with greater recourse to blackmail and violence. Evidently the new round of intrigues has started already.

THE STATE IS THEIR TARGET

The new imperialist and neo-Ottoman threats are loaded with violence and subversion. There are plans to remove President

---

*Haravghi, September 20, 1964.

**Reunification with Greece.—Ed.

Makarios and abolish the Cypriot state. Using *enosis* as a smokescreen, the imperialists are out to liquidate Cyprus as a state so as to deprive it of a voice in the UN, isolate the Cypriots from their friends and allies and impose decisions suiting them. Therefore, the Cypriots should remain vigilant and reject *enosis* as contemplated by the U.S. and Britain, which would only mean dismemberment of the island and introduction of neo-colonialism.

Genuine, unfalsified *enosis* without the seizure of the island by foreigners, without military bases fraught with the danger of nuclear catastrophe, will be implemented, not as a result of an imperialist bargain, but with Cyprus as a genuinely independent and non-aligned state, and with people free to decide their destiny.

This is the only correct and acceptable solution on which the Cypriot people insist and will continue to insist.

SUBVERSION

The Anglo-American imperialists and their Turkish satellites know that all their plans for enslavement are doomed to failure as long as the people of Cyprus remain adamant and united behind the Makarios government on the basis of a clear-cut program of struggle for complete independence enabling the people to be the master in their home. That is why they are intensifying fifth-column activities designed to split the people and break up the nationwide popular front.

Ideological differences, slander and aggression are the dirty means they employ to undermine the unity of the people and to mislead them in their anti-imperialist struggle for liberation.

UNITY AND COURAGE

AKEL salutes the people and their organizations, the parliament, the government and the press and takes pride in them for their exemplary patriotic unity and vigilance towards all the intrigues, conspiracies and designs of the imperialists and their Turkish henchmen. AKEL salutes the armed forces of the republic for their magnificent courage and self-denial in defending the freedom of Cyprus. AKEL pays the highest tribute of respect to the fighters who have given their lives for the ideals of freedom.

Preservation and enhancement of vigilance towards the imperialist intrigues and of the patriotic unity of the people, cohesion of the people and the government around an independent policy of nonalignment and unfalsified *enosis* will surely foil all criminal plans to enslave the country and will guarantee the success of the liberation struggle waged by Cyprus.

We know that the root of evil, of the abnormal situation, of the bloodshed and the calamities that have befallen the Cypriot people lies in the intrigues of the British and American oil monopolies

in the Middle East which plunder the wealth of the Arab peoples and want Cyprus as a base for the defense of their unlawful interests and for their military gambles.

That is why they organize and incite Turkish extremists and encourage their Ankara gendarmes to provocations against Cyprus.

RELATIONS WITH TURKISH CYPRIOTS

Formerly the Turkish Cypriots lived—and in many villages still live—in peace with the Greeks. But the imperialists and their agents prevent them from restoring friendly relations with the Greek Cypriots. As soon as the imperialists withdraw from Cyprus and stop interfering in its domestic affairs normal relations between the Turks and the Greeks on the island will be restored.

Already thousands of Turkish Cypriots suffering under the yoke of Turkish terrorists are seeking an opportunity to break the chains fettering them and reunite with their Greek fellow-countrymen in peaceful labor, restoring mutual understanding and friendship.

AKEL hails the pacification measures undertaken by the government and urges new efforts to strengthen peace and normalize the situation. AKEL suggests that the government work out an extensive program designed to rehabilitate the Turkish Cypriots and guarantee their rights in keeping with the UN Charter. This will help to smash imperialist propaganda and isolate the terrorists and oppressors among the Turkish Cypriots. We call upon the people of Cyprus to contribute in every way to creating conditions for peaceful coexistence and cooperation.

Any measure and action helping the Turkish Cypriots to realize that it is the imperialists and their agents, Turkish terrorists, and not the Greek Cypriots, who are their enemies, will contribute to the defeat of imperialism, to the victory of the Cypriot people.

ASSISTANCE FROM GREECE

AKEL expresses gratitude to the fraternal people of Greece for their assistance to the Cypriot people in their national-liberation struggle. The people of Cyprus are tied with the people of mother Greece by bonds of common struggle and destiny consecrated by the blood shed by their sons.

While not in the least underestimating the great assistance Greece is giving to the struggle of the Cypriot people, AKEL feels convinced that this assistance would be even more effective and resolute if Greece were not tied with NATO.

ASSISTANCE FROM FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

Since in their struggle for freedom the people of Cyprus are faced with the Anglo-American and other NATO imperialists and

their agents from Ankara, they need support not only from Greece, but also from all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The Cypriot people are happy to have powerful and reliable friends and allies. They are grateful to the Soviet Union, whose powerful unselfish support and assistance prevented the imperialists from attacking and invading Cyprus. They also express gratitude to all the other countries, socialist and neutral, which supported their right cause.

AKEL welcomes the government's measures to secure the assistance of the friendly United Arab Republic and the great friendly country and defender, the Soviet Union. A cardinal change in our policy with regard to the countries which have proved that they are our real friends and allies, is imperative. It is necessary to reject the idea that we could appeal to the imperialist countries of NATO, which have shown that they are the sworn enemies of Cyprus and opponents of the settlement of the Cyprus problem.

Cyprus should constantly strengthen ties with all countries supporting its struggle. These ties are its protective armor and a decisive factor for the success of our national-liberation struggle.

PEACE MARCH

AKEL hails the big Peace and Freedom March scheduled for October 11* and urges all Cypriots to take part in it and make it a vivid demonstration of their will and determination in the struggle for the dismantling of all military bases and the demilitarization of Cyprus.

On October 11 our people will have an opportunity to show in a peaceful but most resolute way their desire to live in freedom, without foreign military bases and the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

CYPRUS WILL WIN

A grave danger hangs over the Cypriots. The imperialists will set up new traps and try to drive the people into the web of NATO enslavement. Inside and outside the country they are trying to undermine their struggle and settle the issues by means of a coup.

But the Cypriot people are not defenseless in face of the new imperialist threats. The experience of the past nine months shows that victory can be won given the unity of the people, the army and the government and an undeviating patriotic policy of neutrality and independence which will enable the people to decide their destiny and carry out an unfalsified *enosis;* given conscientious vigilance towards the imperialist intrigues, pacification, and restor-

---

*On that day over a hundred thousand took part in the Peace March manifestations and meetings the keynote of which was to foil imperialist conspiracy against Cyprus and for the dismantling of the British war bases on the island.—**Ed.**

ation of normal relations with the Turkish Cypriot community given assistance from Greece and support from the invincible Soviet Union and all other countries supporting the liberation struggle of Cyprus.

The Cypriot people will win.

NATO will not pass!

INTERVIEW* WITH MOHAMED ENNAFAA, LEADING TUNISIAN COMMUNIST

Q. Of late much has been said about the Tunisian government's trend to "liberalize" its policy with regard to the Communists. What is your opinion on this score?

A. Let us put it simply: certain extraordinary measures adopted at the beginning of 1963 have been lifted. After months of imprisonment the comrades who were sent to jail when legal proceedings were instituted against the newspapers *El Talia* and *Tribune du Progrés* have been released. The dismissed teachers have, with the exception of one, been reinstated. Some of the activists have again been granted passports to travel abroad, and Mohamed Harmel was able to go abroad for medical treatment.

We positively assess this change of policy, at least with regard to people. Is this a sign of "liberalization?" We would like it to be. It is today, when there is growing realization in some Arab and African countries that building a new society, to say nothing of marching forward to socialism, is impossible with the help of measures spearheaded against the more conscious and convinced champions of socialism. It would be lamentable if Tunisia lagged behind other countries, although there was a time when it was one of a few Arab nations, if not the sole Arab state, in which the Communist Party enjoyed a legal status. But in January 1963 the activity of our Party was suppressed, and our press is still closed owing to an injunction of the court which has not completed its investigation.

Real liberalization would mean complete freedom of association and of the press, restoration of the legal status of the Communist Party and enabling it to voice its opinion through the press. I am confident that such a decision would be welcomed by the people and by the Neo-Destour party.

Q. How is the question of democracy posed at the present stage of your country's development?

A. This problem affects not only the Communists: it concerns all citizens, including members and supporters of Neo-Destour. Let us examine it concretely, in the light of the experience accumulated since the establishment of the one-party regime at the end of 1962.

Immediately after the exposure of the conspiracy in December 1962 the government was confronted with the alternative: either further curtail the liberties proclaimed in the Constitution, or, on

---

*Unità, September 9, 1964.

the contrary, extend democratic practices so as to solve problems of vital importance for the people, meet their just demands and cut the ground from under the feet of the conspirators and reactionaries.

Unfortunately, the government and the Neo-Destour leadership chose the first road. But, one may ask, perhaps the reprisals against the Communist Party and progressives united around *Tribune du Progrés* under the leadership of Dr. Sliman ben Sliman, helped to solve our country's problems? Judging by experience, one cannot say so.

The existence of two parties, Neo-Destour and the Communist Party, provided an opportunity, though a very limited one, of comparing ideas, posing and discussing problems affecting the country; it was possible to rally the working-class masses in active political struggle, defend the just demands of the workers and peasants, and offer solutions corresponding to their interests in order to prevent the reactionary elements, who are always ready to seize upon any failure, from using the malcontents as their support.

This policy was undoubtedly of a positive nature, for it enriched ideologically all participants in the national movements—Communists, Neo-Destour members and trade unionists—and enabled them better to understand the problems of the newly-free Tunisia. It was these discussions that shed light on the urgent need for planning and for transforming the socio-economic structures inherited from the colonial and semi-feudal past.

Was the abolition of these opportunities and the forced establishment of the one-party system and uniformity of the press correct? Once again experience gives a negative answer to this question. Instead of actively and consciously participating in the political struggle of the masses, many people simply withdrew from the struggle. And this seclusion, as evidenced by some of the leaders, is seen even among the Neo-Destour members. Is it not the best proof that in the special conditions of present-day Tunisia and against the general background of democratic activity the theory of the one-party system is both false and erroneous?

The broadest democracy alone will make it possible to enlist the popular forces for positive, constructive and fruitful activity, expose and isolate the reactionary elements, the new and old big proprietors who, because of their self-seeking interests, oppose the country's advance along the new road.

Q. It is often said that in Tunisia government policy encounters a double opposition. What is meant by this?

A. Indeed, in Tunisia there are two utterly different, moreover diametrically opposed, oppositions: a reactionary opposition, on the one hand, and a Communist, a democratic and progressive opposi-

tion, on the other, whose aim is not to impede the activity of the government but, on the contrary, accelerate its development in the direction of progress.

It is true that state intervention and the government's measures in the field of agriculture and trade, even though moderate in character, cause the discontent of the agrarian and merchant bourgeoisie which emerged both before and after Tunisia gained its independence. They still cherish dreams about "liberal" economic development which would enable them to wax fat and lead an idle life, caring not a jot for the destiny of the desolated masses. They resist any structural reforms, planning, cooperative development and state intervention. They represent the reactionary opposition active both inside and outside Neo-Destour, since this party is open to everybody. They seriously affect the ideological and political line and practical activities of the ruling party, hampering the country's advance towards economic and social progress.

Utterly different in character is the democratic opposition of the Communists. Aware of their responsibility in the national movement as well as of the need to bar the way to the reactionaries and consolidate the progressive forces inside and outside the Neo-Destour party, the Communists have always supported all the positive steps of the government, but at the same time considered it their duty to criticize certain shortcomings and errors.

They criticized the government when it stopped halfway in carrying through socio-economic changes and meeting the legitimate demands of the working people. After all, this policy, its positive features notwithstanding, creates dubious situations fraught with grave consequences, to which an end should be put once and for all. As the cost of living grows, industrial workers and office employees demand higher wages and salaries at their union meetings. Most strongly these demands were voiced on May Day this year. During his recent visit to the Suk el Arba region President Bourguiba could see for himself the miserable conditions of the peasantry. Such is reality without embellishment.

Q. What is needed to ensure the upsurge and accelerated development of your country?

A. For this the impediments in political life should be eliminated, and all forward-looking forces, both inside and outside Neo-Destour, united on the platform of positive activity. And one must take a definite stand in prosecuting a progressive and democratic policy (which even claims to be called a socialist policy) one should not rely on the reactionary forces. On the contrary, their unsound aspirations must be suppressed.

National unity is essential if the cooperation of the various social and political forces, including those belonging to different parties, is to be ensured. But the content of the national policy changes as

time goes on. During the struggle for independence the yardstick of unity was the following motto: "For or against the colonial and semi-feudal regime of the protectorate." Since 1955, i.e., after independence, this criterion is expressed differently: "For or against the democratic and progressive social development of the country."

It is in keeping with this new criterion that the choice must be made which would enable the masses to have a say in solving their problems, which would lead to an agrarian reform to follow the important step already made in this direction, i.e., nationalization of the land belonging to foreign colonialists, and which would accelerate the nationalization of foreign and wholesale trade and ensure the large-scale industrial expansion of the country. In a word, this would be a choice which would make it possible to accelerate development and raise the people's standard of living within the shortest possible time.

In conclusion I would like to stress that, despite the repressions which have inflicted heavy losses on the Party, the Tunisian Communists have not betrayed the positive and constructive character of their positions. As before, they are guided by the sole desire — to make an effective contribution to the advancement of their people.

MAO'S AGGRESSIVE PLANS AND EXPANSIONIST POLICIES

RESOLUTION* ON MAO'S TALKS WITH JAPANESE SOCIALISTS

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India has read with alarm and indignation the report of the talk which Chairman Mao Tse-tung of the Communist Party of China had recently with a group of Japanese socialist leaders.

This report which has now been published widely all over the world from the August 11 issue of the Japanese journal *Shekai Shuho* has been confirmed by the statement made by Prime Minister Chou En-lai (published in the Japanese daily *Asahi* on August 1,) and by Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Wang Ping-nan, who was asked specifically for an explanation.

The Central Executive Committee draws the attention of all Indians to the dangerous views of Mao Tse-tung as quoted in the report of this talk and in particular, to the following venomous attack on the Soviet Union and on the entire socialist world:

"There are too many places occupied by the Soviet Union. According to the Yalta agreement, the Soviet Union, under the pretext of guaranteeing the independence of Mongolia, has actually placed that country under its domination. Mongolia occupies a considerably larger area than the Kuril islands.

"In 1954, when Khrushchov and Bulganin came to China, we raised this question, but they refused to talk with us. They have appropriated part of Rumania. Having separated part of East Germany, they expelled the local inhabitants to the western part. Having separated part of Poland, they included it into Russia, giving to Poland in compensation part of East Germany. The same happened in Finland.

"They have separated everything that could be separated. Some people have stated that Sinkiang area and the territories north of the Amur river must be included in the Soviet Union. The USSR is concentrating troops on its border.

"The Soviet Union occupies an area of 22 million square kilometers and its population is only 200 million people. It is time it stopped the division. Jepan occupies an area of 370,000 square kilometers and its population is 100 million people.

"About a hundred years ago, the area east of Baikal became

---

*New Age, September 20, 1964.

Russian territory and since then Vladivostok, Khabarovsk, Kamchatka and other places are the territory of the Soviet Union. We have not yet requested settling this account. As for the Kuril islands, this question is clear for us. They must be returned to Japan."

Such an open call for the dismemberment of the Soviet Union is not only pernicious in its treacherous hostility; it amounts to direct and open assistance to imperialism.

Just as Hitler sought to justify his criminal aggressions by pleading for "living space" (*lebensraum*) for the "growing German population, so Mao preaches unashamedly on behalf of the Japanese reactionaries. The demand is made for the surrender of Soviet terrtiory because its 22 million square kilometers are inhabited by only 200 million people, while Japan's 370,000 square kilometers have a population of 100 million.

Mao forgets that the peoples of the Soviet Union, the peoples of the territories he claims for the Chinese leadership, for the Japanese militarists and for all and sundry, have already decided their own destiny and are marching side by side with the rest of the peoples of the Soviet Union towards communism.

Mao perhaps imagines that these millions of Soviet citizens can be transferred at his command out of their Motherland to where he wills. Mao's dreams of such dismemberment count without the Soviet people.

Mao not only attacks the Soviet Union. He supports the West German revanchists in their propaganda demanding the cancellation of the Oder-Neisse border and the swallowing of East Germany.

At the other end, Mao extends his support to the Japanese militarists in their claims against the Soviet Union for the return of the Kuril islands. Mao conveniently has not one word to say about the facts regarding the role of the Kuril islands as a beachhead used by the Japanese militarists for their aggressive plans against the Soviet Far East.

Mao again says not one word on how the U.S. imperialists are using Japanese territory for their nuclear bases, Japanese ports for visits of nuclear powered submarines and Japanese airports for nuclear armed bombers.

In this context, Mao's support for the "return" of the Kuril islands amounts to direct assistance to the U.S. imperialists who seek to use the Kuril islands as an advance base for their plans of war and aggression.

Mao Tse-tung's thesis goes so far as to praise the Japanese imperialists for the "greatness" of their seizure of so many Asian countries during World War II.

Seen in the context of the publication of the Chinese maps claiming large parts of Asia as Chinese territory, this lauding

of Japanese militarism in Asia can have the most sinister meaning in an attempt to justify as "great" Chinese expansionism itself.

On the one side, the Chinese leadership boosts the West German fascists, on the other, the Japanese militarists—the two ends of the pincers the imperialists seek to use against the socialist world and against the peace of mankind.

Abhorrent to any true Communist is also Mao's scandalous attempt to create discord among socialist countries and to rouse anti-Soviet sentiments in all the countries which are neighbors of the Soviet Union.

The rest of Mao's talk deals with other vital questions.

The so-called "intermediate zone" theory is now revealed in all its ugliness—covering up class differences and differences in social systems—all with a view to "justify" the Chinese leaders' growing collaboration with such imperialist powers as Britain and France.

The manner in which Mao Tse-tung deals with the differences with the Soviet Union — "We are ready to continue this war for another 25 years" — shows not the slightest desire for unity. On the contrary, the entire anti-Soviet venom of the Chinese leader indicates his insistence on continuing the campaign of slander and abuse and it is now clear, of unceasing military border provocations against the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party of India has repeatedly warned against the perilous "historical arguments" being used by the Chinese leadership to justify their expansionism. These "arguments" have now reached atrocious limits in pressing the Chinese leaders' claims on the Soviet Union and in bolstering up anti-Soviet chauvinism in Japan and other countries.

The Chinese leaders are not satisfied with making anti-Sovietism their own main plank. They insist on all the adherents of their wrong ideological positions repeating these anti-Soviet falsehoods and justifying Chinese expansionist claims and activities. It is this which adds to the dangers which today beset the anti-imperialist movement all over the world, arising from Chinese expansionism and chauvinism.

Mao Tse-tung's talk with the Japanese socialists, which has been given worldwide publicity, reveals in a flash the grim truth that as far as the Chinese leaders are concerned, their differences with the rest of the Communist parties on ideological issues have now become more and more divorced from all Marxist-Leninist principles and are now for a great part a screen for their expansionist policies and aggressive plans.

On November 1, 1962, the National Council of the Communist Party of India, in its resolution on Chinese aggression, had come to the bitter conclusion that it was the national-chauvinism of the Chinese leaders and their repudiation of all the agreed principles

of the international Communist movement that was at the root of the Chinese aggression against India.

Far from retracing its wrong and dangerous outlook the Chinese leadership has gone steadily forward on the path of chauvinism till now its entire policies are unmasked before the Communists of the whole world as arising from the most fanatical great power desire for world domination.

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India joins Communists all over the world in condemning the chauvinist and expansionist views expressed by Mao Tse-tung.

NOTES

NOTES

Put Monopoly Under Control

A New Economic Policy for Canada

By TIM BUCK

This new 78-page booklet spells out in detail the Communist Party's economic policy for Canada. It deals with jobs, economic growth, Canadian independence, curbing of the monopolies and placing them under public control or nationalization; and the bringing of the benefits of automation to the people.

75 CENTS

Automation and Labor

By WILLLIAM KASHTAN

The meaning of automation for the labor movement, its effects on collective bargaining, the structure of the trade-union movement and the need for a new labor policy are dealt with in this pamphlet.

15 CENTS

Now Available from

PROGRESS BOOKS / 44 STAFFORD ST. / TORONTO 3

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

AUTUMN 1964

is completely devoted to the theme

AUTOMATION

prospect and policy

Here are some of the features:

Automation and the Leadership of the Nation
By Tim Buck

Life on the Assembly Line By An Auto Worker

The Changing Structure of the Working Class and the Technological Revolution By William Kashtan

Canadian Farmers, Technological Change and the Monopolies By William Beeching

Automation and the Social Character of Production
By George S. Wheeler

Single Copy 50 cents

Available now from
PROGRESS BOOKS 44 STAFFORD ST. TORONTO 3

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

25

Included in this Issue

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL
AND THE PROBLEMS OF TODAY

W. Ulbricht

B. Ponomaryov

F. Marek

T. Africanus

A. Yata

FILE COPY

Issued by

WORLD
MARXIST
REVIEW
PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 25

contents

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT TODAY
Walter Ulbricht **5**

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM IS THE REVOLUTIONARY BANNER OF OUR EPOCH
B. N. Ponomaryov **24**

THE INTERNATIONAL'S BEHESTS
F. Marek **43**

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL 100 YEARS AFTER
Terence Africanus **48**

WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS POSSIBLE
Ali Yata **61**

DOCUMENTS OF THE CP OF ECUADOR FOR DEMOCRACY AND PEACE **65**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
November 16, 1964

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT TODAY

Walter Ulbricht

FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
SOCIALIST UNITY PARTY OF GERMANY

We have assembled at this conference* to mark the centenary of the founding of the First International. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany is happy that this conference is being held in the homeland of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in the first German workers' and peasants' state, which carries on large-scale socialist construction.

The facts and experience of history show that the Communist and Workers' parties are the heirs to the First International, that they have remained faithful to the militant slogan: "Workers of all lands, unite!" The Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx, the decisions of the First International and Lenin's teaching have rallied the working class and the working people into a mighty force. In the course of the past century the whole world has changed immensely owing to the victory of the Russian proletariat in the Great October Socialist Revolution conducted under the leadership of the Party of Lenin to the creation of a socialist world system and the victorious liberation struggle of the peoples of the former colonies. The Communist parties in the countries of all continents have a total membership of 42 million. This is indeed an impressive achievement!

The International Working Men's Association, the first mass international organization of the proletariat, helped organize numerous revolutionary working-class parties and formed the foundation of the international Communist movement of the contemporary period.

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

Casting a retrospective glance at the development of the Communist movement we can say that no other political teaching or political movement in the history of humanity have scored in a relatively short historical period such impressive victories as the

---

*Report at an international session in Berlin dedicated to the centenary of the founding of the First International. Abridged from **Neues Deutschland,** September 26, 1964.

Communist movement and the theory of scientific communism. All the revolutionary movements of the contemporary period are in varying degree connected with the principles of the First International.

From the Communist Manifesto and the foundation of the First International the path leads to Lenin's teaching on the role of the proletarian revolutionary party, to the founding of the Bolshevik party and to the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The same path further leads to the joint documents of the Communist and Workers' parties of 1957 and 1960 and to the CPSU Program adopted by the 22nd Congress—the Communist Manifesto of the 20th century.

The Communist movement of today is the most faithful heir to the glorious revolutionary traditions of the First International.

PRINCIPLES OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

The First International laid the foundation for proletarian organization both on an international and national scale. This organization is developing and displaying new features and peculiarities at each consecutive stage of the class struggle. This organization is alive in the "alliance of unity and solidarity, in the identity of action and policy." It is a plan for class organization which, as Marx put it, easily adapts itself to the conditions peculiar to each nation and each particular place, preserving, however, its principal features and thus ensuring unity of purpose and overall agreement on the means to be used to achieve a common aim—emancipation of the working class by the working class itself.

The International ensured constant and active liaison between the national contingents of the working class; it blended together their ideas and aims and showed the vital need for mutual aid. The International taught the various contingents of the working class to benefit from each other's experience of revolutionary struggle and to enrich one another both in theory and in practice.

The International determined the sum and substance of proletarian internationalism, demonstrating that labor could defeat capital only by joint effort. It was within its framework that the national vanguards of the working class grew profoundly aware of their duty to the toiling folk of their respective countries and also of their responsibility to the international working-class movement. Marx and the First International rejected any concessions to nationalism, for nationalism is merely an expression of the influence of bourgeois ideology and does tremendous harm to the working-class movement for emancipation. And if today we witness manifestations of nationalism within the Chinese leadership, they are an expression of backward views, which the imperialist powers are, of course, taking advantage of.

As it organized and strengthened the international movement,

the International promoted proletarian democracy, a new, democratic type of relations with individual working-class organizations. The leaders of the First International were aware that it should take into consideration the different conditions for the development of working-class organizations in different countries.

Karl Marx repeatedly stressed that workers' organizations cannot be absolutely identical in Newcastle and in Barcelona, in London and in Berlin.

The International vigorously denounced every symptom of totalitarianism in the working-clas movement, regardless of whether it emanated from one or another organization, or one or another individual. It fought relentlessly against the exaggeration of the role of leaders, against any personality cult. Karl Marx particularly objcted to all exaggeration of his own personal services. The International regarded every symptom of totalitarianism as a source of error and delusion.

INTERNATIONAL CONTACTS OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES AFTER THE FORMATION OF THE SOCIALIST WORLD SYSTEM AND IN THE PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE THIRD STAGE OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The Soviet Union's victory over Hitlerite fascism and the rise of the socialist world system fundamentally changed the world balance of forces. The CPSU and the Soviet people were confronted with the new problems of social and economic development and also of foreign policy. The party's 20th and 22nd congresses gave clear answers to the problems of communist construction, proceeding from the new prospects.

The problems and experience of communist construction in the USSR are of great international significance for the socialist working-class movement. It is necessary not only to denounce the personality cult, but also to draw the proper conclusions. The world Communist and working-class movement should know how the new problems are being solved in the Soviet Union. The solutions found at the 20th Congress and in the Communist Program at the 22nd Congress should be explained in all countries; they demand uncompromising struggle against reactionary anti-communist propaganda. The eflective operation of economic laws during the period of transition to communism, the system of economic planning and management, development of the social structure and social relations, the functions of the Communist Party and the state, promotion of industrial forms of production and management in agriculture, development of education, literature and the arts—all these are problems which have to be explained to the working people in all countries.

The cult of Stalin's personality and his dogmatism hampered the CPSU and the Communist and Workers' parties in coping with

the historically-conditioned problems that confronted them, and interfered with the building of socialism and communism in every aspect of social, economic and cultural life. In the sphere of foreign policy, too, dogmatism stood in the way of accomplishing political tasks of world-wide importance, such as implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence and disarmament and establishment of good relations, on the basis of equality, with all states willing to do so.

Manifestations of dogmatism are the result not only of the personality cult. They are also connected with the difficulties of state and economic leadership in overcoming the damage wrought by war; they are due to all kinds of shortages and to pressure on the part of international monopoly capital. Whenever there are shortages, formal-administrative methods of leadership begin to prevail.

The restoration of Leninist standards in the life of the Party and the state and in the economy removed the soil on which dogmatism thrived. Specifically, the observance, after the 20th CPSU Congress of Lenin's precepts with regard to methods of economic management resulted, both in the USSR and the other socialist countries, in the broadening of socialist democracy, the improvement of the planned economy and its structure, and stimulated progress in the sphere of culture as well.

The imperialist forces realize the risks involved in unleashing a world war which would be a nuclear war. This, however, does not stop them from implementing in various ways their expansionist policy and from doing everything they can to isolate the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. A new feature in the present state of affairs is that the 20th CPSU Congress and the policy pursued on a world-wide scale, heightened the prestige of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and made it possible to avert serious military conflicts.

The decisions of the 20th Congress also made possible a new approach to relations between the Communist and Workers' parties, in keeping with the changed conditions and the new demands of the time. This was reflected in the holding of the Conference and in the joint publication of the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' parties in 1957. At the Conference and in the decisions adopted in 1957, the principles and new forms of relations between the Communist and Workers' parties at the present stage were worked out.

A resolute rebuff was given to tendencies to end cooperation and replace it with activities within the limits of national territories and different state systems inasmuch as such tendencies weaken the unity and militancy of the international movement. In accordance with the traditions of the First International, the prin-

ciple of the community of interests of the internaional working class was furher developed.

What is the new feature of the process of development? It is the growth of the political and economic strength of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. It is also the extension of the struggle for peace and socialism. The working class and the democratic movement have achieved a higher level of organization. The importance of the trade unions and other workers' organizations, as well as of the organizations of peasants, has grown. The ideological influence of the Communist and Workers' parties has increased. As a result, the working class and the peace forces in the different countries have found themselves confronted by new talks. The changes in the situation and the development of the popular movements have given rise to new problems in the strategy and tactics of the Communist and Workers' parties, solutions to which have to be found in the course of a joint discussion. The economic development of the socialist countries and the technical revolution have led to the appearance of new types of economic relations between the socialist countries. Coordination of long-range plans is being introduced. Cooperation in solving important economic problems is on the order of the day. The specific conditions obtaining in each socialist country call for greater international cooperation in the main directions, within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. We cannot afford to lag behind as regards certain methods of international cooperation practiced by some capitalist concerns, as well as the economic coordination of the state-monopoly capitalism of different countries. Cooperation at the new stage of the world socialist revolution calls for differentiation of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties with consolidation of proletarian internationalism. This internationalism is based not on formal organizational principles, but on the realization of the historical responsibility of the Communist Parties to their own people and to the world Communist movement, on our teaching—Marxism-Leninism.

Preservation of the unity of the world Communist movement has become particularly important in our days. Never before have the Communists borne such a great responsibility for the destinies of peace, socialism and progress, for the destinies of all mankind.

Communist parties exist in almost all the countries of the world today. The diversity of the concrete tasks and of the conditions in which these parties have to struggle gives rise to a diversity of forms of struggle and tactical methods, and different approaches to some of the general questions. Hence the growing importance of the struggle of the Communist parties for a correct ideological

and political course of all the revolutionary forces and above all for the ideological cohesion of the Communists themselves. The successes of this struggle, which is of world-historic significance, depend on the coordination of the goal, the main means and the most important tactical principles of this struggle.

The entire history of the world Communist movement, from the Communist League to today's community of Communist and Workers' parties, shows us that disagreements on questions of strategy and tactics arise when important changes occur in the situation and the conditions of struggle. When the rise of the revolutionary movement in the various West-European countries under the impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution was followed by reverses, Lenin drew the necessary practical conclusions from this at the Third Congress of the Communist International. Addressing members of foreign delegations, he gave them this wise counsel: "He who fails to understand that in Europe—where nearly all the proletarians are organized—we must win the majority of the working class is lost to the Communist movement." And he added: "Soon you will return home and tell the workers that we are more prudent than before the Third Congress. Don't feel embarrassed, say that we have committed mistakes and now want to act more cautiously; by doing so we shall win over the masses from the Social-Democratic and Independent Social-Democratic parties, the masses who are impelled towards us by the entire objective trend of events but who fear us."

Disagreements arose also when a new situation developed with the advent of Hitlerite fascism to power. These differences were removed by the adoption of joint decisions at a world Communist congress which discussed ways of building up a united front of workers and working out a popular-front policy. There were, however, quite a few ultra-Lefts at that time who opposed Georgi Dimitrov's proposals.

The situation today is fundamentally different. The correlation of world forces has changed radically in favor of the Soviet Union, the socialist states, and the forces of peace. A certain relaxation of international tension has been achieved, and therefore it is important to pursue a consistent policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and to concentrate attention on strengthening the economy of the socialist countries and raising the level of communist consciousness. The attempt of the Chinese leaders to find a quicker way through war or by formulating all kinds of dogmas is doomed to failure.

The "big leap" to people's communes was nothing but an attempt to shorten by leaps the path which has been and is still being traversed by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

To be sure, the methods of struggle and leadership of the glorious 8th Army were justified in the war against the imperialist enemies. However, these methods will not do for guiding the party, state and economy in the period of socialist construction. They are bound to lead to internal difficulties in the People's Republic of China, while the attempts to extend them to the international arena, for example, by advocating war as a means of promoting socialism in the world, may have dire consequences for the working-class movement and the peoples.

The Chinese Party leadership demands that the Party members accept the thesis: make two out of one. This means a split and, consequently, is damaging to the international Communist movement. The Chinese leaders have lost the main perspective in their pursuit of these splitting policies. Instead of serving the cause of peace and exerting every effort to raise the people's standards of living, they have been engineering border conflicts: first against India, then against the Mongolian People's Republic and then against the Soviet Union. At present they are coming out against the borders established as a result of the Second World War in Eastern Europe and in the Balkans and thus playing directly into the hands of the West-German imperialists and revanchists.

It is true that throughout the history of the Communist movement a struggle has been waged for the purity of revolutionary theory, against the Right opportunist and Left sectarian danger. This struggle is known to have been waged in the First International itself. Today, however, it is the danger of dogmatism, of Left opportunism that has come to the fore. The Chinese leaders have proclaimed their own particular sectarian line. We are aware of the peculiarities of China's development. The backwardness of an agrarian country, preservation of methods of leadership established in the years of the civil war and postwar economic construction, and the influence of idealistic philosophy—all these weigh heavily on the socialist movement of China and create a nutrient medium for dogmatism.

The Chinese leaders have rejected the proposal to convene a drafting committee to prepare the next meeting of the Communist and Workers' parties, as agreed upon in 1957. They have proved thereby that all their activities are aimed at splitting the world Communist movement. I shall take the liberty of quoting the warning issued by Karl Marx in the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association: "Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workingmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastized by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts."

ON THE PREPARATION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

The experience of the First International and the entire 100 years' history of the Communist movement teaches us that the unity of the international Communist movement is a cardinal condition of the success of the revolutionary struggle. Therefore it is necessary now as before to safeguard this unity by preparing for an international meeting. Representatives of all the 26 Communist and Workers' parties which in 1960 made up the drafting committee, have been invited to take part in December in working out a joint statement on the basis of equality and without any preliminary conditions. We believe that the draft of the statement will be submitted to the parties for study. If the leaders of the Communist Party of China had the slightest interest in joint discussion and in preserving the unity of the Communist and working-class movement, they would take part in the meeting of the drafting committee to be held in accordance with the decisions adopted in 1957 and in the same composition as in 1960, and they would participate in drafting a new joint statement. If there are differences of opinion on this or that question which the drafting committee fails to clear up, the parties will have an opportunity to formulate their proposals and substantiate them at the meeting. There cannot be a more democratic method. All that is needed is the goodwill to cooperate. Thus, no one intends to condemn individual parties or to exclude them from the international community.

The Joint Statement of the Communist and Workers' parties adopted in 1960, was of great historical importance. It helped cement proletarian internationalism and laid the foundations of a policy which the Communist and Workers' parties could launch in keeping with the conditions prevailing in their respective countries. However, several years have passed since then and new questions which need be answered have appeared.

ON COOPERATION OF SEVERAL PARTIES

I would like to mention some of the new problems. Of great importance is the problem of the attitude of the Communist parties to Social-Democracy, to other parties and to the trade unions and other public organizations. This applies primarily to the attitude of the Communists and Social-Democrats to the Christians, Moslems or any other religious community predominant in one or another country. We in our country, after the working class had united in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, went over to alliance in the form of a bloc of five parties: the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Christian-Democratic Union, the Democratic

Peasant Party, the Liberal-Democratic Party and the National-Democratic Party. To this bloc also belong representatives of the trade unions, the Women's Democratic Union, and the Kulturbund. The party of the working class plays, without doubt, the leading role in this bloc. But it exercises its influence, not by dint of some regulations, but on the basis of democratic mutual understanding and cooperation with the other parties. We hold that cooperation is needed not only before the victory of socialism, but also in the subsequent period of transition to communism. People of different political and social backgrounds and different outlooks belong to these parties, but they are united by their devotion to the state of workers and peasants and by a common striving to preserve peace and successfully complete the full-scale building of socialism. The Communists are fulfilling their task by creatively applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching to the concrete conditions of development and ensuring close links with the people. Referring to the Communists' attitude to the other working-class parties and organizations, Marx and Engels said that the Communists do not regard themselves as a party opposed to the other working-class parties; they have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole; they are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: on the one hand, they defend the interests of all workers, and, on the other, in the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class passes through, they represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

As applied to the present situation, this means: in the majority of the People's Democracies the transition from capitalism to socialism proceeds, as distinct from the Soviet Union, not in conditions of a one-party system, but in conditions of the existence and comradely cooperation of several parties. In those new national states which since liberation have embarked upon the democratic road to socialism various new forms of cooperation among different political organizations, trade unions and trends of the anti-imperialist movement will develop. The comradely unity of all these forces, in which special responsibility devolves on representatives of the working class, is one of the main conditions for ensuring democratic development and rebuffing imperialist pressure.

A new situation is arising in the capitalist conutries too. The danger of atomic military conflicts, and growing pressure from state-monopoly capitalism and, on the other hand, the successes scored in easing international tension convince many Social-Democratic parties that peace can be secured and democracy developed only on the condition that friendly relations are established with

the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and some forms of cooperation, if only temporary, are found between the Communist and Social-Democratic parties, the trade unions, Christian organizations, and so on.

This flexible cooperation, which accords with the present requirements, calls for respect for the independence of the democratic parties, trade unions and youth and women's organizations concerned. Consequently, the Communists in the capitalist countries and the national states are far from equating their vanguard role in the working-class movement with the leading role in the mass organizations. For instance, the formulation that the trade unions are the "transmission belts" between the Communist Party and the broad masses is applicable neither in the Western capitalist countries nor in the national democratic states.

ON UNITY OF ACTION OF THE COMMUNIST AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

On the basis of the appraisal of the present situation and conditions of development, the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the joint Declaration and Statement of the Communist parties of 1957 and 1960 noted that peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism was possible. But this peaceful transition, too, can only be a revolutionary one. To achieve it, however, united action by the working class—i.e., accord and cooperation between the Communist and Social Democratic parties and alliance between the working class, the working peasants and intellectuals—is essential. In the countries of state-monopoly capitalism cooperation between the Communists, Social Democrats and trade unions is a vital necessity, a prerequisite for ensuring peace, curbing militarism and restricting and suppressing the power of the big monopolies.

The Communists thus come out resolutely for the rallying of the working-class and democratic movements and seek maximum cooperation and unity with the Social Democrats. We maintain that agreements between the Communist and Social-Democratic parties and their organizations are essential for the cause of the working class. But we reserve the right to criticize revisionism and opportunism, for confrontation of views helps towards clarity and hence towards ideological rapprochement.

We assure the Social Democrats that the Communists do not intend to destroy the Social-Democratic parties. I mention this because many Social Democrats think that after the formation of a popular-front government, or, the subsequent establishment of a socialist government, the Communists will destroy Social Democracy.

Let us take the two German states. The unification of the

two working-class parties in the eastern part of Germany in 1946 was an essential prerequisite for Germany's democratic and socialist development. But this does not mean that today, after the bourgeoisie has divided Germany in two, the same path can be taken in Western Germany. The transition to democratic and socialist development in Western Germany and the reunification of Western and Eastern Germany after German militarism has been curbed and imperialism defeated, cannot be accomplished unless there is cooperation between the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Social-Democratic and Communist parties in West Germany, as well as between the trade unions in both German states. Thus, we do not intend to transplant our socialist system, to export it, so to speak, to Western Germany. But neither should West German Social-Democracy seek to impose its present views on the GDR. The Communist Party and the Social-Democratic Party in Western Germany should chart their own road of struggle for democracy and socialism, in conformity with the specific conditions of struggle in that country of state-monopoly capitalism, and advance along that road. In this way cooperation would be ensured not only in the defense of peace, which directly concerns the nation, but also in the general perspective, and as a result it would hasten the attainment of long-range objectives.

The First International guided by Karl Marx tirelessly strove to build the unity of the working-class movement. If today, on the centenary of the founding of the First International, the Communists and Social Democrats were to come out for cooperation, this would be in the spirit of the decisions of the First International. We, for our part, are doing precisely that.

In the period of detente and of the struggle of the working class and the progressive and peace forces for disarmament, preservation of peace largely depends on cooperation between working-class parties. This cooperation has been started in France and Italy. Eastern Peace Marches and—on the anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War—anti-war demonstrations were held in Western Germany and other West European countries. The popular movement against atomic armament is mounting as people realize the gravity of the threat hanging over them.

The Right-wing leaders of German Social-Democracy are the exception. True, they talk about peace, but in reality they support the West German militarists' demarnd for participation in the multilateral nuclear armament of NATO. They talk about "world disarmament," but they oppose the withdrawal of troops from Germany, discontinuation of the arms race, and disarmament in both German states.

We are of the opinion that the most urgent task of the Com-

munist, Social-Democratic and Christian-Democratic parties is to safeguard peace. Only the struggle for peace can help secure progress, force back and defeat the chief enemy of democracy—militarism. The historic contribution of the Soviet Union is the initiative it has taken in the struggle for peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tension, and disarmament. The peoples of all continents have seen for themselves that the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and the national democratic states are the most consistent fighters for peace. The present balance of world forces makes it possible to avert world war. But we must realize that this calls for maximum effort by the peace forces. Of late the "ultras" have been waging local wars in South Vietnam, in the Congo and against the people of Cyprus and staging provocations on the state frontier between the German Democratic Republic and the occupied zone of West Berlin. Thus, the most urgent task today is to intensify the activities of the peace forces and to unite them still more firmly, irrespective of their political aims or outlooks.

PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACIES AND OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THEM

After the 22nd Congress of the CPSU the relations between the Communist and Workers' parties of the People's Democracies, on the one hand, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the other, began to develop in a new way. The overcoming of the effects of the Stalin cult and dogmatism paved the way to genuine cooperation and exchange of experience.

The CPSU and the Soviet Union suffered the most from Stalin's personality cult and from dogmatism. But the violation of Leninist standards of party and state life also affected the relations of the CPSU and the Soviet state with the People's Democracies. Stalin failed to implement Lenin's precepts with regard to economic management and development of socialist democracy in the period of socialist construction.

He virtually substituted administration by orders from above for the application of economic laws. It was only in the program for the building of communism adopted at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, that answers were given to questions pertaining to the transition from socialism to communism.

The People's Democracies could not adopt the forms and methods of the transition from capitalism to socialism employed in the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, as the leading party of the world's socialist state, had to chart a path of state, economic and cultural development that had no precedent in history. The Soviet people built socialism in their country and bravely marched forward under the hurricane of

fire from the capitalist states. It was easier for the countries of people's democracy, because socialism had already triumphed in the Soviet Union. However, the objective conditions in those countries were different. Therefore they did not follow the Soviet pattern in building their organs of power but created state power in the form of people's democracy.

There is no denying that at one time, under the influence of the Stalin cult, there were many manifestations of narrow-mindedness and dogmatism in the People's Democracies. And yet the path of people's democracy was correct. After the 20th Congress of the CPSU a radical turn took place towards overcoming dogmatism in party life, as well as state, economic and cultural development.

The joint Statement of 1960 reflected the Marxist-Leninist development of the Communist and Workers' parties. The constructive efforts of the 1960 Meeting were the result of the restoration of Leninist norms that had begun in party life and of the great ideological progress made by the parties. Whereas the Chinese leaders had already begun to depart from the theses of their Eighth Party Congress and prepare for the "big leap," the European People's Democracies were systematically building up the economic foundation of socialism and developing socialist democracy.

For instance, after socialist relations of production had triumphed in the GDR and the working class had strengthened its alliance with the peasantry, the intelligentsia and the other strata of the working people, it became possible to forgo certain methods of rule characteristic of the proletarian dictatorship. The cooperation of the party of the working class with the other parties standing for socialism was strengthened. The participation of the working people in planning and in governing the state took a wide diversity of forms, viz.,

—development of socialist legality and democracy;

—more active and responsible participation of commissions of people's representative bodies in implementing the decisions of the People's Chamber and the government;

—establishment of a new system in economic planning and industrial management;

—socialist emulation;

—setting up production committees and other workers' bodies taking part in planning and managing production, without detracting from the executives' responsibility;

—development of agricultural producers' cooperatives and democratic participation of peasant cooperators in the economy of the country;

—placing social insurance under the jurisdiction of the trade unions;

—establishment of public organizations of inventors and rationalizers, and

—setting up arbitration commissions.

Bourgeois authors tend to classify such development of socialist democracy as "liberalism." But this is nothing but wishful thinking. Liberalism is a political phenomenon characteristic of the dawn of capitalism. The liberals fought for bourgeois freedoms for the sake of the free development of capitalism. But in the People's Democracies the issue is not one of returning to bourgeois parliamentarism or any other methods and forms peculiar to the capitalist state, but of further promoting socialist democracy and socialist legality in a socialist state. This is evidenced also by the regular holding of elections, in which young people are nominated who have distinguished themselves in the political, economic or cultural field. Socialist national culture is developed in every individual country.

Many Social Democrats and Christians regard the democratic system in the socialist countries from the standpoint of the forms of bourgeois democracy existing in some capitalist states. But it is a new type of democracy that has been developed in the socialist countries, a genuine democracy distinguished by the fact that exploitation of man by man has been abolished and man is no longer an enemy to man. The rights of voters in the bourgeois countries are limited to casting their ballots after the expiration of the term of parliament, and in the meantime the decisive role in the life of the state is played by the capitalist monopolies and high-ranking representatives of their bureaucratic machine. In the socialist countries, popular representation guarantees the unanimity of decisions and of their realization. It is the people who plan and govern. In this way the population and its organization, the Popular Front, assumes the high responsibility for promoting social, economic and cultural development. Deliverance from the habits of capitalism, elimination of fierce competitive struggle, and a free life based on the humane principles of socialist morality—this is what genuine freedom means. If the enemies of socialism intend, under the cover of the banner of "freedom," to thwart socialist construction, preserve capitalist elements and build bases for the export of counter-revolution, they are wasting their time. The People's Democracies have created a firm foundation of socialism, and their fraternal alliance with the USSR is inviolable.

Economically, the target in the socialist countries is to attain the world scientific and technological level. This can be done only by making full use of the economic laws of socialism and by substituting a new system of economic planning and management for administrative methods. This system is characterized by eco-

nomically-grounded methods of planning and management, as well as by the application of a system of economic levers. In agriculture there is a need to go over from the mentality and methods of the individual farmer, which still predominate in many cooperatives, to industrial methods of production and to conducting agriculture on the industrial principle. As far as foreign and domestic trade is concerned, it is necessary to establish close links between production management and the corresponding trading organizations, and to go over from the administrative methods of guidance, which were necessary in the period of shortages and shortcomings and which were largely applied in the field of distribution, to economic methods, to organizing and directing trade with the help of modern technical means.

Solution of these problems, which life itself has put on the order of the day in our countries, is possible only if a struggle is waged in every country for scientific and technical progress, for higher labor productivity, and for the application of economic methods of management.

The uneven development of the socialist countries and the differences in their economic patterns and methods of management have caused difficulties in cooperation and specialization. These difficulties, in our opinion, can be overcome only if cooperation is based on the economic policy of attaining the highest scientific and technological level in the world. Thus the economic interests of each country will serve as a stimulus both for cooperation and for the use of all potentialities in each country and on the world market.

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC STATES

Interesting problems arise as a result of the development of national-democratic states. A number of these states have decided to take the road of socialist reform, although their understanding of socialism differs in many respects from ours. They are trying to exclude the capitalist way and exploit their natural resources through state enterprises, to turn new enterprises into state property, and to give newly reclaimed lands to state farms, while more and more private farmers are uniting to form cooperative societies and provide for bumper crop yields. Thus, the path chosen by these states differs from that taken by the People's Democracies. They want to weaken the pressure of the imperialist states by utilizing their mineral wealth independently, setting up government-run enterprises and nationalizing private capitalist enterprises belonging to foreign companies. As you see, many new interesting problems exist for the socialist countries in the field of international cooperation.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT IN THE COUNTRIES OF STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

The policy and the economic and cultural successes of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have exerted a great influence on the national-democratic states and on that part of the world which still remains under capitalist domination. The bourgeoisie is trying, with the help of the cold war and anti-communism, to inspire fear of communism in the peoples of the capitalist countries. It seeks to divert the attention of the people from their vital interests in their own countries and incite them against the socialist states. The time has come to make a precise scientific analysis of the development of state-monopoly capitalism in the industrially developed countries and thus provide a basis for elaborating strategy and tactics that would conform to the present conditions. State-monopoly capitalism emerged in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. Concentration of capital and state-monopoly development in Western Europe reached its apex in the period of Hitlerite fascism, and in the United States, during the maximum growth of the war industry.

After an interval this process continued in Western Germany in the early 1950s. It has been analyzed in the program of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. Marked by a strong international interlinking of state-monopoly capital, it is expressed in treaties between big American and West German monopolies, in the establishment of an international bank, the European Coal and Steel Community, the International Monetary Fund and the European Economic Community. I do not propose to make an analysis of state-monopoly capitalism here, I merely wish to point to some new problems.

It is a matter of record that in the past ten years the influence of science on material production has resulted in a tremendous increase in the volume and rate of profit. Appropriating the lion's share of the profits, monopoly capital can afford to spend a fraction of them on satisfying the material requirements of a certain part of the working class and thus wean it away from acute conflicts and class struggle. Monopoly capital employs these methods also to counter the influence of the socialist world system. For instance, until now West German monopoly capital has succeeded in preventing united action by the GDR and the West-German working class.

Bourgeois politicians and right-wing Social-Democratic leaders take advantage of the fact that state-monopoly economic regulation has somewhat modified the operation of the economic laws of capitalism and the forms of capitalist contradictions. It is precisely because the parasitism of capitalist shareholders and

monopolies is starkly revealed in conditions of monopoly capitalism that the monopolies seek to merge closely with state power so as to utilize it for consolidating the exploiter system, increasing their profits, restricting the rights of the working people and diverting the population from class struggle.

Despite the growth of its contradictions, state-monopoly capitalism has managed to change the economic cycle. More and more people are becoming proletarianized and the capitalist economy grows increasingly unstable, but this process is considerably retarded by measures taken by the state, with the result that many crisis phenomena resolve themselves merely into partial crises. It should be added that military production lessens the danger of a crisis of overproduction, although it aggravates internal and external contradictions. Although the crisis cycle has changed, we should note that the exploitation of the working class has been intensified considerably and the gap between the rate of growth of the capitalist magnates' profits and that of the incomes of the working people is widening. At the same time state-monopoly capitalism strives more and more to expand, to increase its influence in countries rich in raw materials and cheap manpower, and to subvert socialist development in the countries of people's democracy.

This appraisal of developments in the countries of state-monopoly capitalism points up the need for the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia of these countries to present greater economic demands and wage a systematic struggle against the restriction of freedom and democratic rights. The great variety of the methods used to ensure the rule of big monopolies with the help of the machinery of state demands not only a similar diversity of the demands and the methods of struggle of the working people, leadership of society. It is necessary to show that the internal contradictions of state-monopoly capitalism and its hostility toward but also their constant orientation on the establishment of their the socialist world system can, in the event of military provocations and nuclear world war, imperil the life of the people. By virtue of the very nature of state-monopoly capitalism the partial demands of the working people for higher wages, reduction of the burden of military expenditures, guaranteed work and a "just distribution of the product of labor" are more and more directed against the state-monopoly capitalist system itself. Hence the need to combine the struggle for reforms with work to explain the causes of social insecurity and of the discrepancy between the colossal profits of the capitalists and the incomes of the workers and peasants. This means waging a constant struggle against the big monopolies and against the state machinery's support of them.

Hence the problem of the work of the parties, trade unions, peasants' unions and consumers' cooperatives in the respective capitalist countries.

It was stressed at the meeting of the Social-Democratic International to commemorate the centenary of the founding of the First International that the road to socialism lies only through democracy. That is true. But in view of the peculiarities of the individual countries and of international development the conditions of the struggle for democracy differ greatly. In the countries dominated by state-monopoly capitalism this struggle is highly complicated and diversified, and working-class unity is particularly essential there. In the struggle for democracy the working class, the other strata of the working people and a part of the bourgeoisie acquire the necessary experience and begin to see the need for unity of action. Consequently, it is essential that the Communists and Social Democrats should agree on how to wage the struggle for democracy and what partial objectives the Communist and Social-Democratic parties could work for together.

★ ★ ★

Now I proceed to the conclusions:

1. The behests of the First International have been carried out and developed by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, by the victory of socialism in one-sixth of the world, and after 1945 by the appearance of the socialist world system. The foundation has thus been laid for the socialist revolution throughout the world.

2. Thanks to the further creative development of Marxism-Leninism and the overcoming of dogmatism after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the adoption of the joint Statement of the Communist and Workers' parties in 1960 and the Program of communism at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, the way has been paved for the successful construction of socialism in the People's Democracies. The way has also been cleared for a new attitude to the states of national democracy which have started building socialism, for the liberation struggle of the peoples suffering from colonial oppression, for the successful mass struggle of the Communist and Workers' parties in the capitalist countries against state-monopoly capitalism, for peace and disarmament, for democracy and socialism.

3. The consistent policy of the Soviet Union and of the socialist countries aimed at ensuring peaceful coexistence, disarmament and relaxation of tension, on the one hand, and the pressure of the war monopolies on the peoples of the capitalist countries and the aggressive policy of atomic armament, on the other, are creating a new situation in which cooperation, on a national and

international plane, of the Communist and Workers' parties and the Socialist parties for the maintenance of peace, becomes both necessary and possible.

Let the recognition of the decisions of the First International by the Communist and Socialist parties on the day of its 100th anniversary be backed by joint efforts to agree on united action for international detente, for preventing multilateral atomic armament, for nuclear-free zones and for disarmament.

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM IS THE REVOLUTIONARY BANNER OF OUR EPOCH*

B. N. Ponomaryov

SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Comrades, our Party and people and the entire international communist and working class movement are celebrating the centenary of the foundation of the First International, whose leaders were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

The First International laid the foundation of the world-wide struggle for socialism. The bourgeoisie realized at once how terribly destructive was the mine that Marx and Engels had laid under the pillars of its class rule. No wonder that at the very inception of the International, the bourgeoisie directed the full force of its fury and frenzy against it.

The International proclaimed the overthrow of capitalism and the building of the new society of communism—the fairest and most perfect of societies—to be the historic mission of the working class.

In the name of the working class, the International declared war on national strife and put forward the aim of forging the fraternal alliance of the working people of all countries.

The International declared the resolve of the proletariat to fight against war and establish on this planet the kingdom of Freedom, Labor and Peace.

One hundred years have gone by since then. In importance this is a centenary without equal in the whole of man's previous history. It has seen a truly triumphant march of communist ideas, an unprecedented growth of the world revolutionary movement in both power and scale.

The picture the world presents has changed radically in these 100 years.

—The Great October Sociailst Revolution ushered in a new

---

*Speech at a meeting devoted to the cententary of the First International. Abridged from Pravda, September 29, 1964.

era in the history of humanity, that of the triumph of communism. The peoples of the many countries comprising the world system of socialism are following the road of the October Revolution.

—The international working class and its communist vanguard have developed into the most influential force of our day.

—Imperialism's colonial system, the world's prison house of nations, has been destroyed. The newly-free countries are becoming makers of history and many have announced the building of socialism as their goal.

—The ideology of the proletariat, Marxism-Leninism, has taken hold of the minds of all progressive mankind.

—For the first time in history, the forces of socialism and peace have achieved superiority over the forces of aggression. Mankind now has real possibilities of preventing a world war.

On this great day Soviet Communists gratefully recall their predecessors, the Russian section of the First International, which Karl Marx represented on its Council. He signed International documents as "secretary and correspondent for Germany and Russia." The seeds of the revolution, which Marx planted in the soil of Russia, have indeed borne remarkable fruit. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, which the great Lenin founded and steeled, our people are the first in history to be building communism!

1. GREAT CAUSE OF WORKING CLASS IS WINNING OUT

To mark the First International's centenary is in the first place to emphasize and re-emphasize the historic mission of the working class and the importance of solidarity and unity between the various national detachments of Labor's great legion.

In those distant years of the First International the proletariat comprised an insignificant minority among the population of our planet. Today it is an extremely large class, the most influential one in society.

However, the numerical strength of the proletariat does not in itself determine its role in society. Numbers, Marx emphasized, decide the issue only when the masses are organized. The First International paved the way for the formation of mass political parties of the proletariat. Today hundreds of millions of the working people throughout the world are organized in one form or another. These forms of organization are the national democratic parties and the trade union, women's, youth, cooperative, sports, and other organizations. What is particularly important is that today there are Communist Parties in nearly all countries and they boast a total membership of more than 43 million. The Communists are the standard-bearers of our epoch, which is one of the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism.

This century of experience has further shown that an organization becomes a truly revolutionary force when it is wedded to scientific socialism. The ideological and theoretical level of the working class has risen immeasurably since the times of the First International. Its revolutionary vanguard, which is many million strong, is fighting under the banner of Marxism-Leninism in the arena of social and political battles.

The great idea of the working class deciding its fate for itself, an idea that sparked a century ago, has become a mighty flame that is burning capitalism to ashes. Pointing out the ways towards socialism's coming victory, Marx indicated that the triumph of the political economy of the working class over that of the bourgeoisie was indispensable for it. It is precisely this that is now being brought about in the socialist countries, whose all-round socio-economic and political progress has become the decisive factor for the development of the world revolutionary movement.

The proletariat of the leading capitalist countries has won major economic and social gains. It is steadily building up its forces, waging persistent class battles against the monopolies, enemy No. 1 of all the working people, in imperialism's own citadels. The young working class in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America is heroically struggling, in company with its allies, for national independence, for rooting out all the remnants of colonialism, and for social progress.

One hundred years ago the prevailing form of working class struggle against the bourgeoisie was the economic struggle. Today nearly every working class action is both economic and political in character. This reflects the revolutionary content of our epoch and at the same time the increased strength and role of the proletariat.

The great liberating mission of the working class has been displayed in literally all spheres of human society in the second half of the 20th century. Historical experience, above all that of the Soviet Union, has proved that the victorious working class ensures:

in the economic sphere—crisis- free development of the productive forces, attainment of the summits of modern science and technology which are placed at the service of the masses to improve their living standards;

in the political sphere—genuine democracy for the people, genuine freedom of the individual;

in the sphere of national relations—friendship and fraternal alliance of all the nations;

in the sphere of intellectual and cultural life—a genuinely people's culture inspired by the lofty ideas of serving society and man;

in the sphere of international relations—a lasting peace among the nations, the deliverance of mankind from the disaster of thermonuclear war, and support of the revolutionary movement in other countries.

By all this the working class has convincingly demonstrated that it differs radically from all the other classes which have ever stood at the helm. Perpetuation of its power and oppression of other classes, groups and sections of the population are alien to the working class by its very nature. And this fact is of more than transitory importance. While the monopoly bourgeoisie repels the majority of the people, including also certain sections of the bourgeoisie itself, the working class attracts the broadest masses of the peasantry, artisans, intellectuals, all democrats. The point is that the basic interests of the working class and all who live by their labor coincide both in the struggle against the exploiting system and in the course of building socialism.

The successes of the international proletariat are great and indisputable. But as a class destined radically to remake the entire world it clearly sees that there are still tremendous and responsible tasks ahead of it. Naturally, the greatest difficulties will have to be overcome by the detachments of the working class which have not yet taken power. New, exceptionally broad possibilities for choosing the road of transition to socialism have opened up before them now. This road can be either peaceful or non-peaceful. But in all cases this is a revolutionary road chosen by the people themselves and their revolutionary Party.

Do the working class and all the working people have a real possibility of accomplishing the titanic tasks confronting them? Yes, there are such possibilities, and they are constantly growing. The victories already won by the working class, its numerical strength, its place in production and its role in contemporary society show that it possesses unprecedented social might. This might is quite sufficient for the proletariat, together with its allies, to abolish exploitation and oppression on earth, to put an end to wars, to lead all working people out of the darkness of a life in bondage and make the workingman the true master, a builder in freedom and ruler of the world everywhere.

Consequently, the thing now is for the working class to make full use of the available objective possibilities and the revolutionary forces it has accumulated and to carry right to the end its mission as standard-bearer of world socialism. The Marxist-Leninist Parties see their mission as being to ensure the triumph of the cause of the working class and the victory of socialism in all countries.

2. PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AND THE REVOLUTIONARY TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIETY

The First International is precious to us because, having proclaimed in its Inaugural Address the great slogan of Marx and Engels: "Workers of all lands, unite!" it began to put proletarian internationalism into practice as a major principle of the revolutionary struggle. In our days internationalism has acquired outstanding significance. For what reasons?

First, because socialist internationalism has now found material embodiment in the system of socialist states. The socialist community is called upon to furnish a model of new relations between different peoples and nations, to lay the foundation of the future communist fraternity of people. This is a new undertaking, one that is exceptionally intricate and is being carried out for the first time in the long history of mankind. That is why the Communists must work with still greater energy and wisdom to accomplish this magnificent task. No internationalist duty is higher in our days than the strengthening of the unity of the world socialist community.

Second, more than 60 young national states have emerged on the world scene. The national-liberation movement is one of the most important revolutionary forces of our epoch. It has inflicted, and is continuing to inflict, powerful blows upon imperialism, having already smashed its colonial rear. The national-liberation movement puts forward new problems of world development. These countries are confronted with the choice of ways for national and social development. This choice largely depends on the consolidation of the militant alliance of the socialist countries and the international working class movement with the peoples who have won national independence or are fighting for it. Objectively, because of existing conditions, because of the need for the earliest elimination of their economic backwardness and defense of national independence, the newly-free peoples cannot march forward without advancing to socialism. Scientific socialism furnishes a solution to all these new intricate problems. Consequently it is natural that the young national states should be drawn more and more to socialism.

Third, the ideas of internationalism are helping the peoples to unite ever closer in the struggle to prevent a thermonuclear war and are facilitating the establishment of a powerful front of solidarity of the working people of various countries, a front of peace counterposed to the front of aggression and reaction. This is particularly important in the present conditions when the forces of war are hatching plans for mounting an offensive against the forces of peace and social progress.

Fourth, in our time proletarian internationalism creates a wide ideological platform for uniting in one stream the most diverse detachments engaged in the revolutionary struggle now underway on a world-wide scale.

The experience of the past 100 years shows that proletarian internationalism has always been a reliable and powerful weapon of the working class. It is known that the bourgeoisie asserted itself as the ruling class with the help of nationalism. It fanned, and continues to fan, national discord, pitting one people against another, one country against another, to the point of world war. The bourgeoisie utilizes what belongs to the nation as a whole for its class ends and makes capital out of the interests of the nation. But the proletariat, in contrast to the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes, rejects the counterposing of peoples and states. Solidarity of all the working people and friendship among nations correspond to its class interests. Having entered the arena of political struggle as the grave-diggger of capitalism, the proletariat has also proclaimed to the world the great importance of internationalism.

Proletarian internationalism plays an increasingly effective part from one historical stage to another, above all in the struggle of the working class itself. At first, prior to the victory of the October Revolution, proletarian internationalism was chiefly the instrument of class solidarity of the workers of different countries and a school that trained them for the joint assault on capital.

The victory of the October Revolution and later the appearance of the socialist world system enriched the content and forms of manifestation of proletarian internationalism to an extreme degree. Today proletarian internationalism means the following:

—Solidarity and all-round mutual support of all the revolutionary detachments in the struggle for the common goals;

—Defense of peace and active struggle against the threat of a new war and for the affirmation in international affairs of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems;

—Exertion by each socialist country of the maximum effort to carry out its prime internationalist duty—the building of socialism and communism;

—Implementation inside the countries and in the international arena of a policy that promotes the strengthening of the socialist world system as the main factor in present-day revolutionary development;

—Support by the peoples of the socialist countries and the working people of the socialist countries for the national-liberation movement;

—Utmost efforts to help rally the progressive forces of all countries and continents in the democratic movements regardless of differences in race and nationality;

Defense and strengthening of the unity of the international communist movement, a resolute struggle against factionists and splitters, against reactionary nationalism and its penetration into the communist and workers' movement;

Defense and the creative development of Marxism-Leninism as the ideological foundation of the international Communist movement.

The immortal slogan "Workers of all lands, unite!" put forward by Marx and Engels brilliantly expresses the essence of proletarian internationalism. With the national-liberation movement of the colonies joining the general current of the world revolution, this slogan gained added meaning. And Lenin supplemented it with a new motto: "Workers of the world and oppressed peoples, unite!" Our time has provided the opportunity for, and insistently demands, the formation of an unprecedentedly broad front of political alliances embracing all the three main revolutionary forces of the present day. Such a front presupposes unity of action on the part of the Marxist-Leninist Parties, of other workers' Parties, of the revolutionary-democratic Parties of the young independent countries and of all the organizations fighting against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism. In the light of this, the great international motto rings out with still greater force in our time and calls for the uniting of the forces of the countries of socialism, of the international working class, of the national-liberation movement, and of all the anti-imperialist forces.

The vital tasks confronting mankind and the peoples of different countries demand that the Communists apply unswervingly the principles of proletarian internationalism in all their practical activities. Today, as never before, it is necessary to rebuff firmly any attempts to split the peoples.

This is particularly important in view of the fact that one can now observe in the Western countries a fresh burst of activity on the part of the extreme reactionary forces. One sinister sign of this is the growth of fascist tendencies.

In view of this the consistent and selfless struggle of the Marxist-Leninist Parties for international solidarity and the friendship of peoples, for organizing resistance to the aggressors and for preserving peace becomes all the more important. The constant provocations against Cuba and the attempts to strangle it by blockade, the attacks by U.S. naval forces and aircraft against the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the aggression in the Congo, the plot of the imperialists against the freedom and

territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus—all these so-called "trials of strength" call once more for vigilance against imperialism and against the reactionary nationalism and chauvinism of the aggressors and warmongers.

As far back as the seventies of the last century Marx gave the warning: "If the working classes forsake their duty, if they remain passive, the present tremendous war will be but the harbinger of still deadlier international feuds, and lead in every nation to a renewed triumph over the workman by the lords of the sword, of the soil, and of capital." Communists do not forget and have no right to forget the lessons of history. Fifty years ago the imperialists, having poisoned the minds of the masses with the venom of national hatred, started the First World War. Twenty-five years ago German fascism, whipping up nationalism and chauvinism to monstrous proportions, started the Second World War. By appealing to dark instincts, by cultivating a feeling of contempt for other peoples, and inculcating a feeling of superiority over the people of other nationalities and races, fascism reared cohorts of cut-throats and murderers, who drowned the earth in blood. And it all began with calls for the revision of frontiers, with references to the "unjust distribution of territories," to a lack of "living space"! Such nationalistic calls are harmful, no matter from what source they come. They kindle the flames of bellicose nationalism and are fraught with danger to the cause of peace.

The working people had to pay in tens of millions of lives, in many years of starvation, chaos and militarist terror for the world wars. The working class cannot allow mankind to be pushed into a world war again, particularly since it would be a thermonuclear one this time.

Throughout its history our Party—the Party of the great Lenin—has been actively fighting against imperialist wars, against reactionary nationalism and chauvinism. According to Lenin's definition, the October Revolution meant "the first victory in the struggle to abolish war." The CPSU and all the Soviet people have exerted the maximum effort to continue this cause, bequeathed to us by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. The radical change in the balance of world forces, stemming from the victory over fascism in 1945, enabled the CPSU at its 20th Congress to reach the conclusion that there is a real possibility of preventing a new world war. The years which have elapsed since have fully confirmed the correctness of this conclusion. The socialist community, the international working class and all the peace forces have foiled the attempts the imperialists have repeatedly made in this period to involve mankind in a new world catastrophe. And this

great achievement of the international working class and of all the forces of peace is the direct result of the firm and consistent policy of the Soviet Government, of our glorious Leninist Party.

Comrades, to Marxist-Leninists what is genuinely national does not stand in contradiction to what is international. The great force of scientific socialism is that it has found a proper blend of the national interests of the working people, of the masses of each country, their patriotism and their affection for their country, with internationalism, with unity in the common interests of working people of different nations and different countries.

Marxism-Leninism draws a profound distinction between reactionary nationalism and chauvinism which oppose one nation to another, and the nationalism of young nations which have risen in struggle for their vital interests, for the freedom of their countries. The present-day national-liberation movement has shown that the rallying of all anti-imperialist forces under a common national banner is playing a big progressive role. The historic victories of the revolutionary national-liberation movement in the postwar years, which led to the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, have caused a tremendous upsurge of national consciousness among the liberated peoples. Whereas only yesterday they were cruelly oppressed by the colonialists, they have today won their national independence, set up their sovereign states, and are taking an active part in deciding the destinies of the world, making a worthy contribution to the cause of mankind's complete liberation from all forms of national and social oppression. All this arouses in them legitimate feelings of national dignity, self-consciousness and pride. And they have something to be proud of.

Marxist-Leninists sincerely support the national movement, since it expresses the general national interests of the newly-developing countries, and unites different social forces of the people of a group of peoples in accomplishing their main task, that of freeing themselves from all forms of colonialism. At the same time, Marxist-Leninists warn against attempts to use the upsurge of the national movement to set one nation against others, to cultivate enmity between peoples. They consider that there are objective conditions in our epoch which make it possible to direct the rapidly-developing process of consolidation of nations in the former colonial countries along the lines of mutual support, respect and friendship of peoples. Of tremendous importance in this connection is the experience of the creation of a socialist community of free nations in the Soviet Union and the consistent internationalist policy of the socialist countries.

The Soviet Union's internationalism finds its expression in great

concrete deeds—in the building of communism, in the defense of world socialism against the encroachments of the imperialists, in the curbing of aggressive forces which are threatening the world with a nuclear war, in the support and aid for the developing countries, for all peoples fighting for freedom and social progress.

The international bonds between the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries have never been as strong as now. The Soviet people, envoys of a new world, have become welcome guests in all parts of the globe. The Soviet people are now taking a direct part in the creative effort of the peoples of 37 countries. They are putting up modern factories and dams, institutes and hospitals. The Soviet people are helping their brothers overcome their age-old backwardness and advance to the heights of modern civilization.

It is not accidental that in the minds of the peoples Moscow has come to symbolize socialist internationalism. Here, in our capital, big international congresses are held whose watchword is fraternity and friendship of peoples and nations of all countries, struggle for the common cause of peace and social progress.

The Soviet people highly value the friendly feelings and fraternal solidarity shown in the first socialist country by the working people of the world. This solidarity and international assistance have always been cherished by the Soviet people, inspiring them and making easier their struggle to build a new world.

Proletarian internationalism has more than once been strikingly displayed in solidarity with and support to revolutionary detachments operating on the front line of the struggle against the common enemy, against imperialism and fascism. This international support is known and remembered by the heroic people of Spain, who were the first to rise in armed struggle against fascism. It is constantly felt by revolutionary Cuba—this beacon of socialism in the Western hemisphere. This support is a reliable aid to all fighters against imperialist reaction and aggression, against dictatorships and colonial reservations that still remain on earth. International solidarity is truly a great force whose significance and role are steadily increasing.

The whole world can see that the nationalist actions of the leaders of the Communist Party of China are particularly unseemly. For the sake of their strivings for hegemoney, and sacrificing the interests of their own people, they are seeking to undermine the unity of the socialist world system, the unity of all the revolutionary forces of our day. The working class movement has never come up against such open egoism, such bellicose nationalism on the part of those who call themselves proponents of socialism.

Uniting the workers in the First International, Marx armed them with the ideas of solidarity in the struggle against the capitalist system. Founding the Third International, Lenin made internationalism the weapon of all the revolutionary forces of the epoch of the transition from capitalism to communism. And the Chinese leaders are trying to destroy the unity of the Communist and liberation movement, to sow poisonous seeds of nationalist strife in the world socialist system. This intention was voiced most frankly in the interview given by Chairman Mao Tse-tung to the Japanese Socialists. With amazing political irresponsibility Mao Tse-tung asserts that since no blood is being shed in the struggle that has developed in the Communist movement, this struggle (which he calls a "war on paper") can be conducted for decades, as if to imply that the sky will not fall as a result. By their entire behavior the Chinese leaders are opening the front to the class enemy, are causing harm to the revolutionary movement, and are actually helping the imperialists to intensify their pressure on separate sectors of the revolutionary front. At every step they show arrogant disregard for the interests of the socialist countries and the Communist Parties. What Mao Tse-tung and his followers are now doing is actually profanation of the very essence of proletarian internationalism and Marxist-Leninist teachings.

Now the Chinese leaders are directing their main blow against our Party, against the first socialist country. But this is what they said recently: "The question is: either alliance with the Soviet Union or with imperialism, explains Mao Tse-tung in his book, On New Democracy. Either one or the other. Such is the watershed between patriotism and national betrayal; such is the watershed between revolution and counter-revolution, such is the watershed between progress and reaction in each nation in the world. To come out against the Soviet Union must inevitably conform to the interests of imperialism and constitute a betrayal of one's own national interests." This is what one of the leaders of China, Liu Shao-chi, wrote. No internationalist can fail to admit that these words are as true today as they were when they were uttered.

The enemies do not conceal their joy at the difficulties that have arisen in the Communist movement through the fault of the Chinese leaders. The enemies are now shouting about a split in the Communist movement, claiming that the Communists are taking to their separate "national homes." They are now banking mainly on reactionary nationalism and reckon that with its assistance they will be able to put an end to communism. But this must not happen and will not happen. Communism will

triumph over reactionary nationalism. What is this confidence of ours based on?

It is based on the fact that all the classes and social groups of the socialist countries have common aims in the struggle for communism. Their interests coincide in both the economic and the political fields. All of them have a common enemy, imperialism. All of them are interested in unity to defend their socialist gains, to strengthen peace and international security. All the peoples of the socialist community are deeply interested in the closest unity of their ranks, which ensures the accomplishment of both internal and external tasks of building a new society. In other words, certain contradictions and centrifugal tendencies that arise in the socialist community are not due to the nature of the socialist system. They are largely due to transient phenomena, such as the personality cult, the novelty of the transition to socialism of countries different in their social, economic and cultural level, and in their history. Frequently, as can be seen from the example of China, they are the result of a wrong, erroneous policy. However, socialism has already shown its ability to overcome the personality cult and all its grave consequences. The development of socialism will more and more remove the transient phenomena and unite the peoples. The ideological maturity of the Communists guarantees their victory over nationalist distortions and deviations.

The role of Marxist-Leninists is that they should, basing themselves on the objective laws of socialism, actively work for the unity of the socialist countries. Persistent activity by the Communist Parties to educate the masses in the spirit of socialist internationalism and overcome nationalistic survivals both in relations between the peoples inside the country concerned and with regard to the peoples of other countries is a prime necessity in this connection. Our Leninist Party, its Central Committee, in all their activities both in the country and in the international arena are invariably guided by the great Lenin's behests and set an example of socialist internationalism in practice.

3. THE UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IS A GUARANTEE OF FURTHER VICTORIES FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY CAUSE

Now that we are looking back over the path traversed by the working class in a hundred years, we clearly see the interconnection between social progress and the development of the communist movement. The mightier the international army of Communists, the more rapid is the development of mankind, the wider the front of the revolutionary movement, the greater the

benefit to the workingmen. Thanks to the activities of the Marxist-Leninist Parties, the peoples are now well aware of what Communists are.

The Communists are a Party which devotes itself wholly to the cause of the complete liberation of the working class, of all working people, to the cause of the complete uprooting of colonialism. The Communists are a Party which is staunchly and selflessly defending peace, vigorously fighting against the warmongers.

The Communists are a Party which has devoted itself to setting up a fraternal union of the working people of all countries, which supports all the revolutionary forces and to which proletarian internationalism is a sacred law.

The Communists are a Party which, on coming to power, musters all the forces of society for building socialism and communism, for developing the productive forces in the interests of steadily raising the material and cultural standards of the working people and ensuring their genuine freedom.

The Communists have proved on a world scale that it is they who express the vital interests of working mankind and that to march forward in this century means to march side by side with the Communists.

The strength of the Communists is that they are guided by a Marxist-Leninist theory. Since the appearance of the Communist Manifesto the ideas of scientific socialism have been subjected to frenzied attacks by bourgeois ideology. In the course of this struggle the superiority of scientific socialism has become increasingly obvious. During the past century the ideas of socialism have spread far and wide, penetrating to the very heart of the masses. No one can deny that scientific socialism has become the banner of the century. During this century capitalism has grown drab and barren; it has no ideas capable of attracting the working people. This fact graphically demonstrates the bankruptcy and barrenness of bourgeois ideology. However, while suffering defeat in the struggle against socialist ideology, the bourgeoisie does not lay down its arms. It musters all its forces against communism and has placed the entire state machinery at the service of anti-communism. The offensive against bourgeois ideology is therefore our major task. A decisive condition for its final rout is success in socialist and communist construction, the translation into life of the great ideas of socialism.

Over the century Marxism has also been compelled to struggle against hostile ideological tendencies within the working class movement itself. Marx and Engels themselves had to wage a non-too-easy struggle against what they called "socialist and

semi-socialist sects," against the Blanquis, the Proudhonists, the Bakhuninists, and other splitters. Subsequently, the ideological struggle came to be concentrated on two fronts—the Right-wing, i.e. against bourgeois distortions of scientific socialism and attempts to reconcile the working class with capitalist reality, and the Left-wing, i.e. against various sectarian-dogmatic, pseudo-revolutionary trends.

In the past 100 years life has put all the trends and tendencies in the working class movement to the acid test. It has spurned the Rightist deviations from Marxism as tending to lead the working class astray from the highway of the revolution. This does not, of course, imply that the Rightist danger has disappeared, because as long as capitalism exists, reformism and revisionism will exist too, and the struggle against them cannot be relaxed. It is, however, obvious that the main danger to the working class movement today is the pseudo-Left, nationalist dogmatism.

Marxism-Leninism is the synthesis of everything progressive evolved by mankind. It becomes enriched by analyzing new phenomena in history, and it absorbs all the wealth of modern science. Had the theory of Marxism-Leninism not been developed, the working class movement would not have been able to advance and win the victories in which it so rightly takes pride today. The 100-year experience of the international revolutionary movement shows us that in cases when Marxists have taken a creative viewpoint and given a timely and correct appraisal of new developments in life, hostile ideology has been put to rout in, so to say, vanguard battles. And, vice versa, when Marxists overlooked new developments and were late in correcting their fire, hostile ideology secured some freedom to maneuver and Marxism's positions became temporarily weaker. That was what happened during the time of the personality cult, when the stagnation it had produced in the theoretical work of the Communists enabled our ideological adversaries to intensify their activity and make capital out of the new scientific discoveries and the new data relating to social progress. The creative, bold conclusions reached at the 20th Party Congress cut the ground from under the revisionists and dogmatists, and equipped the Communists with a very sharp weapon of attack in their struggle against hostile ideology, for a new powerful advance in the working class cause. The 20th Congress of the CPSU has gone down in the history of the working class movement as a symbol of the triumph of creative Marxism-Leninism, as a great milestone on the road to fresh victories for the forces of the revolution.

Present-day Marxism is a teaching that has made a great stride forward since the time when it had only just emerged onto the

historical scene. Marxism-Leninism has received its supreme embodiment in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow Meetings of the representatives of the Communist Parties and in the CPSU Program, which the fraternal Parties have termed the Communist Manifesto of our time.

The most responsible tasks that are confronting the international working class in our time imperatively demand unity of action on the part of all the detachments of the working class movement, and the healing of the breach. The Communist Parties believe the establishment of contact and cooperation with Socialist workers extremely important.

After the October Revolution, the working class movement, as will be remembered, forked, taking the Marxist-Leninist, Communist road of development and the Social-Democratic one. Both roads were put to the test of history and in every case life supplied one and the same answer, that the road pointed out by Marx, Engels and Lenin was the right one. It was demonstrated in every case that departures from Marxism lead people away from the ideals of socialism and run counter to the vital interests of the working class.

Though after the war Social-Democracy has come to power more than once in a number of countries, nowhere has it realized even the minimum of socialist aims; nowhere has it made the working class the leading force in society. Experience is convincing the Social-Democratic working class masses that the doctrine of "democratic socialism" does no harm to capitalism and that to take it for a guide is to knowingly reconcile oneself to the preservation of the capitalist system with all its consequences; unemployment, fear for the future, poverty, and war. Meanwhile, the achievements of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and their foreign policies of peace are increasing the appeal of the ideas of Marxism and the Communist Parties for the masses. All this is causing a swing to the Left among the working class in the capitalist countries and is influencing developments now taking place in the Social-Democratic Parties. Some Social-Democratic leaders are beginning, even though very slowly, to realize that in the dispute between the two ideologies they are not on the right side; others are reluctantly admitting that frank repudiation of Marxism is impairing the influence of the Social-Democratic Parties among the masses and is weakening their positions in the political life of their respective countries.

The ideas of the 20th Congress of the CPSU and subsequently the decisions of its 21st and 22nd Congresses and our Party Program have greatly influenced the processes underway in the working-class and Social-Democratic movement. The initiative

displayed by the CPSU in establishing contacts with the Socialist Parties represents a signal contribution by Soviet Communists to the fight for united action by the various detachments of the international working-class movement. Anyone who wants to defend the interests of the working class cannot but seek to unite its ranks—indeed, has no right, particularly today, not to do so.

The past few decades have seen an abjuration of Marxism by the Right-wing leaders of Social Democracy. However now, under the pressure of socialism's increasing might and the sympathies of the masses for Marxism, they are observing the First International's centenary and have convened a special congress for the purpose. The Social-Democratic International would like to pose as heir to the International of Marx and Engels. At this centenary time Social-Democratic leaders have tried to present Marx as a reformist and to emasculate his revolutionary teaching. However, these efforts are in vain. The teaching of Marx has always been the greatest revolutionary teaching, and so it remains. It is the Communists, the International Communist movement, who are the real heirs and continuers of Marx's cause, of the traditions of the First International.

It should be noted that during the jubilee celebrations in Brussels one also heard sober thoughts voiced, in particular, about the need to rally the ranks of the working class in face of the war threat. That is clear evidence of the changes occurring deep down inside the working class movement in the West. The proletariat has every right to expect of the leaders of Social-Democracy tangible moves towards unity. After all, celebration of the International's centenary means associating oneself with its traditions, and these traditions, which mirror the vital interests of the toiling masses, call for abandonment of the policy of anti-communism and for effective cooperation, both internationally and nationally, between all detachments of the working class movement. As for the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties, they, for their part, have already made quite a few moves to help honest Social Democrats brush aside the mountebanks of anti-communism, sit down at one table, and work out a mutually acceptable program for joint action for peace and socialism.

In our time favorable prospects exist in the capitalist countries for forming broad coalitions around the working class, which include all those prepared to fight for peace, the regeneration and broadening of democracy, the abolition of the power of the monopolist oligarchy. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry is the nucleus around which all anti-imperialist forces rally. Marx predicted that in the peasantry, "the proletarian revolution would get the chorus without which its solo in all

peasant lands would become a swan song." This remarkable idea about the need for combining the working class struggle with the peasant movement was comprehensively developed by Lenin and brilliantly realized by the October Revolution in Russia. Ever since, the entire course of international developments has confirmed the fruitful character of the revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants. The intelligentsia has now joined in the anti-imperialist movement on a wide front.

The ideological source and prime guarantee of the unity of all the revolutionary forces is the unity of their communist vanguard. The abolition of the Stalin cult not only released the Communist movement from a heavy burden hampering its development. It demanded of every detachment in our movement that it display a far greater measure of responsibility for strengthening unity on the basis of the supreme principles of proletarian internationalism, each Party striving, in a strictly voluntary fashion, to coordinate its efforts with the other Parties. It goes without saying that the Communist Parties can be the real vanguards of the people in the struggle for socialism only if they act as independent, genuinely national forces. This, however, does not at all imply that they should stick to the idea of "keeping to one's own parish." The desire to interpret independence of Parties as a departure from the solution of common international tasks, as a peculiar kind of "neutrality" in tackling common matters, can be considered neither as a sign of independence nor as a sign of maturity. This position accords neither with the common interests of the international working class nor with the interests of its national detachments.

There is one road to success for each Communist Party, and only one—this is the proper combination of its independence with fidelity to internationalism. "Let us recall the basic principle of the International: solidarity. We shall attain the great goal for which we are striving if we firmly establish this life-giving principle among all the workers in all countries!" These words of Marx retain their full force today as well.

To the splitting nationalist line pursued by the leadership of the Communist Party of China our Party and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties loyal to the behests of Marx and Lenin are counterposing proletarian internationalism which has reliably served our movement for more than 100 years now. We firmly remember that division in our ranks helps the class enemy, while stronger unity strikes a blow at the bourgeoisie. Our Party, like the other Marxist-Leninist Parties, has always considered, and considers now, that unity of the Communist movement, which has always been a guarantee of its success, is more necessary

today than ever before. Our motto is: unity, unity and once again unity of the world Communist movement!

International meetings of Communists are one of the most important forms of cooperation at the present stage in the development of the working-class and Communist movement. The idea of such meetings is deeply rooted in the traditions of the Communist movement. Let us recall that Marx and Engels regularly held congresses of the International, at which the strategy and tactics of the working class movement were collectively elaborated. In the most difficult years of our movement, the years when the Communist Parties were being formed, Lenin considered it necessary systematically to hold, and did hold, congresses of the Communist International, seeing in the exchange of experience with comrades in the struggle, in the elaboration of a common line, an indispensable condition for the successes of the international working class movement.

Now that the situation in the Communist movement has become particularly complex, it is all the more necessary to act in the way Marx, Engels and Lenin taught us. The organizational forms of international ties have changed. Today there are no grounds for the existence of a centralized organization of the type of the International. But international solidarity is vitally necessary and it must be developed in forms corresponding to the new stage of the Communist movement. Our Party, like most fraternal Parties, holds that the convening of a new international Communist forum is the best method of overcoming the differences. The purpose of a new Meeting, as is understood by the Central Committee of the CPSU, is not to "excommunicate" someone from the Communist movement, to "sever" someone from it, but to strengthen the unity of the movement and further creatively to elaborate urgent problems of the world Communist movement.

Our Party, despite the attacks of the Chinese leaders and the slanderous, anti-Soviet campaign unleashed by them, is extending a hand of friendship to the Communist Party of China in the name of joint struggle against imperialism, for the cause of peace, national freedom and socialism.

Our Party has done, and will continue to do, everything possible to rally the Communist movement and ensure its unity on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The Communist movement created by Marx and Lenin has marched and, despite everything, will continue to march forward, gaining ever fresh strength. The Marxist-Leninists know that the future belongs to them!

★ ★ ★

Comrades! As it marks the centenary of the First International,

the Communist movement is drawing important conclusions for the future.

The first conclusion is that loyalty to the Marxist-Leninist teaching is the most important condition for our success. Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism organically includes the defense of its basic principles, irreconcilability to their distortions from both Left and Right, the development of theory in accordance with the changing conditions of life in society. The Central Committee of our Party provides an example of such a genuinely revolutionary approach to the theory.

The second conclusion drawn by Communists is that one has to do everything possible in one's country or in one's area of activity to contribute to the success of the common revolutionary cause. This is the only way to ensure a concentrated offensive against world imperialism by all the detachments of the Communist movement.

The third conclusion, which wollowing the hundred years' experience of proletarian internationalism, is that the class and national-liberation struggle should always be combined with the struggle against reactionary wars, for the prevention of a world war. The struggle for peace is at the same time the broadest platform for the consolidation of all progressive forces behind the banner of socialism and friendship between peoples, one of the major traditions of the First International.

The fourth conclusion following from the 100 years' history of proletarian internationalism is that no revolutionary cause can be a success without constant vigilance and merciless struggle against reactionary nationalism. Reactionary nationalism always becomes a weapon of imperialism, no matter what gives birth to it, no matter what aspect it assumes and with what "ultra-revolutionary" phraseology it disguises its actions.

And the fifth conclusion. The unity of the international Communist movement is an earnest of the success and eventual triumph of the principles of proletarian internationalism all over the world. To be true to the behests of Marx and Lenin, to the traditions of the First International, means doing everything, not in words, but in deeds, to preserve and strengthen the unity of our movement.

The first century of the struggle of the working class for communist ideals has been marked with tremendous, really historic victories. The forces of communism are now in action in all continents and all countries. The general line of development of human society has finally taken shape: it is communism. The second century of the development of the international working class movement is bound to become and will become the age of the complete triumph of communism!

THE INTERNATIONAL'S BEHESTS*

F. Marek

MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRIA

A hundred years ago the participants in a public meeting in London, held under the leadership of Karl Marx, agreed that it is the working people, those who by hand and brain create all the wealth of society and who maintain and work for it who should also manage the affairs of society.

Since this idea—great in its simplicity and simple in its greatness—was first advanced much has changed, in no small measure thanks to the ideas of the International, which inspired the working-class movement of our time. The course of events increasingly reaffirms the truth that the capitalist class has outlived its time, that historically it has exhausted its social function and must cede state leadership of society to the working people. This is a fact, although the terms "labor-taker" (Arbeitnehmer) for those who sell their labor and "labor-giver" (Arbeitgeber) for those who appropriate the fruits of this labor—terms which Engels, Marx's comrade-in-arms, considered utterly absurd — still have currency.

To win power for the purpose of building socialist society—such was the grand task set the workers of the First International in its famous Inaugural Address.

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE WORKING CLASS

This document also gave advice to the working class as to what position of principle in keeping with the dignity, strength and interests of the workers it should adopt in order to win socialism. The winning of a Ten Hours' Bill by the English workers—at that time the workers in our country were still doing backbreaking work 12 and 14 hours a day—was characterized as a victory for the political economy of the working class, for the principle of "social production controlled by social foresight" as opposed to the anarchy in production and profit-seeking.

In a capitalist country like Austria this political economy of labor is still of decisive importance, for it teaches us to defend

---

*Volksstimme, September 20, 1964.

the class interests of the workers in all questions of the day-to-day struggle, wages and prices and counteract demagogic talk about social partnership with the anti-social and anti-socialist forces. It makes it incumbent upon us to counterpose all admonitions about "moderate wage claims" and "proportionate incomes" with the truth that what the working class demands is a bigger share of the so-called social product, practically all of which is created by the workers.

In a country like Austria, where 70 per cent of the gainfully-employed population are industrial workers and office employees, the political economy of the working class implies that, although they have not yet become the dominant force of society, they nevertheless should have a say in the management of industry and the economy as a whole, and should enjoy the functions of control over price fixing and the investments policy. An example here should be set by the nationalized enterprises which reflect, though in a very limited sense under capitalism, the principle of "social production controlled by social foresight."

Needless to say, the political economy of the working class can triumph only when it enjoys the complete support of the workers. The ideology of social partnership is not only incompatible with the socialist perspective but also runs counter to any independent conscious working-class policy. The independent, socialism-oriented policy of a working class conscious of its strength—such is the first major lesson of the International.

PEACE AND SOCIALISM

The intransient significance of the Inaugural Address and the farsightedness of its author, Marx, are evidenced by the fact that he clearly regarded the struggle against "a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs," the struggle against "squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure" as an integral part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working class. Socialism would not be the most human of all goals, had not the struggle for tis achievement been linked with resolute resistance to all predatory wars, with which capitalism is fraught just as a cloud is fraught with rain.

In our time we realize more than ever before this link between peace and socialism, for today there are 100 tons of TNT to every inhabitant of the earth, and also because nuclear war would destroy whole countries and nations. It is absurd to argue about what is more important—the struggle for peace or the struggle for socialism. The struggle for socialism would be meaningless unless simultaneously we defended the principle that there is no disputed issue in world politics that can justify an atomic war. We want socialism for full-blooded men and women and not for

those puny, maimed troglodytes who would survive nuclear war. On the other hand, the struggle for peace can receive a powerful impetus from the movement, the aim of which, in the words of the proletarian anthem, the Internationale, is to win for man the right to a life fit for human beings.

This connection between peace and socialism is expressed in the fact that whereas the Soviet Union, which is the strongest force of socialism, is at the same time the biggest peace-loving power, those forces which most desperately resist the rise of the working-class movement present the greatest danger to peace. This has been demonstrated anew by the aggression in Vietnam. The inseparable connection between he struggle for socialism and the struggle for peace—such is the second major lesson of the International, whose congresses Marx called "congresses of peace."

FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF PEOPLES

The third lesson of the First International may be drawn from the history of its foundation. The formation of the International took place against the background of a campaign of solidarity with Poland which, at that time divided into three parts, suffered from triple oppression: from the Hapsburgs, the Hohenzollerns and the Russian tsar.

With the emergence of the colonial system of imperialism, the question of national independence acquired an international significance. In recent years we have witnessed a great anti-colonial revolution in the course of which nations formerly regarded merely as suppliers of raw materials and cannon fodder and whose destinies were decided on the stock exchanges of New York, London and Paris are shaking off the chains of colonialism and emerging as an active force onto the international arena. Like a torrent of water breaking through a dam, this force is sweeping away all obstacles raised by the colonialists, and nothing, not even the U.S. "military advisers," can arrest its progress.

We remain loyal to this principle of the International. Our feelings and sympathies are with the partisans of South Vietnam, with Lumumba's avengers, and with the Negroes of South Africa. Nor do we forget the Negroes in the United States.

Socialism, peace and national independence—such is the triple behest left us by the First International.

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

It goes without saying that the rallying point of this triple orientation is proletarian internationalism. The Inaugural Address says that disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries and incite them

to active struggle, will be chastized by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. In our time these words contain much bitter truth for us Communists, all the more so since the view that the abolition of the relatons founded on capitalist ownership removes the soil that breeds nationalist prejudices and considerations of prestige, has proved to be an illusion.

It seems obvious to us that, in view of the diverse conditions of struggle in the different countries, no center and no central organ can either lead or direct the struggle of the individual parties. The parties are independent and autonomous, and they should formulate their policy proceeding from the interests of the working class of their own country. There may be differences of opinion between the fraternal parties, but we would be betraying the heritage of the International were we not to do everything in our power to achieve the utmost agreement on all the cardinal issues of the struggle against imperialism and for socialism.

Proletarian internationalism means that we, as genuine socialists, regardless of our differences and ideological disagreements, are conscious of our close bonds with all countries building socialism, our solidarity with all workers who suffer, hope and fight, whatever their party affiliation, and consider ourselves duty-bound to help all peoples fighting against colonialism and neo-colonialism, regardless of race and colour. From proletarian internationalism we also draw the feelings of friendship and kinship with all people of goodwill who stand for peace, peaceful coexistence and disarmament, regardless of their political views and religious convictions.

From proletarian internationalism derives our conviction that the Communist movement, which effected the historical transition from capitalism to socialism the movement whose struggle paved the way for the upsurge of the anti-colonial revolutions and made a substantial contribution to the cause of preventing a third world war, will, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism, ultimately find in itself the strength to achieve maximum unity on the key issues of the struggle against imperialism and for socialism.

WORKING-CLASS UNITY

We regard the centenary of the First International not only as a festive occasion for the Communist movement, or for our Communist Party. It is also a great day in the life of the entire working-class movement, for both Socialists and Communists. Moreover, it should be the occasion for the recognition and sober assessment of two basic facts:

1. In the developed capitalist countries of Europe there are both Communist and Socialist parties. In some countries the

former are stronger, in others, the latter. Social changes are inconceivable without the attainment of the broadest accord between two forces of the working-class movement.

2. The presidential campaign in America has demonstrated how serious is the danger that at some moment the forces from Texas or Arizona may spark off a holocaust that will spell immediate annihilation for millions of people. This heightens the responsibility of the European working-class movement which, on its part, should also reach agreement on steps to be taken to avert this mortal danger.

Without agreement between Socialists and Communists in this part of the globe the socialist perspective cannot be achieved, nor any essential contribution made to the cause of preserving peace. We therefore propose to the comrades from the Socialist Party to observe the anniversary of the First International in this spirit: in our minds—the triple orientation towards socialism, peace and national independence; in our hearts—the idea of proletarian internationalism, the idea of solidarity of the workers of each country and of all countries, an idea that knows of no state borders; on our lips— the slogan, with which Marx and Engels ended the *Communist Manifesto* and which was incorporated in the document that proclaimed the founding of the First International and became its guiding star, a signal for the awakening of the working-class movement of our time: *Workers of all Lands, Unite!*

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL 100 YEARS AFTER

Terence Africanus

A hundred years ago, on September 28, 1864, a meeting was called in London to express the idea of unity among the workers of all countries, and to express solidarity with the Polish national struggle against tsarist colonialism. It was attended by representatives of workers and revolutionaries from a number of European countries, and it was decided to give organizational expression to the ideas of the meeting by founding a new movement—the International Workingmen's Association. The guiding spirit and inspiration of the movement throughout its ten stormy years of existence was Karl Marx, elected as a representative of the German workers. It was Marx who wrote the basic documents of the First International—the Inaugural Address and Rules which defined the aims and character of the Association.

His ideas and his outlook were the most formative and decisive, not by reason of any formal position he held, nor because his colleagues had studied or accepted his ideology, but by virtue of the depth and originality of his views, his strength of purpose and clarity of expression. He led because his ideas and his policies really reflected the interests and aspirations of the working people. Under the guidance of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the First International became a school of scientific, revolutionary socialism. It rallied the workers of Europe from the grave setbacks to the cause of democracy suffered after 1848, for fresh organizational and political advances which reached their climax in the Paris Commune, of immortal memory, the first workers' government. It established the firm theoretical and organizational principles for the Communist movement of our times, that has destroyed capitalism forever in a third of the world, and is leading the peoples towards socialism with irresistible momentum throughout the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas.

When the First International was founded, it was confined to only a few countries of Western Europe—those where capitalist development had brought into being the working class. Marxism was but one of the currents which made up the socialist movement of the day, and socialism itself was far from being the accepted aim of most movements of workers and oppressed people.

THE TRIUMPH OF MARXISM

The brief hundred years which have passed have seen the most extraordinary change in this position. All the "varieties" of socialism other than Marxism have failed to stand the test of time. Theoreticians like Proudhon, Owen, Lasalle, Duehring, Kropotkin and others, will known in Marx's time, are remembered mainly by scholars and historians, whereas Marx's name is familiar to almost everyone in every continent.

The reason for this swift and dramatic triumph of Marxism is that it has been proved correct by events. As Marx foresaw, capitalism has proved unable to solve a single one of the huge problems of our day. Great as were its achievements, as compared with the feudal society which it superseded, capitalism is a dead end. Capitalism, in its final monopoly stage of imperialism, has grown into a frightful monster of destruction, which threatens all mankind with extinction. The great masses of working people and all the best, most far-seeing thinkers of our day, have turned their backs on capitalism and sought another road. The road into the future is the road to socialism and communism. And when we speak of socialism today we can only mean one thing: the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels, as developed and continued in conditions of 20th century imperialism by their greatest disciple, Vladimir Lenin, and as enriched and applied practically to complicated and widely different conditions by the talented Marxist-Leninists of a hundred countries of the world.

THE DIALECTICS OF DEBATE

The point of philosophy, as Marx pointed out, is not merely to explain the world, but to change it. And to change the world, we need more than arguments, we need organization and struggle. We cannot persuade the capitalist class to abandon its evil ways of exploiting the workers, and to embrace socialism. We cannot talk the colonialists of Southern Africa into abandoning national oppression and into embracing democracy. On such matters, which affect their own interests, their power, their profits and their privileges, these people, as a class, are not open to reason. One might as well try to persuade a lion to become a vegetarian.

That does not mean that we do not need arguments, or as it might be put vulgarly, that the only argument is a fist or a gun. Our enemies, the capitalists and imperialists, fear our arguments more than anything else, because they are only a small minority, and they depend for their continued rule on the support, active or passive, of the masses whose real interests are opposed to imperialism. That is why—since they are unable to answer our case, and to meet reason with reason—they suppress our parties

and our national liberation movements; they jail our spokesmen or find other ways to prevent them writing or speaking to the people.

Argument, debate, is also essential among the opponents of reaction; to clarify the truth and enable the workers, peasants and intellectuals to discern truth from error. Marx, Lenin and all the great leaders of the workers never feared debate, even among fellow-members of the working class and liberation movements whose views and analyses differed sharply from their own. On the contrary, they welcomed every opportunity for controversy, on the level of principle, recognizing that such discussions were an unrivalled means of education and clarification, and having boundless confidence in the reasoning capacity and common sense of the working people. Some of the greatest educational works of the science of socialism were produced in the course of such debates, such as Engels' penetrating analysis of the German socialist Duehring, and Lenin's brilliant demolition of the various non-Marxist and pseudo-Marxist tendencies in the international and in the Russian labor movements.

A splendid example of such invaluable debates occurred during the early days of the International Workingmen's Association. An English member of the General Council, Weston, who was an old follower of the famous Utopian socialist, Robert Owen, introduced a discussion on the question of wages. He claimed that wage-increases could not benefit the working class generally, and that if a trade union won wage increases for one section of the workers, it would be to the disadvantage of the others. Marx prepared a full reply to these erroneous arguments in a document (published as the booklet *Value, Price and Profit*), which remains to this day an outstanding illustration of how complicated economic questions can be presented in a lucid and simple way. Remarkable too is the way in which Marx completely destroyed Weston's false ideas without the faintest shadow of a personal attack, or anything which could antagonize the man himself. Indeed, he began by complimenting Weston on his "moral courage" in putting forward such ideas in a gathering—consisting of trade unionists and workers—where they were bound to be extremely unpopular.

Such debates and polemics could only strengthen the movement and clarify its ideas; they could not lead to splits and divisions. Unfortunately, as time went on, a very different sort of "polemics" appeared in the First International. These were of a type which did split and were designed to split, in which not only matters of principle and policy but also personal ambitions were at stake, and in which intrigues and slanders replaced honest debate. Such was the nature of the wretched fight which Bakunin and the "ultra-revolutionary" anarchists carried on, a fight which

split the Association from top to bottom and in the end wrecked it.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

By then its main mission had already been accomplished. The seeds of revolutionary Marxism had been sown abroad; they took deep root in a number of countries, and burgeoned forth in the form of the mass socialist workers' parties in Europe, parties adhering to the internationalist conceptions of the Association. These conceptions found their organizational form in the establishment, on July 14, 1889, of the Socialist International, known as the Second International.

At the core of the Second International was the German Social-Democratic Party, which had grown up under the personal influence of Marx and Engels. It was the biggest and most influential party of the movement, and the model party at that time. Nevertheless, from its inception it was not wholly Marxist; and it continued to harbor non-Marxist and anti-Marxist trends and currents which in the end destroyed both it and the Second International as fighting organs of the working class. At its origin the German Social-Democratic Party marked a coming together of the Marxists, headed by Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel, and the followers of Ferdinand Lassalle, founder of the General Association of German Workers, an opportunist and supporter of Prussian imperialism.

These two trends, the revolutionary Marxist trend and the right-wing opportunist trend, both existed for many years in the Party: in fact they were reflected in all the Parties which belonged to and made up the Second International. Some of the German leaders, headed by Eduard Bernstein, openly said that Marx's views were out of date and should be revised; they suggested that the workers should try to improve capitalism by means of gradual reforms rather than to end it and replace it with socialism. These revisionist views were rejected by the German Party at that time, and by the whole of the Second International. But many continued to harbor such ideas, and to carry them out in practice. Some of the Parties in the Second International, like the British Labor Party never accepted Marxism, even formally. Others, like Kautsky, upheld Marxism formally, in words, and called themselves Marxists; but in practice they watered Marxist theory down and blunted its revolutionary edge. There was continuous friction in the International between such opportunist tendencies, and the trend of revolutionary Marxism represented by Lenin and the Russian Bolshevik Party, by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in Germany, and many others.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

After the war and the world-historic victory of the workers and the oppressed people of the former tsarist empire in the Great Socialist Revolution of 1917, the revolutionary Marxist parties of all countries came together to form the Third International. This carried forward the best traditions of the First and the Second Internationals. The new International was called: The Communist International.

Among the first parties to affiliate to the Third International was the International Socialist League of South Africa, which in 1921 joined with other Marxist groups in the country to form the Communist Party. Its leaders were for the most part seasoned fighters with many years of experience in the trade union and labor movement. But the same was not true of the members and leaders of all the young Communist Parties, some of them newly-formed, which affiliated to the Communist International. Some of these were enthusiastic people, often from a middle-class background, but with little understanding of Marxism and less experience of the struggle. Impatient for "revolution right away," they were not prepared to face the hard slogging work of persuasion and organization, often lasting many long and thankless years, which are the lot of any serious revolutionary. They denounced the trade unions and other mass organizations which had so painfully been built up by the working people, declaring that the workers should resign from such "reactionary" bodies and form new unions on "pure Marxist" lines. They said it was useless to take part in Parliamentary elections; these merely spread illusions about Parliaments and diverted the attention of the Communists from their task of "preparing for revolution." They said the central task of the Communists in the capitalist countries was not to attack the ruling classes but to concentrate on exposing the reformist Labor and Social-Democratic leaders.

In his brilliant essay *"Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder,* Lenin patiently analyzed the errors of these "ultra-revolutionaries." He showed that the struggle of the working class for power was a long and complicated process, at each stage of which it was necessary to isolate the main enemy and to gain allies, however vacillating and unreliable they might be. It was necessary to work among the masses wherever they were to be found, in the trade unions and other mass organizations, even if these were under right-wing leadership. To boycott Parliamentary and other elections—unless there were special circumstances, for example a revolutionary situation in which the masses themselves had already lost all confidence in parliaments—was merely to leave the political field clear for the capitalists and

their agents, and to lose the opportunity for revolutionary work. Lenin also, in this essay, traced the origin of this ultra-revolutionary "Leftism." It reflected the social position of the petty bourgeois, swinging in between the workers and the capitalists. One day, following a small victory, they would be full of enthusiasm and confidence, imagining that victory was already won and attacking the workers' leaders for being too slow and "compromising." But, the next day, a small setback would be enough to cast them into despair.

Some of those criticized by Lenin heeded his wise words and proved themselves to be outstanding Communists. Others attacked him as a "compromiser." They completely failed to understand the need to combine firmness of revolutionary principle with flexibility of tactics, the need for united action of workers, peasants and other progressive strata in various phases of historical development, for unity of Communists and non-Communists in the labor, national liberation and other progressive movements. Such romantic, unstable elements are attracted to every revolutionary movement as to a magnet. They suffer from an irresistible "itch" to substitute revolutionary phrases for hard revolutionary work. If they should gain the leadership of any movement they are apt to gamble its achievements and resources in reckless, sometimes disastrous, adventures. Failing to gain the leadership, their malice knows no bounds. Such were the followers of Bakunin in the First International and of Trotsky in the Third.

TROTSKY AND THE TROTSKYITES

It is perhaps difficult for young people today to imagine the bitterness of this split or the mischief it wrought in the movement. The Trotskyites formed themselves into an international sect or order. Many of them were originally admirers of the Soviet Union who became disappointed because it did not rapidly enough transform itself into the Utotpia of their dreams, or because of its real failings and shortcomings. Others were Communists who had become disgruntled or soured by grievances, genuine or imagined, against the Party leadership in this or that country. Many were ardent young revolutionaries impatient that the workers were too slow to rise against the oppressors, and convinced that the cause was to be found in the timidity or "treachery" of the Communists, rather than in the objective circumstances. But whatever their motives, sincere or otherwise, in practice the Trotskyites were an unmitigated nuisance in the international labor and liberation movements, a source of disruption and division everywhere. They seemed to have no policy of their own, but just to be waiting to see what the Communists would say in order to condemn it and put forward an opposite viewpoint.

In South Africa the Trotskyites were most successful among the coloured community in Cape Town — not among the workers, but among the teachers and other intellectuals who predominated in the national movements. The effects were regrettable in the extreme. Some intellectuals seemed to be attracted to this particular sect because it gave them the opportunity to be extremely "revolutionary" in words while in practice doing nothing that would bring them into conflict with the authorities or endanger their jobs. They were very good at destructive criticism, but once elected to office in any organization, their sectarianism, their weakness for revolutionary phrasemongering and their recurrent tendency to quarrel among themselves soon led to the collapse of that organization. Such was the fate of the African People's Organization: the pioneer coloured national liberation movement. The result was the virtual isolation of an important section of the coloured community in the Cape from all the historic struggles of the African National Congress and its allies during the fifties: for, sneering and criticizing, these leaders encouraged the people to abstain from participation in the Defiance Campaign and the Congress of the People, and to go on working during the great series of national general strikes and stay-at-homes from 1950 onwards.

In some countries the supporters of Trotsky went even further. In the midst of the Spanish civil war against the Franco rising, which was sponsored by Hitler and Mussolini, the POUM (Marxist Workers' Unity Party) went so far as to organize an "armed revolt" against the Republic behind the lines. An unending stream of envenomed propaganda was poured out declaring that capitalism had been restored in the USSR, that the system was on the verge of collapse, that the workers were seething with revolt, that the Communist leaders all over the world had "sold out." The Trotskyites said, and probably actually believed, that the moment the Soviet Union was attacked by an external enemy the state would collapse and a new revolution would take place, led by the "Left Opposition." These beliefs and hopes were rudely shattered by reality.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL

The Communist International differed from its predecessors, the First and the Second Internationals, not only by virtue of the precision and the uncompromisingly revolutionary character of its principles, designed to exclude opportunists, but also in regard to its Constitution. Reacting against the utter indiscipline and vulgar nationalism of the Social-Democratic parties, which led to the collapse of the Second International, the Third set out to be a single world organization, of which the local Party in each

country was to be merely a "section." It seemed a sound theory. And, indeed, in the first years of the International the experience of the CPSU and other senior parties was of invaluable assistance in establishing and guiding new Communist Parties, in equipping them with an understanding of Marxism-Leninism.

The Third International differed in another most important respect from its predecessors. Inevitably the First International had been confined to the more industrially advanced countries of Western Europe and North America. And, in the Second International, the predominant influence of the imperialistically-minded right-wing labor leaders had meant that socialism was regarded as the exclusive concern of the European workers and the burning problems of national liberation in the colonies never featured seriously on the agenda. All this was changed with the establishment of the Communist International.

For the first time, representatives of the enslaved workers and peoples of Asia, Africa and Central and South America were drawn into the mainstream of the international working class movement, enriching its policy and character and drawing on its knowledge and experience for the benefit of their own people. Under the inspiration of the Communist International, Communist parties were established in many colonies and semi-colonies; the pioneer Communist Party of our continent, that of South Africa, was followed by others in a number of African countries.

In this respect and in many others the Communist International played a splendid and irreplaceable role in the onward march of mankind towards a socialist and Communist movement. In speaking, as one must also do, of certain negative features, one should never forget this immortal positive contribution to the liberation of humanity.

Unfortunately the concept of a highly centralized and closely knit world party has certain latent weaknesses which began to show themselves over the course of time. It is possible and very desirable and necessary for an international working class organization to carry out the sort of broad function which the First International did in Marx's day: to work out in common the broad main trends of the day, and in the light of this analysis to plan the overall strategy of solidarity and advance. Communists need to arrive at a common approach on the big world questions of war and peace, a foreign policy, in all countries, which would serve the needs of the masses. But once an international organization attempts to solve detailed problems of Party policy and tactics in a large number of countries each differing intricately over a wide range of conditions and circumstances, gross errors are unavoidable. Marxism-Leninism is not a set of formulae which enables one, in the seclusion of a far-away academy, to

work out specific programs and slogans for a fighting party. It is a set of tools, the use of which enables such a party to work out a correct policy and strategy only in the thick of the ever-changing battle, with a detailed knowledge of the terrain, the relationship of forces, the shifts and strains of the struggle.

The Sixth World Congress of the International in 1928 discussed the situation in South Africa and the policy of the Party. It summed up its deliberations by adopting, against the will of the South African delegation, the perspective slogan of an "Independent Native Republic." Looked back at with the wisdom of 40 years experience, we see that was not a suitable slogan and it has never been revived. All the same, the discussion and the decision rendered a profound service to the Party and the people of our country. They enabled the healthy elements in the Party to overcome the remnants of white chauvinism which lingered within its ranks. They focused the attention of the Party on the central issue in South Africa, the struggle of the revolutionary masses of oppressed people for national liberation from the special form of colonialism embodied in the political and economic structure of the country. A decisive turn was made from which the Party has never retreated and which finds it most complete and scientific expression in the Party program, *The Road to South African Freedom.*

If the International had confined itself to correcting deviations from Marxism-Leninism and directing the Party's attention towards its inescapable historic task of building a united front for the national-democratic revolution, it would have proved an unmixed blessing for our country and for Africa. It did not do so. The South African Communists fell, in the late twenties and early thirties, to talmudic disputes among themselves over the correct "interpretation" of the slogan, contending groups appealing to the executive committee of the International for a ruling as if it were a sort of supreme court. This was a temptation to the executive, which it did not resist, to dabble in the details of South African affairs, on which it was, naturally, not intimately informed. It was also an excuse for the South African Communists to escape their duty to make a detailed study of all aspects of their own country and to hammer out policy decisions on the anvil of collective and democratic discussion, within the Party.

The harm was compounded in the early thirties when a directive came from the executive of the International that all the affiliated Parties should be "Bolshevized." It is true that the structure of many of the affiliated Parties was too loose, and that Social-Democratic political and organizational ideas were still prevalent in many of them. But a mechanical directive intended to be ap-

plicable to all Parties, irrespective of the dialectics of their own inner development, was liable to do more harm than good. It is probable that much harm was done to a number of parties at this time; certainly this was true in South Africa. Using the directive as their text, a sectarian "ultra-left" group came into control of the Party. They began expelling a number of veteran Communists, including Bunting and Andrews, without a shadow of democratic procedures. Backed by the International, they all but wrecked the Party, and the brief period of their ascendency left a scar which will not soon be forgotten. The development of the Stalin cult in the Soviet Union must be held largely responsible for such arbitrary twisting of the purposes and functions of the International, for the CPSU occupied a unique position of authority and prestige. Many other parties also suffered as a result; a sectarian, dogmatic phase ensued in which the parties affiliated to the Communist International were unable to recognize, or take timely and adequate steps to rally the people against, the growing menace of fascism and war.

UNITED FRONT

This situation was corrected by the Seventh—and last—World Congress of the International, at which the main reports were given by Dimitrov, who spoke on the need to counter the International fascist counter-revolution with a united front of the workers and the whole people, and by Togliatti, who explained the complex international situation, then (1937) on the brink of erupting into the Second World War. The Congress implicitly recognized the limitations of an international organization of Marxist political parties. It was important, in fact essential, for such parties to get together from time to time to discuss the main problems and world developments facing the movement as a whole. It was equally essential for each Party to have the fullest autonomy, to have the right and the inescapable duty to study and master the intricate realities of the changing political and economic set-up in its own country, to enter into short or long term alliances with other progressive movements in the interests of the workers, to guide their actions according to the precise realities of time and place. Otherwise local initiative would be stifled and tragic errors committed.

The formal structure of the Communist International was useful in its earlier period, when most of the parties were small, young and inexperienced, and when many of the greatest writings of Marx and especially of Lenin were not available in translation. But with the development of big and influential Communist parties in many countries, with their own cadres of tried and talented Marxist-Leninists, this structure had become a hindrance. After

the Seventh Congress, most of the affiliated parties proved their maturity and the correctness of this general approach by remarkable political and organizational advances. Naturally mistakes were made as well, but the parties had no one to blame for such mistakes but themselves. It may be observed that one learns a thousand times more from one's own experience and mistakes than from those of anyone else.

In 1943, all the Communist parties were playing an independent and glorious role in extremely varied conditions, in national united anti-fascist and national fronts. The Communist International had helped bring most of these parties into being and to train and purify them in their most formative periods; but with this historic mission fullled, and in the midst of a life-and-death world conflict against nazism and fascism, the Third International was dissolved.

AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Second World War ended in the crushing defeat of the fascist Axis powers. When the dust lifted from the battlefields a completely new situation confronted the peoples of a world very different from that which existed in the times of the First, the Second and the Third Internationals. It was no longer a world dominated by imperialism. The Soviet Union and Mongolia had been joined by no less than eleven more countries of Europe and Asia advancing to socialism under Communist leadership, including China, with the most numerous population of any country. Practically all of Asia and most of Africa broke away from foreign domination, in a continuing revolution for full independence and equality whose logic is inevitably impelling them more and more in a socialist direction. And this process is still in full swing: Cuba is the pioneer of national independence and socialism in the Americas, her example inspiring all the victims of United States' neo-colonialism with hope and the spirit of rebellion. In Southern Africa, and in the Portuguese African colonies, a bitter struggle is raging between the forces of apartheid and reaction, backed by international imperialism, and the heroic national liberation movements.

In these new conditions, vital new problems, whose solution cannot be postponed, face the workers and oppressed people of all countries and their Marxist-Leninist vanguard parties. Problems of state, economic and other relations between the socialist countries; of cooperation between workers of the metropolitan countries and those of their colonies and semi-colonies against the common enemy; of evolving a common line of policy for Communists in the interests of the national liberation, peace, trade unions, women's youth and other progressive movements; of

coordinating solidarity actions with the victims of imperialist and fascist oppression—all these and a hundred other immediate issues need constant review and the working out of Marxist solutions in an ever-changing world. Clearly, nothing would more hamper our cause and please the imperialists than a failure of the Communists to achieve unity, and the dissipation of our energies in quarrels among ourselves.

A number of steps have been taken in recent years to fill this obvious need. Chief among these were the famous gatherings of representatives of Communist and Workers' parties which took place in 1957 and in 1960. At these meetings unanimity was achieved on all the principal issues facing the workers and oppressed people. Methods were decided upon to settle and disagreements that might arise in the future, methods of joint consultation between parties. It was hoped that in this way we would achieve the constant aim of the Marxists over the past century, the aim of the "three Internationals"—to ensure unity.

A SERIOUS PROBLEM

It is most disturbing to have to record that these hopes have not been fulfilled. First the Albanian Party of Labor, and then the Chinese Communist Party, have come out against a number of the decisions jointly arrived at. Worse still, they and their followers have not maintained their arguments on a level of principle; they have descended to abuse and misrepresentations, accusing the CPSU, as well as the majority of Communist Parties which uphold the common decisions, of "revisionism," of being traitors and downright enemies of the workers and oppressed people. Their supporters in a number of countries have broken away from their parties to form rival factions and organizations.

To write about the historic anniversary of Marx's International without drawing attention to this problem would be empty. For this is the most serious problem of international working class unity today: the most serious, in fact, that has ever existed. The present threat to unity comes not from a small clique of petty-bourgeois "ultra-revolutionaries" like Trotsky's group, but from the leaders of one of the biggest and most respected Communist parties, a party which led a glorious and triumphant revolution and is building the foundations of socialism in a country of crucial world importance. It is precisely for this reason that the present dispute is so dangerous. Already it has undermined the fraternal solidarity of the socialist countries. It is poisoning relations between Communists, whose comradeship, hallowed by the blood of countless heroic martyrs of our cause, is closer than that of brothers and sisters. Everything must be done, by all Communists and anti-imperialists, to call a halt to this sterile

and destructive dispute before it deepens into a complete break, a factional split whose bitterness, as experience has taught us, may take many years to heal.

We should have no doubts about the character of this dispute and the direction which it is taking. It is the direction of factionalism.

Internal disagreement and debate, as we have seen in this short and far from complete survey, have always characterized the development of the working class movement. There is nothing alarming and unhealthy about this phenomenon. Provided the debate is serious and principled, it can only be educational, the clash of opinion serving to sharpen and clarify our ideas. But once a disagreement takes on a factional character the real issues at stake become incredibly oversimplified, crude and false. Distortion and misrepresentation replace the give-and-take of reasoned argument. The object is no longer to prove one's opponent to be mistaken, but to depict him as an enemy to be destroyed. Irreparable harm follows. Dear comrades-in-arms are suddenly "transformed" into traitors and spies. Leaders of rival factions are depicted either as enemy agents or as infallible super-men, demi-gods.

Such were the Bakuninist and Trotskyite faction fights in the time of the First and Third Internationals. We can and must act now to see that the same thing does not happen again on a far more serious scale. For there is nothing "inevitable" in this process. We Communists have a hundred years' experience behind us of international organization and international solidarity. We have learnt enough to know that, whatever the provocation, we must not yield to the temptation of a majority to react to a faction by organizing a faction of its own. Remembering our responsibilities we must not react to mudslinging by mudslinging, but maintain all discussions on a high level of principle. We must not reply to intrigue by counter-intrigue, by witch-hunts for "deviationists," but uphold the procedures of democratic discussion. We must not respond to attacks on our leaders by making a fetish of their personalities. And we must strive unceasingly for the restoration and strengthening of the most complete unity of the international Communist movement. The will of the millions of Communists everywhere for unity is a mighty force which no Party and no leader, however eminent, can ignore. That is why every one of us, from the most senior leader of the biggest party to the humblest rank-and-filer or supporter of the smallest, has a solemn duty to fight factionalism.

WAY OUT OF THE CRISIS POSSIBLE

Ali Yata

FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
MOROCCAN COMMUNIST PARTY

The discussion of the non-confidence resolution submitted by the National Alliance of Popular Forces to the June session of parliament splotlighted the deep crisis plaguing Morocco, a crisis which has affected the economy, finance and the social and political life of the country.

A few figures will help gain a better idea of the economic impasse.

According to the Central Statistical Service, between 1958 and 1963 the population of the country grew by 20 per cent, while gross output registered a mere 10 per cent increase.

Consumption per citizen in 1964 is 10 per cent below the 1955 level, and unless changes take place in our economy, next year consumption is expected to drop by another 9 per cent compared with 1960, the year when the government of Abdallah Ibrahim, Secretary of the National Alliance of Popular Forces was ousted. This spells catastrophic growth of the misery of the people.

The economic derangement is also illustrated by the state of our national surrency, the dirham. Valued at 93,000 million dirhams in 1963, the currency stock went down to 27,000 million in March 1964 and hit a new low of 17,000 million in June. The issue of 7,000 million dirhams authorized by the International Monetary Fund in June will completely exhaust our external gold assets and necessitate a devaluation of the dirham, which is wanted by the monopoly circles and which will further worsen the plight of the masses.

Following independence the wages have been actually frozen. The wage rise of 5 per cent during the 20 per cent devaluation in 1959 in no way increased the purchasing capacity of the working people. The cost of living went up by 40 per cent (prior to the last increase in the prices of sugar, tobacco, petrol, etc.). In the course of one year the price of sugar, a staple product next only to bread in importance, almost doubled.

Unemployment is growing daily. Official estimates put it at 350,000 in the cities, or more than 20 per cent of the labor force,

and more than half of the rural population. According to official data, 20 percent of able-bodied men and 48 per cent of women in our population of 13 million are fully unemployed.

Every year 400,000 people are added who have to be fed, clothed, provided housing and medical assistance; 150,000 people to be given work; 70,000 children to be sent to school. Forty thousand dwelling have to be built in the city alone.

The brunt of this demographic increase weighs down on the shoulders of a people suffering from want and unemployment. Politically, this means that since independence our country has been living on the reserves of capital accumulation inherited form the protectorate period and that these reserves have been depleted by now.

The recent governments are unquestionably responsible for the tragic determination of our economic condition, but the main reason is that independent Morocco adopted the policy of capitalist liberalism which protects the interests of the imperialists and the privileged classes, and dooms the people to exploitation and poverty.

Far from serving the interests of the people, this policy has enriched only the imperialist monopolies, foreign capitalists and their allies and local agents, to the detriment of the toilers and the masses generally.

The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the general crisis that has gripped our country is that it must abandon this harmful, anti-national and anti-popular courses and steer along the road of non-capitalist development, the road of socialism.

Fraternal Arab and African countries, the United Arab Republic and the Algerian People's Democratic Republic among them, realized this historical necessity having suffered the collapse of the capitalist road or having seen this happening in the states which took this road after independence.

We proceed from the principle that nothing is more alien to the spirit and rights of the peoples, including the people of Morocco, than capitalist exploitation of man by man. An analysis of the situation in the country shows that capitalist orientation subordinated to neo-colonialism is leading us to catastrophe. This is also true of the other countries which have chosen the capitalist path. On the contrary, the achievements of the countries that have embarked on the road of socialism are very encouraging and give us a positive perspective.

To come out for socialism does not mean slavishly to imitate any one, but to draw lessons from the history and experience of our country and all the peoples fighting for economic, political and social emancipation.

But in order to attain this highest stage of the liberation of

our people and build a modern prospering Morocco it is not enough to repeat endlessly the word "socialism," as is often done in our country, or vociferously to call the ruling party a Democratic Socialist Party. Political conditions have to be provided for changing the orientation now being forced upon our country.

One such condition is agreement of all progressive and patriotic forces of the nation reached on a common basis.

This agreement is feasible because the masses grow increasingly discontented with the failure of the rulers. They have realized how harmful internal strife is and seen from their own experience that unity alone will lead the country out of the blind alley. But the masses, unless they allow themselves to be deceived by reactionary, demagogy, expect from the progressive and patriotic forces concrete commitments, especially as regards political arrangement and an economic and social program.

It is impossible to criticize the economic, financial and social position of our country without touching upon its political problems.

In the first place, it is necessary to revise the 1962 Constitution in a democratic spirit, renovate the national, provincial, local and corporate assemblies, which were appointed rather than elected, and replace the Bahnini government with a representative government of the progressive and patriotic forces, which alone can defend and extend democracy.

It is necessary for the national progressive and patriotic forces to work out an economic and social program aimed at saving the country from ruin and restoring its economy.

Therefore a radical agrarian reform without any compensation should be effected to put the speediest end to the profound inequality which paralyzes and weighs heavily on our peasantry, hampering the development and modernization of our agriculture.

An effective and rational industrialization of the country has to be carried out, drawing upon all the internal resources and unselfish aid from friendly countries granted on the basis of noninterference in our domestic affairs and respect for our anti-imperialist struggle.

Vigorous measures should be taken to protect our national currency, which has never before been in such a grave condition. The land's wealth should be returned to the nation: on the financial plane, through the nationalization of banks and insurance companies, and on the industrial plane, through the nationalization of mines and big industrial establishments. Nationalization should be carried out without ruinous compensation payments. In some instances fair compensation may be paid, but without any damage to our economy. At the same time

strict measures should be envisaged to prevent the outflow of capital and currency from the country.

The wages and salaries should be immediately raised by 30 per cent, as demanded by the Moroccan Labor Union.

Such are the main points of the immediate program on which the progressive and patriotic forces can easily reach agreement.

Rapid implementation of this program is impossible without the spirit of mutual confidence and the mobilization and enthusiasm of the people. This, in turn, can be achieved by declaring the amnesty of all the political prisoners jailed since 1956, and granting democratic liberties.

The present crisis is at once political and economic. Taking into account the exceptional gravity of the situation and the vast revolutionary potentialities of our people these practical political and economic measures are urgent.

Any measures not differing radically from the capitalist and monarchic path we have traversed will fail, just as all the previous ones did, and the crisis will be further aggravated.

Therefore, we solemnly call upon all responsible leaders, militants, progressives and sincere patriots to get together, come to agreement, and act in common on the sound and democratic platform proposed by us.

Casablanca, July 28, 1964

DOCUMENTS* OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ECUADOR FOR DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

For our Party members to be able better to comprehend the policy of the Party and to implement it more efficiently it is essential that they correctly assess the situation both inside and outside the country and make a Marxist-Leninist analysis of it. Hence the need to formulate some basic principles that will help appraise correctly the trend of internal and international events and prove the correctness of the Communist stand.

Fairly broad sections of the population, especially the vacillating petty-bourgeois elements and elements from other classes, who have been led astray by the lying propaganda of the enemies of the people, still cherish illusions regarding the possibility of an intermediate position between capitalism and socialism and tend to misinterpret our chief slogan of the struggle for democracy and peace, for peaceful coexistence and disarmament, as "conciliation" with imperialism at the expense of the national-liberation and revolutionary movement.

I

THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

1. Is There an Intermediate Position Between Socialism and Capitalism?

Many representatives of the above-mentioned sections are acting in a revolutionary spirit; they are fighting for the interests of the people, against social injustice. against the misery and suffering of the masses. At the same time they are not against capitalism, for they consider that all these problems can be solved within the framework of capitalism. Clearly we Communists cannot demand that these people declare themselves to be "enemies of capitalism" as a condition for joint struggle for the solution of concrete problems of improving the conditions of the masses and ensuring the country's progress. That would be sheer sectarianism. It is precisely in order to avoid sectarianism, in order to promote unity of action and avoid fatal consequences for the democratic and revolutionary movement that may follow from incorrect appraisal that we Communists

*Slightly abridged.

must have complete clarity on the question of whether this neutral or intermediate position is possible; is it possible in the present internal and international situation, to fight for the interests of the people while keeping capitalist rule intact, disregarding, to some extent, the fundamental principles of scientific socialism, and without drawing upon the rich revolutionary experience of the peoples who have already won freedom and are building socialism and communism?

Such seemingly "independent" positions are undoubtedly harmful to the struggle of the masses, for they create a breach which the imperialist agents utilize for smuggling in anti-communism and for engineering splits. Such positions facilitate the advocacy of the idea that all problems can be solved without the participation either of the capitalists or the Communists. These theses merely add grist to the capitalist mill. In view of this it is of vital importance that we should explain this problem. We do not propose to make an exhaustive analysis of the matter; we shall merely try, on the basis of our country's revolutionary experience, to make some assessments which will help us answer the question correctly.

2. The Policy of the Peoples

Only two kinds of policy are possible in the world today.

One is them is the policy of the peoples, the policy of those who are fighting for a new life for the masses, for the elimination of antiquated institutions and impediments to the country's development and improvement of the well-being of the peoples. This struggle is directed against any stagnation, backwardness, oppression, exploitation and injustice from which the overwhelming majority of the population suffers.

This is a progressive policy. Consequently, all actions of the masses accord with it: the actions of workers, office employees, artisans, specialists, etc., for better living and working conditions, higher wages and incomes, and so on; of students and intellectuals for better conditions for study and artistic and scientific work, for decent remuneration; of peasants against feudal oppression and for a democratic agrarian reform; of the unemployed for their needs and above all for permanent and well-paid work; of women against discrimination, for political and social equality, for constant child care. In line with this policy is also the struggle for more far-reaching aims: against feudalism, oligarchies and imperialist monopolies, for peace, for national and social emancipation. All these actions, seemingly disconnected, intertwine, reinforce and complement each other, because they all are aimed against a common enemy—capitalism (identified, in our conditions, with the local oligarchy and foreign

imperialism), which resists any change, any advance, any gain of the people.

Such is the objective state of affairs, and it does not depend on those who take part in actions and on whether or not they consider they are fighting against capitalism. In addition, herein lies the basis for a broad unity of action between the Communist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party and other democratic political groups; unity which emerges from, and is determined by, class interests and by the demands put forward by the Confederation of Working People together with the Coastal Agricultural Workers' Federation and the Indian Federation and their organizations; unity which has also been developed, in one way or another, by other class and democratic associations.

Capitalism is a system of exploitation and oppression of the working people in general by a handful of industrialists and monopolists who have captured the means of production, the wealth of the country and the machinery of state and exercise their economic, political and ideological rule, penetrating into all fields of human activity. In our country, already several months before the military coup of July 11, 1963, the exploiter classes, subservient to U.S. imperialism, had lost domination in the government, the National Congress, the judicature, the provincial and cantonal councils, etc., although they utilized the constitutional system they had created in order to seize the institutions of state and make them serve their class interests. In addition to state power, the big capitalists possess powerful economic levers. Supported by the imperialist monopolies, they have become a powerful oligarchy grouped around the banks, the chambers of commerce, and so on. In conformity with the "law," all these organizations participate in a large number of big joint-stock companies, such as the Institute of Social Insurance and Labor, the United Banks of Economic Development, the Central Bank, the Bank Administration, the Charity Council, Social Insurance, the Red Cross Society, the Supreme University Council, etc.

This oligarchy is closely connected with U.S. imperialism which, in turn, controls and directs the most important aspects of the life of the country through its inter-American cooperative services(health, education, agriculture, military aid, etc.) on the strength of the so-called Point IV (which enables them to interfere in all kinds of "technical" activity and split the movements of workers, students, peasants and artisans, as well as to establish control over university organizations); resorting to the assistance of the Peace Corps (which helps the imperialists infiltrate all fields of social life, sport in particular, to carry on espionage work and facilitate imperialist penetration), and finally,

with the aid of the Alliance for Progress — the main channel through which all these activities are directed for the purpose of subordinating our country still more to the U.S. monopolies. This colonialist activity of U.S. imperialism is assisted by such supra-national institutions as the Organization of American States, the International Monetary Fund, the Latin American Free Trades Association, the Inter-American Bank of Development, and others. Their objective is to impose on us the neo-colonialist *diktat* of U.S. imperialism, which is incompatible with our sovereignty, free trade, the stability of our currency, and our national interests.

The local oligarchy and imperialism have concentrated in their hands vast economic, political, social and ideological power. Their investments enable them to control the press and other propaganda media (the radio, television, etc.) and supply them with the propaganda material without which these organs of "free speech and thought" could not exist. They have the services of the majority of bourgeois party leaders. By supporting various political parties and groups the plutocracy and imperialism can palm off forgeries as a free expression of the will of the people and hoodwink the masses with the spurious propaganda of "representative democracy." Sport, the cinema and the church —all are in the service of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, in the service of this machine which the exploiters have streamlined in order to be able to suppress nearly the entire population and which has spread its tentacles throughout the country.

That is why actions for the demands of all sections of the population inevitably come into collision with capitalism and imperialism, with their instruments and forms of exploitation and oppression. This means that in the final analysis all actions of the people are essential in the great battle against capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression. However, it is essential that all the contingents of the masses led by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, should mobilize all forces in the struggle for the vital demands, that these actions should merge into one big revolutionary stream. This will lead to still greater unity, better organization, and joint leadership. In this connection the Program of our Party advances the main strategic slogan of building up a National Liberation Front spearheaded against imperialist domination. This Front will constitute the basis for the subsequent development of the struggle against capitalism and the entire system of exploitation. This has been demonstrated by the revolutionary experience of the peoples who have freed themselves from the colonial yoke and imperialist dependence, such as the peoples of the Soviet Union, Cuba, China, Algeria and other Asian and African countries who

are building socialism or embarking on the socialist road.

Thus our Program stresses that in the final analysis it is the task of the revolutionary movement, and of our Party in particular, to ensure that the various isolated actions, including actions by some bourgeois circles, as well as popular actions of a purely economic or even reformist character, should become part of the common struggle for the aims of the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, democratic revolution and for the subsequent transition to socialism.

This thesis is corroborated by the revolutionary experience of our country. The united actions of workers, peasants, office employees and others, supported and headed by the Confederation of Working People, the biggest united working people's organization, were marked, despite their limited objectives and participation, by great militancy and resulted in direct clashes with the entire apparatus of the bourgeois dictatorship — the police, the army, the chambers of commerce, agriculture and industry, the press, radio, television and other propaganda media, the executive power, the National Congress, the judiciary system, the Ministry of Labor, and various public bourgeois organizations. This showed to the people the anti-popular, reactionary class nature of the bourgeois state and contributed to the rapid rise of the revolutionary sentiment of the masses.

Such was the case with many working people's actions in Guayaquil and other regions of the country. The same can be said about the peasants working at the big estates of local landlords and foreign monopolies in many coastal and mountain provinces. Many of these actions developed into real class battles.

On the other hand, in addition to being directed against one and the same enemy, all these actions have another common feature: in order to be effective more democracy is needed, although at the same time they contain elements of a potential broadening of democracy. This is not to say that they can take place only in conditions of democracy. But they should never be isolated from the struggle for democracy, which is primary for all sections fighting for their specific demands, irrespective of their views on democracy. The very fact of taking joint actions and presenting demands promises democratic freedoms, such as the freedom of organization, assembly and presentation of demands, the freedom of thought, etc.

The essence of the demands that are being advanced, the actions undertaken by the masses, and the means they employ to secure victory signify an extension of democracy. This is taking place daily in the course of actions by workers, peasants and other working people. If all democratic freedoms, even the

most limited ones, are not utilized whenever possible, and if they are not defended with maximum determinations, energy, ardour and persistence, which alone can foil the maneuvers of the reactionaries, exploiters and their organs of repression, democracy is weakened and the way is paved for the establishment of the most undemocratic, cynical and ruthless regimes. That was precisely what finally happened in our country, where an ultra-reactionary military dictatorship was established.

In recent years the fighters for democracy in our country did not act with sufficient energy. The governments of Velesco, Plaza, Ponce and others increasingly restricted the democratic freedoms of the people, cynically trampled upon them and persecuted progressives and democrats, who failed to organize a vigorous large-scale rebuff. The press and other propaganda media were free to misrepresent everything pertaining to the revolutionary and popular movements and their leaders, whereas only insignificant popular and trade-union press facilities were at our disposal. That prevented us from duly exposing their efforts to deceive the people. That was why the results of the actions of workers and other strata were modest, and even big successes, such as those scored in 1936, and 1944 and 1961, were short-lived. Unquestionably, all democratic gains were won in hard struggle, including a popular uprising. But it should be admitted that we did not display constant militant vigilance and failed to act promptly and resolutely against any, even the slightest, infringements of democracy.

That was why the reactionaries and imperialists were able to utilize a whole arsenal of means and subterfuges to attack and reduce to nil the democratic gains of the people, the workers in the first place. When the masses joined in the active struggle demanding satisfaction of their demands and respect for their rights (recognized by bourgeois legislation), the employers, landlords and other reactionaries resorted to all kinds of anti-democratic and unscrupulous measures designed to deceive and confuse the masses. They suborned judges to institute proceedings and declare the demands of the masses to be unjust, bribed officials from labor bodies* and police chiefs and launched a slanderous anti-communist campaign in the yellow press. Confronted with the growing unity and solidarity of the working people and the masses generally and with the mobilization of their forces threatening to put an end to the injustices, the employers and other reactionaries began to flout their own bourgeois laws and hired assassins and other criminals in an attempt to break the militant spirit of the movement. Having

---

Organizations dealing with problems of labor.—**Ed.**

failed to suppress the struggle of the masses for their demands with the help of these means, the reactionaries used the army, the police and the navy. When even these extreme measures proved insufficient to check the rise of the popular forces, the reactionaries unleashed terror in order to lay the blame on the working people and the democratic forces, to slander the fighting patriots. They launched a vicious anti-communist campaign and ruthless repressions. Realizing that the actions of the masses and their revolutionary spirit threatened to topple the already shaky edifice of so-called bourgeois democracy, and wishing to save it and "gain time," they openly steered a course towards a reactionary military dictatorship. There is no doubt that continued actions by the masses, who have gained new experience, will demolish this prop in the shape of the military dictatorship, which, incidentally, is beginning to disintegrate rapidly itself.

The bourgeois-democratic regime, being a limited democratic system, does not promote the interests of the majority of the population. While serving a minority class and carrying out its policy of exploitation and oppression, it is confronted with attempts of the masses to use at least the curtailed democratic freedoms proclaimed by bourgeois constitutions. But unless the masses fight for the consolidation and extension of the limited democratic forms existing under capitalism and unless their democratic gains are guaranteed, it will be impossible to pave the way to achieving higher forms of democracy, the democracy of the most developed type which is established under socialism and blossoms out fully under communism.

Highly valuable in this respect are the lessons of the struggle of the North American Negroes, who do not limit themselves to demanding a legislation conforming to human rights and aimed at ending racial discrimination, but fight selflessly for the realization of their rights already provided for in the law recently adopted in the United States.

★ ★ ★

In their day-to-day activity the Communists cannot disregard the democratic essence of the struggle of the people for their legitimate rights and the fact that this struggle is being waged against a common enemy. What does this mean for the people on the one hand, that in the present conditions the struggle against the military dictatorship which oppresses the people is a prime task, and, on the other, that all actions of the most diverse strata for the most diverse aims help to undermine the dictatorship. We also want to say that the struggle against the military dictatorship should of necessity be combined with

popular actions for vital political, economic, democratic and other demands, for the aims of the national-liberation revolution, i.e., for the program of the entire people.

The slogan of the struggle for democracy thus presupposes the utmost development of all mass actions for any demand of the people, for radical changes in the defense of democratic gains. At the same time it calls for the struggle against the dictatorship, against all reactionary maneuvers and deals aimed at deceiving the people, who want an end to the dictatorship and a genuinely democratic regime, and inducing them to accept "constitutional solutions" whose civilian garb conceals unending repressions and attacks on the rights of the people, rejection of democracy, and the whole reactionary and traitorous policy of the military dictatorship. We are not opposed to a return to the constitutional order, but we want the regime which will replace the dictatorship and the new constitution to express the will of the people and fully conform to the interests of the people; we want the government which will emerge on the ruins of this sinister dictatorship to be a popular and democratic one and represent the forces fighting against the dictatorship and for the program of the people. This naturally demands great effort to achieve unity of action and build up a national-liberation front.

This concept of the struggle for democracy corresponds to the essence of the policy of the people stated above and to the policy which the Communist Party pursued prior to the establishment of the dictatorship.

3. The Policy of the Ruling Classes

There is a different policy, the very reverse of the policy of the people. It is the policy of the ruling classes: capitalists, imperialists and feudal latifundists, the policy of those who want to preserve their class privileges and retain their hold on the machinery of state and all its levers, to continue to oppress and plunder the people, and rake in ever bigger profits. This policy, consequently, is directed against all actions of the masses for their demands and interests. The policy of the ruling classes is reactionary, for, in addition to the aforesaid, it gives rise to plots and meneuvers to restore the old methods of exploitation and oppression destroyed as a result of the stubborn struggle of the people. In order to protect their interests, which are diametrically opposed to the interests of the people, the local oligarchies and the foreign imperialist monopolies not only resist the struggle of the people, but also undertake steps to prevent them from utilizing all means of struggle by curtailing and even abolishing altogether the democratic freedoms won by them. They employ

a wide diversity of means, such as the church, racism, anti-communism, etc., to split the mass movements. The oligarchies and the imperialist monopolies and those who support their reactionary policy are the worst enemies of deomcracy and of the unity of the people today. Confronted with the victorious development of the popular struggle, the imperialists do not hesitate to implant fascist concepts and methods. This is taking place in the United States and other imperialist countries, where fascist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan, the John Birch Society, the American Legion and their like are stepping up their reactionary activities and committing crimes in the hope of coming to power with the help of the fascist candidate of the Republican Party.

Such is the policy which is being pursued in our country today and against which the people of Ecuador are fighting.

4. Conclusions

It thus turns out that actually there is no middle-of-the-way position on this issue. There can be no policy intermediate between the ruling classes' policy of fascist reaction and the democratic and progressive policy of the people; between capitalism and socialism. This must be made absolutely clear to the masses. But such a view should not be allowed to become an obstacle to united action with other forces which do not yet understanding of the problem.

An analysis of the content of the two kinds of policy solely possible today explains why the struggle for democracy is, along with the struggle for peace, the central slogan of the political life in all countries. Whereas the capitalists seek to destroy democracy and sow discord among the masses, the peoples are fighting for democracy, for its extension, and for the unity of all democratic, revolutionary and patriotic movements.

The struggle for democracy reflects the aspirations of the working people, students, patriots and progressives, the aspirations of the entire people. It constitutes the essence of all their actions for the immediate demands and for structural changes in society, that is, for the full implementation of the program of the people.

II

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

5. Two Positions in World Politics

The two kinds of policy we have spoken about above, i.e., the two different attitudes to progress and to the well-being of the masses, clash in a severe battle in the international arena,

too. The progressive and revolutionary forces headed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are waging a constant struggle, in all fields, in all forms and employing all means, against the forces of capitalism headed and directed by U.S. imperialism. In view of the main content of our time, and the fact that the peoples are inflicting defeat after defeat upon imperialism and the local reactionary forces, no doubt is left as to who will win: the peoples or their oppressors.

Whereas socialism is growing and developing, imperialism is losing its positions and its influence in the world is weakening. The policy pursued by the ruling classes in the international arena reflects the aggressive, bellicose aspirations of the imperialist monopolies. The policy of the peoples accords with the peaceful aspirations of all mankind. There is no intermediate position in this field, either.

6. The Cold War, the Arms Race, Bases and Aggressive Blocs

Aware of the ground slipping away from under their feet, the imperialists are trying to postpone their doom. They see the only way out in implanting fascism in both the metropolitan and the dependent and colonial countries, and also in a world thermonuclear war. They pursue a cold war policy, engage in brinkmanship, carry on a frenzied arms drive, militarize their economies, set up military blocs, and criminally encroach on the sovereignty and independence of other countries: Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, Cyprus, the Congo (Leopoldville), and others.

The atmosphere of cold war enables the reactionaries the world over to strike blows at their peoples with a view to continuing their plunder, perpetuating class oppression and crushing the national-liberation movement. An example of this was provided by the establishment, on July 11, 1963, of a reactionary dictatorship in our country by U.S. imperialism in collusion with the local reactionaries. Imperialism is setting up fascist-like dictatorships in other Latin-American countries as well. It is waging a dirty war against the people of South Vietnam. Not long ago it launched a war against the people of Patrice Lumumba. Threats are constantly addressed to Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and other countries.

★ ★ ★

Capitalists, imperialists and all ruling classes are uniting to defend their interests on a world scale and pursue a common foreign policy designed to facilitate their rule over other peoples and class oppression in their own countries. This policy is con-

ditioned primarily by the interests of the warlike, aggressive monopolies.

For our countries, dependent on U.S. imperialism, the foreign policy of the oppressors means militarization of the economy, involving colossal allocations for the purchase of obsolete material and the maintenance of the army command, of its venal, parasitic and traitorous "elite" and used by the imperialists as a weapon against the people. Unsettled border conflicts are used to intensify the arms race in our countries, which enables the imperialist monopolies, selling obsolete weapons to us at exorbitant prices, to obtain big profits. Sabre-rattling is used to intimidate our own people rather than the military castes and aggressive ruling classes in the neighboring countries. Therefore our Party, conscious of our people's profound love for peace, was the first to advance the demand for a revision of the Rio de Janeiro protocol, forced on us by U.S. imperialism, under which we lost almost half of our territory. Together with the people the Communist Party of Ecuador hails the initiative of the Soviet government in proposing an international agreement to rule out war as a means of settling border and territorial disputes.

The attitude of the different states to international problems is bound up with the nature of the policy conducted at home. We in Ecuador know from our own experience the consequences of the cold war policy, preparation for a world thermonuclear conflict, and the arms race. We have had to suffer from traitorous and anti-democratic regimes, including the dictatorship which has now been imposed on us and which is reactionary to the extreme and subservient to U.S. imperialism.

The main features of this policy are:

—enormous military budgets, militarization of the economy, and development of militarism in all its aspects;

—astronomical growth of taxes and rising cost of living due to the colossal arms expenditures;

—growing improverishment of the people, disregard fo rtheir needs, for the organization of public works and all kinds of social welfare schemes;

—backwardness and deformation of the national economy, which is geared exclusively to supplying the basic raw materials to the imperialist monopolies;

—increasing dependence of the various sections of the bourgeoisie on imperialism;

—extensive support to the landlords in intesifying their exploitation and plunder of the peasants;

—government support to the big bourgeoisie, latifundists and

imperialism in peddling anti-communism, launching all kinds of reactionary companies and splitting working-class and democratic organizations;

—ruthless suppression of working people's action and their organizations to enable the ruling classes and imperialism further to intensify the exploitation of the working class and the people generally;

—abolition of democratic gains and guarantees and consolidation of the reactionaries' rule;

—growing interference of the imperialist agents in all fields of state and public activity, increasing dependence of the country on imperialism, more and more blatant suppression of national sovereignty, etc.

7. The Struggle for Peace, Peaceful Coexistence and Disarmament

Thus, the cold war serves the capitalists and imperialists as a means of preserving their class privileges and the "right" to oppress other peoples. Contrarily, the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, against the incendiary plans of the imperialist monopolies is the highest form of the struggle for the rights and interests of the peoples, including also the demands of the working class and all other working people. It is a struggle to weaken and defeat imperialism, which is out to preserve the most repugnant forms of exploitation and oppression of the peoples. Hence the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence is not at all a "complot" of the revolutionaries with the capitalists. Essentially, it is a special form of the class struggle waged by the working people in their countries to fulfill the historical mission of transforming capitalist society into socialist society. it is indispensable for the broadest possible development of the liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialist oppression and capitalist exploitation.

It is indisputable that in the years of peaceful coexistence new countries have broken away from the capitalist system; the national-liberation movement has been on the upgrade; the class struggle in the developed capitalist countries has grown in intensity; more than 50 independent states have emerged in Asia and Africa, and the banner of socialism has been raised in all the continents, including America, where Cuba has dealt a staggering blow at U.S. imperialism. The policy of peaceful coexistence has demonstrated its tremendous revolutionizing force.

On the other hand, this policy accords with the humane aspirations of Communists and to the will of the peoples, who for centuries have striven to rid mankind of the scourge of war. To deliver mankind from the threat of thermonuclear war, which can destroy most of the earth's population and its riches, is the main task today.

That is why the progressives, democrats and revolutionaries maintain that struggle for peace is, along with the struggle for democracy, one of the paramount tasks of all the peoples.

★ ★ ★

The splitters seek to belittle the importance of the struggle for peace and even to discredit it, calling it a "fraud." They are trying to convince the peoples that peace is merely a notion, a "category" that has been given currency in the sphere of international relations and foreign policy. They distort the content and significance of the struggle for peace. They fail to realize this struggle creates a situation in which the imperialist powers are compelled to coexist and in which they are powerless to unleash a thermonuclear war, although they periodically engineer, for this purpose, provocations and even wage local wars. They overlook the fact that if a world missile-nuclear war has not broken out up till now, this is thanks to the colossal might of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, to the struggle of the peace-loving peoples, who comprise the overwhelming majority of mankind.

This distortion of the essence of the struggle for peace is not accidental. It is a consequence of very serious causes. In some cases, it stems logically from the crazy "theories" that war and the destruction it brings is, as it were, a "bridge" for mankind to go over to a higher stage of development. In others, these views are spread by "ultra-revolutionaries" who have deserted to the enemy and degenerated into shameless agents of imperialism, merely posing as anti-imperialists. The struggle for peace, man's age-old dream, is at the same time, as everybody knows, an active, often bitter and even armed, struggle against the imperialists and their schemes. It is a constant clash with, and constant exposure of, the oppressive and warlike policy of the imperialists. The splitters and "ultra-revolutionaries," however, no longer regard imperialism as an enemy but as an ally.

Nor is it fortuitous that the imperialists and "ultra-revolutionary" renegades conceal the political character of the struggle for peace both in the national and international arena. This is nothing but a vain attempt to deprive the struggle for peace of its inexhaustible vitality, to minimize its tremendous significance in international politics. The attitude of states to the cold war and to the preparations for thermonuclear war is determined by the following factors:

a) their line in world politics: attitude to the arms race, military bases, military pacts and blocs, economic blockade; their position in international organizations, etc.;

b) their international positions as a whole: expansion or con-

traction of trade with other countries; acceptance or rejection of lists of goods restricting foreign trade; extension or curtailment of scientific, cultural and diplomatic contacts with definite countries; participation or non-participation in subversive activities against the socialist countries, and so on;

c) their concrete obligations in the international arena: attitude to the factors and consequences of the cold war, the arms race, etc.

We have seen already how the domestic policy of our country is affected by its international policy pursued under the influence of the cold war, the arms race, etc. It is impossible to separate internal policy from foreign policy; a country can have no "democratic" internal policy if in its foreign policy it follows in the wake of the warmongers and advocates of international tension.

Not to appreciate the rich content of the struggle for peace means, in our opinion, escaping from reality, refusing to see the developments taking place around us, failing to realize the tremendous importance of the big and small battles which can, in the course of the struggle for peace, be waged victoriously against imperialism and the local oligarchies, undermining their power, influence and rule. It means shutting one's eyes to the need for the peoples to develop resolutely the struggle for peace, which is a component of the struggle for their emancipation, in order to compel the governments to pursue a national policy and respect democratic freedoms.

III

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE IS THE MOST REVOLUTIONARY AND AT THE SAME TIME THE MOST HUMANE STRUGGLE

8. Peaceful Coexistence Policy Has Nothing in Common With "Pacifism"

Peaceful coexistence should not be understood either as "pacifism" or as refusal to react properly to the violence used by imperialism in the world and in every country where the struggle for national liberation is mounting and where it supports the local reactionary forces. Peaceful coexistence should be understoon as it is understood by the Soviet comrades and the leaders of other Communist parties and not by those who pervert its essence so as to be able to attack Marxist-Leninists. The essence of peaceful coexistence as explained by *Kommunist*, theoretical journal of the CPSU, is this:

—the struggle between the two systems is transferred into the sphere of economic development and raising the well-being of the people. In the course of peaceful economic competition the

economic and defense potential of the socialist states grows steadily and the socialist world system is becoming an ever more powerful factor of preventing war between states;

—the advantages of socialism become ever more obvious, with the resulting increase of its influence on the growth of the revolutionary forces the world over;

—the masses are acting ever more vigorously for peace, to prevent thermonuclear catastrophe, consolidate the anti-imperialist forces and isolate the monopoly bourgeoisie;

—disarmament is imposed on imperialism and its attempts to export counter-revolution are frustrated, which creates increasingly favorable conditions for the national-liberation and class struggle and brings nearer its victorious completion all over the world;

—the countries that have freed themselves from the colonial yoke are rendered ever greater political and economic assistance facilitating their national revival and transition to the non-capitalist path of development, which accords with the interests of their peoples.

Such is the clear-cut position of the world Communist movement headed by the CPSU. Such is the position of the Communist Party of Ecuador.

Thus, the policy of peaceful coexistence presupposes: active and courageous struggle against imperialism in the economic field, in politics and ideology alike; resolute defense by the socialist countries and peace-loving forces of the revolutionary peoples against attacks by the imperialists and their flunkeys; reliable assistance to the peoples in the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism; growth of the might of the social'st countries, including their military might designed to prevent world thermonuclear war and imperialist aggression against other peoples.

★ ★ ★

We have dwelt on these aspects of the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence to demonstrate the utter falsity of the position held by the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, who contend that this struggle is a "fraud;" that "it can in no way replace the revolutionary struggle of the masses in different countries;" that "it demands that all the oppressed peoples discontinue the revolutionary struggle and 'coexist peacefully' with imperialism and colonialism;" that "Khrushchov has departed from the Communist positions as regards support for just wars;" that this policy "tends to compel the oppressed nations to accept colonialism;" that with their peaceful coexistence policy the CPSU leaders "intended to ensure by hook or by crook that the

peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America discontinue the revolutionary struggle." These and similar attacks are contained in the comments published in *Jenminjihpao* on October 22, 1963, and in *Hungchi,* theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Chinese

★ ★ ★

Thus, there is no intermediate position between capitalism (imperialism) and socialism in the sphere of international relations. If the newly-free Asian and African countries declare that they hold a neutral position (active neutrality), they regard it as "independent" with respect to military blacs; they regard it from the standpoint of their attitude of resistance to imperialism. Hence, they are neutral only as far as military blocs are concerned. The struggle of these countries for peace and peaceful coexistence is a means of defending their national independence and national economic development and, consequently, is marked by a clearly-expressed anti-imperialist trend and ever closer relations with the socialist world. From the socialist countries alone can they expect reliable economic assistance and powerful political and military support for the successful realization of their objectives.

★ ★ ★

Developments in each of our countries and in the whole world show ever more clearly that whereas imperialism and the capitalist oligarchies, seeking to enslave other peoples, to preserve their colonial rule or introduce neo-colonialism, are taking recourse to fascist reaction and to cold war (with systematic attempts to turn it into a shooting war), the peoples, on the contrary, are fighting for democracy and peace in order to destroy the power of the capitalist monopolies, free themselves from the imperialist rule, safeguard their newly-won independence, and march firmly along the road of progress and prosperity.

Communist Party of Ecuador, August, 1964.
Executive of the Central Committee,

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

26

Included in this Issue

47TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION
L. I. Brezhnev

INTERVIEW WITH HO CHI MINH

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 26

contents

47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT SOCIALIST REVOLUTION
L. I. Brezhnev **5**

THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY
Georges Marchais **24**

INTERVIEW WITH HO CHI MINH **41**

STATEMENT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, IRAQI COMMUNIST PARTY **44**

OPEN LETTER
To Movement of November 13 from Political Commission, CC, Guatemalan Party of Labor **49**

FIRMNESS OF PRINCIPLES OF CPSU AND CONTINUITY OF ITS LENINIST LINE
Interview with R. Arismendi **56**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
December 9, 1964



47th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT SOCIALIST REVOLUTION*

L. I. Brezhnev

FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

Comrades,

Forty-seven years separate us from the day when the world's first socialist state was born in the flames of revolutionary battles that were started by the proletariat of Petrograd under the leadership of the Bolsheviks and taken up by the insurgent workers, peasants, and soldiers of the whole of Russia.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a new birthday for our country. It opened the way for the people to freedom, justice and happiness. At the same time, the October Revolution changed the historic destinies of all mankind. The flashing beacon of our revolution today continues to inspire the peoples on all continents, lighting up the way for them to liberation from imperialist oppression, the way to freedom, independence, socialism and communism. The great renovation of the world begun by the October Revolution in Russia is a process no one can stop today.

The anniversary of the October Revolution is the greatest holiday of the Soviet people. At the same time, it is an international holiday. It is celebrated by the working people of the entire world, by all friends of freedom, peace and progress on earth. And it gives us great satisfaction and sincere joy that representatives of the fraternal socialist countries and other foreign friends of ours are with us today, having come to the Soviet Union to take part in the celebrations of the 47th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government, and on behalf of all the Soviet people, I warmly welcome our dear guests from the socialist countries: the Bulgarian delegation, headed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov; the Hungarian delegation, headed by Comrade Janos Kadar; the delegation from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, headed by Comrade Pham Van Dong; the delegation from the German Democratic

*Speech at the meeting dedicated to the 47th anniversary of the October Revolution in Moscow, November 6, 1964. **Pravda**, November 7, 1964.

Republic, headed by Comrade Walter Ulbricht; the Chinese delegation, headed by Comrade Chou En-lai; the delegation from the Korean People's Democratic Republic, headed by Comrade Kim Ir; the Cuban delegation, headed by Comrade Ernesto Guevara; the Mongolian delegation, headed by Comrade Yumzhagiin Tsedenbal; the Polish delegation, headed by Comrade Wladyslaw Gomulka; the Rumanian delegation, headed by Comrade Ion Gheorghe Maurer; the Czechoslovak delegation, headed by Comrade Jiri Hendrych, and the Yugoslav delegation, headed by Comrade Velko Vlahovic.

Heartfelt greetings to you, dear comrades! In your person we greet the fraternal peoples of the socialist countries of Europe, Asia and Latin America!

We also extend fraternal greeting to the representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of other states who are present here and to all the delegations of the working people of foreign countries that have arrived in Moscow to celebrate the October Revolution anniversary together with us. Your presence here, comrades, symbolizes the great force of proletarian internationalism, which unites all working people of the world and is a genuine earnest of the universal victory of socialism.

Permit me also, comrades, to welcome Marshal Abdel Hakim Amer, Vice-President of the United Arab Republic, and the delegation of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, headed by Comrade Haji Ben Allah, who have come to the Soviet Union.

EPOCH-MAKING VICTORIES OF THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Comrades, the Great October Revolution is forever associated with the immortal name of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, whose great genius was the soul of the Revolution, and united and inspired its heroic fighters. For nearly half a century world development has been proceeding under the powerful influence of the ideas of the October Revolution, the ideas of Leninism. The revolutionary exploit of our people served as a mighty impetus which started a whole chain of revolutionary changes in the world.

A giant wave of revolutionary movements rose in other countries of Europe and Asia shortly after the October Revolution. The people's revolution in Mongolia triumphed in 1921.

The rout of fascism in the Second World War created favorable conditions for a new upsurge of the revolutionary movement. Socialism triumphed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, North Vietnam and North Korea. In October 1949 the Chinese revolution was victorious, and the People's Republic of China was established. At that time a socialist state, the German Democratic Republic came into existence also on German soil, while ten years later the Republic of Cuba became

the first country on the American continent to take the road of socialism.

The formation of a world system of socialist states, the disintegration of colonial empires and the appearance of dozens of independent national states in Asia and Africa, the development of class struggles in the capitalist countries, and the steady weakening of the positions of world imperialism — this is the remarkable result of historical development since October 1917. We cannot but rejoice over this result, comrades!

The most important result of the revolution is the complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR, and the entry of our country into a period of full-scale construction of communism. The Soviet people and our Party regard communist construction in the USSR also as their internationalist duty, as an integral part of the revolutionary struggle of the working people of the world.

The Soviet people have something to be proud of. A truly gigantic leap had been made in the years of Soviet power from backward tsarist Russia to the mighty, flourishing socialist state which our country has become. This is the result of the heroic efforts of our people in peaceful labor as well as on the battlefield under the guidance of Lenin's Party.

As we welcome the 47th anniversary of the October Revolution, we pay tribute with a feeling of profound respect to the veterans of the revolution, to the Leninist Old Guard. We pay tribute to the great courage and selfless labor of the Soviet people, who have blazed the highroad to socialism for humanity. Noting our successes, we have the right to say that the present generation of Soviet people carries aloft with honor the triumphant banner of the October Revolution.

Lenin pointed out that the main and most difficult task of the victorious socialist revolution was construction. The decisive thing for the triumph of the new system, he said, was to create new economic relations and achieve the highest possible labor productivity. Our Party and the Soviet people are implementing Lenin's behest in full.

We have created mighty productive forces. Industrial and agricultural production continues to grow, and the building of the material and technical basis of communism is proceeding succesfully.

Let us take such a vital index as the rate of development. The average annual growth in industrial output in the Soviet years has been 14 per cent, whereas in the main capitalist country, the United States of America, the average in the same period has only been 3.4 per cent.

An alliance of science, the latest technology and production is the basis on which the Soviet Union is confidently advancing to

leading positions in the key sphere of world scientific and technical progress. And in our age this is of decisive importance.

Soviet people have blazed the trail to outer space. The launching of the spaceship Voskhod is a new and outstanding victory in this field, and a concentrated expression of the Soviet people's successes, of the economic might of Soviet power, the level which our technology has attained, the creative effort of our scientists and the high standards of culture of all Soviet society.

Comrades, the October Revolution signified a basic reconstruction of society's social and political system. And it is in this sphere that the advantages of socialism over the capitalist organization of social life first became evident.

Our country has long since abolished the exploiting classes. The alliance of workers, peasants and intellectuals is growing ever stronger. The Soviet people, closely rallied around the Communist Party and welded by an ideological and political unity, make up a new human community, the first in history to be free from social and national antagonisms.

We have successfully solved the national problem, one of the acutest and most difficult problems we inherited from capitalism. Today all the nations of our country, both big and small, live in a close-knit family.

The friendship of our peoples is part and parcel of our social life. Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Georgians, Azerbaijanians, Lithuanians, Moldavians, Latvians, Kirghiz, Tajiks, Armenians, Turkmenians, Estonians—all the peoples of our country regard each other as comrades and colleagues, help each other, work together, participate together in the struggle to build communism. Such is the magnificent result of the Leninist national policy.

Freedom from exploitation, the triumph of social justice and the absence of class and national oppression and inequality have produced in our country an atmosphere of creative enthusiasm and ensured the active work and the initiative of the masses. A spirit of good comradeship, fraternity and collectivism and confidence in the future are an integral feature of the life of socialist society.

Our state of the whole people, which has developed naturally from the state of the proletarian dictatorship, expresses the will and defends the interests of all Soviet citizens. The participation of the working people in state and public affairs becomes more effective and significant year by year. We see in this a living incarnation of the ideas of the October Revolution, of Lenin's immortal ideas.

Soviet democracy develops and improves steadily, augmenting the strength of our society and placing at its service the collective wisdom of the people. Socialist democracy is the most humane

democracy for it is based on the most just of principles—those of socialism and communism. Man's position in socialist society is determined not by his wealth or origin, but by his achievements in labor, his abilities, intellect, initiative and contribution to the common cause.

Socialism means regeneration in the sphere of spiritual life. It places at the disposal of the working people all the wealth of science and culture. In the years of Soviet power our homeland has become a country with a high cultural level and a science second to none. Nowhere else do scientists, teachers, men of letters and artists play such an important role and enjoy such respect as in socialist society.

The Marxist-Leninist world outlook is the foundation of the Soviet people's spiritual life and their ideological weapon in the struggle for a new world. We are educating a new man, a man of the noble ideals and lofty moral principles expressed in the moral code of builders of communism. The concept of "Soviet man" is a synonym for courage and staunchness, heroism in labor and on the field of battle, and high awareness of public duty.

Comrades, it has become a fine tradition to sum up, at the time of the October celebrations, the preliminary results of economic development in the current year.

Our country will be glad to hear the good results achieved by our industry. This year we shall put out approximately 85 million tons of steel, which is more than the steel output of Britain, France and West Germany combined. We shall produce 62 million tons of pig iron, 223 million tons of oil, and 551 million tons of coal. Electric power output will be 459,000 million kwh, almost 50 per cent more than the total for twenty prewar years.

The program for the accelerated development of the chemical industry and the chemicalization of the national economy, mapped out by the Party, is being carried out successfully. The measures taken in this field are already beginning to produce tangible results; this year alone more than 200 million roubles' worth of chemical goods will be produced over and above the plan.

It is generally known that last year was a difficult one for our agriculture. Today the country's collective farmers and state-farm workers are completing the agricultural year with high production indices. The state grain procurement plan has been fulfilled. Much more sugar beet, sunflower seed, potatoes and vegetables have been grown and have been purchased by the state than in preceding years. The increase in the output of livestock products has been less, and we shall have to work hard to repair matters in this field.

A good job has been done this year by the agriculturists of the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, the Baltic Republics, Byelorussia and other Union Republics.

These successes are a source of joy to the Soviet people. They enable us to count more confidently on the further development of all branches of field crop cultivation and animal husbandry. We must do everything to ensure a steady growth of agricultural output, to make full use of the vast capacities of socialist agriculture.

On the basis of successes in material production, the Party and the government are taking measures to raise the living and cultural standards of Soviet people. "Everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man" is a law in the activities of our Party, and we shall unswervingly follow it.

This year saw a growth in public consumption. More clothes, footwear, knitted garments, refrigerators, TV sets, bicycles, watches and other goods were sold.

A good measure was the adoption this year of the law to raise the wages of workers in education, public health, trade and other branches. The question of pensions for collective farmers has also been solved.

As in the preceding years, many new houses will be built for Soviet people.

With the progress of communist construction an ever growing part in our life is being played by the public consumption funds. This means that we spend more and more money on public education and health, which are both free of charge, on the maintenance of kindergartens and on pensions and on recreation facilities for the working people. At present public consumption funds amount to more than 36,000 million roubles and they will continue to grow. They are an important factor in raising the people's living standards.

Comrades, the October Revolution aroused mighty forces of rebirth and renewal in our people, and revealed inexhaustible sources for the uninterrupted growth of the material and spiritual wealth of society.

Our Communist Party, glorious working class, collective farm peasantry and people's intelligentsia, all people, are working devotedly for the victory of communism. We have achieved wonderful successes in these 47 years. There is, however, still more to be done. And Soviet people will spare no effort to implement the stupendous plan for building communist society in our country.

ALONG THE PATH OF LENIN TO THE VICTORY OF COMMUNISM

Comrades, Lenin said that the best way to celebrate an anniversary of the great revolution was to concentrate attention on unsolved problems. Life never stands still. Our society is constantly developing, new problems take the place of old ones and require careful study and correct solution.

Our movement's Leninist path to communism is indicated clearly and precisely in the Program of the CPSU. We are following that path relying on the tremendous experience of socialist construction that has been acquired in the Soviet years and in the period the socialist world system has been in existence.

The Party of Lenin teaches us not to rest content with what has been achieved, not to close our eyes to faults and to see reality in all its complexity. This is the only approach that enables us to solve urgent problems in good time, overcome difficulties as they occur and advance more rapidly and confidently.

One cannot help but see that against the general background of successful development there still remain a number of problems whose solution is of vital importance. We know that the quality of many goods we manufacture is below the level of the best and that there is plenty of room for improvement as regards the supply of goods and services to the population. The economy has to carry a big overhead because of the slow realization of capital invested, because building lags behind schedule and because new machinery and advanced methods of work are introduced too slowly. Farm produce is still not sufficient to satisfy the growing needs of society in full.

It can well be understood that all Soviet people are keenly interested in getting these problems solved as quickly as possible. The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government are studying these questions. We realize that their solution will take some time and will require intensive work by our entire Party and all our people.

Our economic policy must ensure further development of Socialist industry, especially its more progressive branches, comprehensive electrification and chemicalization of the economy, accelerated development of agriculture and the growth of farm incomes, expansion of the production of consumer goods, and all-round improvement in services for the people.

All our work in the field of planning and economy must have a sound foundation in objective appraisals, exact information and correct application of the economic laws of socialism and the achievements of science. Experience has shown that wherever the scientific approach is replaced by subjectivism and arbitrary decisions failure is certain and mistakes inevitable.

In his day Lenin said: "We have a great many people eager to re-organize in every possible way, and this re-organizing is such a calamity that I have never known a greater one in all my life." (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 44, p. 326.) Lenin taught us that the important thing is not in instituting, in re-organizing and in issuing new decrees, but in people and in checking up on the work done. The Central Committee of the CPSU and

the Soviet government regard it as their duty to carry out the necessary measures to improve management of the economy and to do so with caution, without any fuss and hurry.

The economy must develop harmoniously so that the highest productivity of social labor and constant improvement in the living standards of the people are achieved. The development of heavy industry must be subordinated to the needs of regular retooling of the entire economy, the requirements of defense and the interests of promoting the rapid growth of agriculture and of the light and food industries.

Our industry is today turning out vast quantities of various goods. In the interests of further technical progress we must not only strive for a quantitative growth in output but also pay attention to the qualitative aspect, and to increasing the economic effectiveness of production and investment.

Society is not indifferent to what the satisfaction of these requirements will cost, how well these requirements will be met, how long manufactured articles will last and reliably and productively new machines will work. Improving quality is one of the most important reserves for higher productivity of social labor. It is essential for every enterprise and for every executive to know the highest world standards in his own field and to strive to equal and excel them.

The need to apply economic incentives for the development of production is more obvious today than ever before. Economic stimuli must encourage enterprises to make better use of their production funds, use raw materials and semi-manufactures economically, get new machinery running more quickly, improve the goods produced and raise the productivity of labor at every factory. Here there are tremendous untapped reserves for economic growth.

The solution of these problems will ensure the correct combination of the interests of society as a whole and the material interests of every factory staff and every individual worker.

In addition to the consistent implementation of the principle of providing material incentives, our society also possesses moral stimuli that inspire people to achieve better results. A profound understanding of the problems of communist construction and the urge to accelerate the solution of these problems have given rise to mass-scale emulation and to an extensive popular movement for a communist attitude to labor. And that, comrades, is a mighty force that accelerates the country's advance towards communism.

The country's requirements in foodstuffs and raw materials are steadily increasing, making it imperative for us to eliminate the lag in agricultural production. We shall have to continue stepping up capital investments in agriculture and in the industries

which supply it with machines and fertilizers. Fuller use of the principle of the material incentive of collective farms and collective farms acquires special importance. It is necessary not in words but in deeds to provide collective farms and state farms with greater rights in organizing and planning their work.

Nor would it be correct to ignore the possibilities which the subsidiary personal households of collective farms and factory and office workers offer in helping meet their requirements. In recent years unfounded restrictions have been imposed in this sphere, although the economic conditions are not yet mature for such a step. These restrictions have now been removed.

The growth in the incomes of Soviet people brings an increased demand for consumer goods of better quality and variety. We should take this into account and utilize all opportunities and all achievements of science and technology to develop mass production of consumer goods.

Housing construction, too, will continue on a large scale and the living conditions of the working people will continue to improve. These problems are a matter of constant concern for our Party and government.

Unreasonably little attention is still being paid to trade and public services despite the fact that these are important branches of the economy which most directly concern the working people. We allocate large funds to develop trade and public services, but these funds should be used more effectively. People should have better and more efficient services. It is necessary, comrades, to change the very attitude towards public services and amenities and those working in them.

All these are urgent tasks. They, of course, do not exhaust everything we shall have to accomplish in the economic sphere. However, we are convinced that to carry them out is essential for the implementation of the Program of our Party.

Comrades, the building of the material and technical basis of communism, the establishment of communist social relations and the all-round development of the individual are impossible without promoting in every way the creative initiative of the masses, without developing socialist democracy. Lenin pointed out that a new society could be built only when the masses of the working people themselves started to build the state, started to build the new economy.

The Party has done a great deal in pursuing this Leninist policy. Our system guarantees the working people extensive rights and political liberties. The Party and the state will vigilantly guard them, will strictly observe socialist legality. It is our common duty to combat resolutely red tape and window-dressing and see to it that all executives consider their main aim that of serving the people.

The political consciousnes and professional skill of the workers and peasants and the ideological maturity and creative power of the Soviet intelligentsia have grown immeasurably. A great army of highly competent specialists fully devoted to the ideas of communism has grown up during the years of Soviet power. These people should be valued. We should rely on their knowledge and experience and boldly promote the best of them to positions of responsibility.

The Soviet youth, for whose education and upbringing we spare neither money nor effort, are the pride of our people. They actively participate in building communism.

The building of communism demands from all Soviet people—workers, farmers and intellectuals—a maximum of energy, initiative and consciousness. It is the civic duty of every Soviet person to work honestly for the commonweal, to regard the interests of society and the state as his own interests, strictly to observe state and social discipline, to show a high sense of responsibility, initiative and activity. There is no matter more noble and lofty in our life than that of serving our socialist Motherland, the country of the Great October!

THE BANNER OF OCTOBER IS THE BANNER OF STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Comrades, the birth of the world's first socialist state meant the birth of a new policy in international affairs. Socialism, peace and freedom for the peoples—these were the slogans inscribed on the banners of the October Revolution. The Communist Party and the entire Soviet people are loyal to the cause and ideas of the October Revolution.

The foreign policy of the Soviet state derives from its socialist nature, from the noble aims and tasks of our Party and our people. This policy was initiated by Lenin.

Today the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism is being waged on all continents; imperialism is losing one position after another. The formation of a world system of socialism is the greatest gain in this struggle. And that is one of the most important results of the revolutionary transformation of the world started by the October Revolution.

In their relations with the socialist countries, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet people are guided by the principles of socialist internationalism, by the desire to strengthen fraternal friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance on the basis of full equality, independence and a correct combination of the interests of each country with the interests of the entire community.

Our country is celebrating its 47th birthday. Other socialist countries this year marked their 20th or 15th birthdays. Heroic

Cuba took the socialist path only recently. We are profoundly convinced that new red-letter days will appear in the calendar of history marking the entry of other countries and peoples into our socialist family. However, irrespective of the experience one or another country has to its credit in building socialism, the socialist world system is a social, economic and political community of free and equal peoples.

Back in 1920, when he outlined ways of securing a fraternal alliance of the working people of different nations casting off the imperialist yoke, Lenin pointed to the need to base relations between them on complete confidence, full awareness of fraternal unity and full voluntary consent. "Such an alliance," Lenin wrote, "cannot be brought about at once; we have to work towards it with the greatest patience and circumspection, so as not to spoil matters are not to arouse distrust, and in order that the distrust inherited from centuries of landlord and capitalist oppression may have a chance to wear off" (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 40, p. 43.)

The implementation of this thesis of Lenin's acquires still greater importance in relations between the sovereign states which make up the socialist world system.

There is every objective condition for cooperation between socialist countries to grow increasingly stronger. Our peoples are united by a community of fundamental interests. We have an economic foundation of the same type—social ownership of the means of production. We have similar state systems—the power of the people, headed by the working class. We have a single ideology—Marxism-Leninism. We have common interests in ensuring security, in safeguarding the peace and security of the peoples, in protecting revolutionary gains against encroachments by the imperialists. We have a single, great aim—communism.

The interest of each socialist country in the experience of other countries in building a new society is understandable. At the same time we consider that it would be wrong to thrust the experience of any one party and country on other parties and countries. The choice of methods and forms of socialist construction is the sovereign right of each people.

We hold that originality in the ways of building socialism should by no means prevent the development of friendly relations between the fraternal socialist countries. The correctness of one or another viewpoint on concrete questions of socialist construction should, in our opinion, be checked in practice, by the effectiveness of the results achieved in building a new society.

The family of socialist states, which have forever done away with capitalism and are building a new and happy life for the working people, is great and mighty. The world of socialism has spread for many thousands of kilometers across the vast expanses

of Europe and Asia. Socialism has also found a home on the American continent. Socialism serve as an inspiring example to the peoples of many African countries. The socialist world is exerting a constantly growing influence on the entire course of human history.

Allow me, comrades, to declare from this rostrum, on the eve of a holiday near and dear to the heart of every Soviet man that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our government consider it their sacred duty to do everything necessary to strengthen the cohesion of the socialist countries on the reliable foundation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This is in the interests of the most successful construction of socialism and communism in each of our countries. This is in the interests of the triumph of our great common cause the world over.

May the friendship and cohesion of the socialist countries grow stronger!

Comrades,

Our Party has invariably been rendering support to the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America against imperialism and all forms of colonialism. The CPSU, as our Party Program points out, regards the fraternal alliance with the peoples who have shaken off the yoke of colonialism and semi-colonialism, as one of the cornerstones of its foreign policy.

The October Revolution awakened the national consciousness of the peoples and lent unprecedented scope to their struggle for emancipation from the foreign yoke. Lenin foresaw that "the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their own bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the colonies and countries of all dependent countries against international imperialism." (*Collected Works,* Russ. Ed., Vol. 30, p. 138). Now everyone can see that in this respect, too, history is developing as Lenin predicted.

If we compare two political maps of the world, one dating back to October 1917, and another, a contemporary one, we shall immediately see in all their contrast the tremendous changes that have taken place on our planet in this period of history. The first of these maps would show Asia and Africa almost completely covered with colors of colonial powers. Today the flags of sovereign states flutter proudly over almost 60 countries on these two continents.

We understand the feelings and aspirations of the newly free peoples, their desire to consolidate their independence and to bring to a succesful end the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. The imperialists are exerting no little effort to drive socialism and the national liberation movement which are merging into a single revolutionary stream into different channels. But the peoples of the young national states are beginning to distinguish

ever more clearly between real and reliable friends and enemies who are camouflaging their colonialist aims.

Soviet people are sincerely glad to see that the countries that have cast off the fetters of colonialism are playing an ever greater part in world politics. The recent Cairo conference of non-aligned countries graphically demonstrated their will to abolish all forms of colonialism, preserve and consolidate peace and strengthen the unity of the forces fighting against imperialism.

We are completely at one with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America in considering that the last colonial regimes should be wiped off the face of the earth. Wherever the people's struggle is unfolding against foreign imperialist interference—in Cyprus and in the Congo, South-East Asia and the Arabian Peninsula and in the countries of Latin America—the peoples see and feel our support of their just struggle for national and social emancipation.

On the day of the anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which paved the way for the emancipation of the nations, we proclaim: let the disgrace of colonialism disappear into the past forever, long live the freedom and independence of all nations!

The Soviet Union has been pursuing and continues to pursue the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The purpose of this policy is to prevent a world thermonuclear war, settle disputes between states by negotiations, respect the right of each nation to choose the social and state system it desires and settle in its own way the problems of the internal development of its country.

The policy of peaceful coexistence provides a foundation for mutual understanding and mutually profitable cooperation, regardless of the difference in the social systems of countries. At the same time the atmosphere of peaceful coexistence facilitates the liberation struggle and the attainment of the revolutionary goals of the peoples.

Soviet people sincerely desire that the incipient relaxation of international tensions will continue and that solutions will be found to the vital international problems on which the peace and security of the nations depends. Our state is for the step-by-step settlement of outstanding problems and for the strengthening of peace.

The Soviet Union has been advocating and will continue to advocate the termination of the arms race and the reaching of an agreement on disarmament. The policy of the imperialist powers has forced our country to concentrate efforts on producing powerful missile-nuclear weapons, a reliable guarantee of our security and of the security of our friends and allies. We are nevertheless ready to do away with nuclear armaments and all armaments in general, provided that the other states do the same.

We are resolutely working for general and complete disarmament; we are also advocating measures which would, at least initially, restrict the arms race. We, naturally, are also in favor of such agreements which, in the same way as the Moscow partial test-ban treaty, restrict the possibilities for the further development of nuclear weapons.

There are different proposals as to which aspect of disarmament should be given priority and the level of negotiations and who is to negotiate. As to the Soviet Union, the important thing, in our opinion, is to make progress towards disarmament and achieve concrete results.

Among the unsolved problems in Europe it is necessary, first of all, to discard revanchist doctrines and conceptions, recognize the situation that has developed in the center of Europe, and proceed from the obvious fact that there exist two German states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. There can be no other basis for ensuring peace in Europe.

We have opposed and shall continue to oppose the plans to form a NATO multilateral nuclear force giving the West German Bundeswehr access to nuclear weapons, and the proliferation of nuclear armaments.

No foreign interference in the affairs of other peoples and countries—such is the firm and clear stand of the Soviet Union. Everyone knows of the intrigues, provocations and plots which are being incessantly engineered against revolutionary Cuba and against the right of its people to build their life as they wish. The sallies against Cuba evoke a legitimate feeling of indignation, and it is time to put an end to them. Hands off the Republic of Cuba—such is the demand of the Soviet people and of all the upright people of the world.

We have always held that Taiwan should be reunited with its homeland, the People's Republic of China.

We resolutely condemn the provocations against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. We hail the courageous people of South Vietnam waging a heroic struggle of emancipation against the corrupt anti-popular regime and against the armed intervention of the U.S. imperialists, for the unification of their country on democratic principles.

We hail the courageous people of South Korea struggling for the evacuation of U.S. troops and for a peaceful reunification of their country.

These peoples are waging a profoundly just struggle and they will win.

Our policy is one of good relations and mutually advantageous cooperation with all states, and from year to year our relations with those countries which are interested in this are improving.

We attach great importance to the development of business contacts, to the development of relations with the main capitalist powers.

The Soviet Union is ready to promote Soviet-U.S. relations in the interests of our peoples, in the interests of strengthening peace. A long-term trade agreement was concluded with France a few days ago. We would also welcome the readiness of other capitalist countries to expand mutually advantageous trade with our country. Possibilities undoubtedly exist for the further development of relations with Britain, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and other states.

In implementing our policy of peaceful coexistence we rely on the might of the community of the socialist countries, and on the actions in defense of peace taken by the independent states and by all peace-loving forces.

In all countries the broad masses are demanding the strengthening of peace and broader international cooperation. The presidential elections which have just taken place in the United States have shown most convincingly that the majority of the American people also cherish peace, that they are tired of the cold war. The defeat of the U.S. "ultras" is a good lesson for all advocates of the policy of adventure and reaction.

Our policy of good-neighborliness and friendship with India, Finland, Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey, the Scandinavian countries and other neighbors of the Soviet Union is traditional and invariable.

The Leninist principles of foreign policy serve us as a guiding star in the present-day international situation with all its complicated and contradictory trends. This policy is distinguished by firmness in upholding positions of principle, a highly responsible approach to vital issues of world policy that affect the destinies of the peoples, readiness for talks and agreements, and flexibility in settling practical issues.

Our Party, like the other Marxist-Leninist parties, proceeds from the fact that a world war is not inevitable in contemporary conditions. We are firmly convinced that a world war can be averted by the vigorous joint struggle of the socialist states, the international working class, the peoples who have freed themselves from colonial oppression, and all forces working for peace. Peace on earth can be secured.

But we never forget that there are also aggressive forces in the world which are interested in bringing international tension to a head. They have a direct stake in engineering international crises, whipping up the arms race, pushing the world toward war—in all this they see a direct benefit for themselves. The peoples are encountering manifestations of the activities of these forces almost daily. That is why the Soviet Union remains vigilant.

We have mighty weapons reliably guaranteeing the security of the USSR and the other socialist countries. Until an agreement on disarmament is reached we shall maintain our defense capacity at a high level.

Standing guard over the great gains of communism are our valorous and renowned Armed Forces. They are commanded by experienced army leaders and a well-trained corps of officers. Our army is an army safeguarding peace. The Soviet people love their army and it is the object of their care and concern. Our glorious army is faithfully serving the people and is standing guard over their creative activities.

Honor and glory to the Soviet Armed Forces!

The general line of the Soviet Union's foreign policy, defined by the decisions of our Party's latest congresses and its Program is consistent and unchanged. It is a line that ensures peaceful conditions for the building of socialism and communism, for strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, their friendship and fraternity, a line that supports the revolutionary liberation movements, the all-round development of solidarity and cooperation with the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, a line that affirms the principles of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries, and aims at saving mankind from a world war. It is the only correct line. It is fully approved by our people and by the overwhelming majority of the population of our planet.

Comrades! Our Leninist Party has always held high the banner of proletarian internationalism. We consider the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement and the solidarity of the national liberation and democratic forces to be a guarantee of new successes for peace and socialism.

The Communist movement is being tempered in fierce encounters with imperialist reaction, in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and the triumph of the ideas of socialism. In capitalist countries Communist parties continue to be hounded and persecuted. But despite all difficulties they hold high the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism. By their deeds they show the working people the vital force of their ideas. The glorious names of heroic Communists who gave up their lives in the struggle for freedom live in the memory of the peoples, inspiring them to new exploits.

On the anniversary of the Great October Revolution, our Party and the entire Soviet people send warm greetings to all the fraternal Communist parties and express their solidarity and support.

Our enemies are striving to weaken the Communist movement. They would like to use the differences which have arisen to harm the revolutionary forces. In these conditions the task of strengthening the unity of the international Communist movement as-

sumes special importance. Concrete and effective measures for this are required; it is necessary to advance step by step along the road of cohesion.

Differences in views should not be permitted to undermine the main source of the strength of the Communists—their unity in the struggle against the common enemy, imperialism. The solution of problems concerning the entire movement is a matter for all the fraternal parties.

The world army of Communists has a clear and precise general line, jointly drawn up at the 1957 and 1960 Moscow meetings.

The Communists also have an effective method of overcoming differences in points of view which may arise between parties, and of strengthening unity. This was clearly pointed out in the Statement of the 81-parties, adopted in 1960: "The Communists and Workers' parties hold meetings whenever necessary to discuss urgent problems, to share experience, acquaint themselves with each other's views and positions, work out common views through consultations and coordinate joint actions in the struggle for common goals."

It seems to us that a better method for strengthening the unty of the world Communist movement cannot be found. The need for a new international meeting of the fraternal parties has obviously matured. And the purpose of such a meeting, its principal motto should be cohesion on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the unity of fellow-Communists in the struggle for our great common goals.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union will do everything it can to achieve such cohesion.

May the great movement of all the Communists of the world expand and grow stronger each day, drawing fresh strength from consolidated unity, and scoring new successes in the struggle against imperialism for the bright future of all the working people!

THE COMMUNIST PARTY—MILITANT VANGUARD OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

Comrades, the working people of our country know that all our successes and gains have been achieved under the guidance of the Leninist Party. That is why the Soviet people love and respect their Party, trust the Party, and follow the Party. The great ideals of the Communist Party have become the ideals of the entire Soviet people ,and the Program of the Party has become a practical program for the whole people.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has traversed a difficult and glorious road. Only a few decades ago our Party, as Lenin aptly put it, was a close-knit group of people who moved hand in hand along a difficult and rocky path, surrounded on all sides by malicious enemies and under their constant fire.

But the Communists were equipped with an indomitable life-asserting weapon, the great Marxist teaching. Following this teaching and creatively developing it, our Party has now grown into a mighty army numbering some 11 million like-minded people, Communists. The ranks of the CPSU unite the finest sons and daughters of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, sons and daughters of the entire Soviet people. The Party believes in the inexhaustible creative energy of the people and regards service to the people to be the purpose and meaning of all its work.

The bigger the tasks tackled in the course of communist construction, the greater the role and importance of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society. We become convinced of this in practice. That is why the further improvement of Party guidance in all fields of communist construction, and consistent adherence to the Leninist principles and standards of the life of the Party and the state, acquire special importance.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU initiated the restoration of genuine Leninist standards in the life of our Party and played an oustanding part in developing the creative initiative of the Communists. The plenary meeting of the Central Committee which took place in October of this year was an important landmark in carrying out the decisions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

This plenary meeting is fresh proof of the concern of the Central Committe for the succesful implementation of the Party's general line. Its work was imbued with the spirit of Leninist collective leadership and allegiance to Lenin's behests. It took place in an atmosphere of complete unanimity of all its participants. The plenary meeting decisions met with the approval and support of the entire Party and of the whole Soviet people.

The Central Committee highly appreciates this support of the Party and the people. It gives us new strength in our efforts to carry out the tasks confronting the Party.

Comrades, the Party's Program and Rules are the invariable guide for all the activities of our Party bodies and Party organizations, for all of us. Communists have extensive rights in participating actively in the life of the Party, in expressing freely their opinions, in effectively supervising the activities of state, economic and public organizations. Conditions should be created for the maximum development of a sense of responsibility on the part of each Communist for the state of affairs in the country and in the Party, of comradely criticism and self-criticism and intolerance of any violation of Leninist standards of Party life.

The tasks of building a new society demands a considerable improvement in the Party's entire ideological work. The education of the new man, the inculcation of a scientific Marxist-Lenin-

ist world outlook in Soviet people is the main feature of this work. Marxism-Leninism is, in its very essence, a profoundly creative and revolutionary science; it does not tolerate stagnation of thought, inertness and conservatism. To educate people in the spirit of communist ideology means first of all to develop in them such qualities as firm adherence to principle, a creative approach to work, a careful attitude to public property and concern for its increase. All Communists should clearly understand the tasks confronting the Party and the country, and should be prepared to fight for the fulfilment of these tasks as for their own vital, personal cause. An irreconcilable attitude towards hostile bourgeois ideology should be an inherent quality of every Communist.

We Communists should always remember Lenin's great behest. "Live in the *midst of things*. Know the *moods*. Know *everything*. Understand the masses. Be able to approach them. Win their *absolute trust*." (*Collected Works*, Russ. ed., 44.. p. 491.) This counsel of Lenin's is the key to the success of all our Party work.

All the work of our Party and of each Communist should continue to be imbued with the Leninist Party spirit. We should always and everywhere be guided by the great slogan of the Party. Everything for the sake of man, everything for the benefit of man; dedicate all our energies to the building of communism in our country.

Comrades, history has placed a great responsibility on our Party, on the Soviet people. We are carrying out tasks of vast magnitude. For nearly half a century our country has been blazing new trails of social development. Each success of ours in communist construction is a contribution of the Soviet people to the common cause of the revolutionary struggle of the working people of all countries for peace, freedom, and a happy future of mankind.

Under the guidance of the Party, under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet people will build a communist society.

For new victories of communism, comrades!

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live the glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union founded by Lenin!

Long live the unity and solidarity of the international Communist movement!

Long live world peace!

THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

Report* by Georges Marchais

MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU AND SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

The de Gaulle government is not only continuing, but also accentuating the policy catering exclusively to the interests of big monopoly capital. This becomes clear from the economic and social measures it is contemplating and above all from its intention to render a permanent character to the so-called stabilization plan, originally designed to operate for a few months only.

THE HARM OF THE STABILIZATION PLAN

That is precisely what the monopolies want, for, as experience shows, this plan serves them as a weapon against the working clas and the non-monopoly sections.

The government promised that the plan would check the growth of prices and bring down the cost of living. But it hasn't.

With the standard budget drawn up by the Supreme Commission for Collective Agreements—which is a minimum budget leaving out of account the new requirements of the working people—taken as the reference point, already last July the stabilization plan led to a more than 5 per cent increase in the cost of living. Then followed the rise in the rates on electricity and rent. Now the government has decided on a new increase in prices, specifically in railway and postal tariffs.

Thus the talk about stabilization and price reductions was actually designed to deceive the people and conceal from them one of the real objectives of the plan: to reduce their purchasing capacity.

The government has had a measure of success in this. True, as a result of joint struggle the workers in the private sector have won a wage rise, but it hardly compensates for the growth of prices. The purchasing capacity of the working people has reached a new low following the freeze on the family allowances and the reduction of the working day without compensation.

The situation is even more serious in the state sector. The gov-

*Abridged from **l'Humanité**, October 13, 1964, carrying documents of Central Committee FCP.

ernment is doing nothing to eliminate the wage and salary lag existing since February 1962. The rise obtained of late has failed to compensate for the growing cost of living, which means a new reduction in the purchasing capacity. The wages of the railwaymen lag behind by 12.4 per cent and those of the gas and power industry workers, by 13 per cent. The gap is even bigger in the case of office employees.

By limiting the purchasing capacity of the working people the stabilization plan narrows down the domestic market. In the conditions inherent in captialism and the existence of the Common Market, this policy is creating economic difficulties in the automobile, textile, ship-building and other industries. Tens of thousands of workers have been dismissed or work shorter hours with a corresponding cut in pay.

In this respect the government sets an example to the employers. For instance, it has opposed compensation for the wage losses of the Renault workers, which have reached some 5,000 old francs a month for a 2nd grade skilled worker.

The government is being consistent, for one of the objectives of the plan is to increase the manpower market and create an atmosphere of insecurity and actual unemployment so as to press upon the existing level of wages.

The situation in the countryside is marked by an exacerbation of discontent among the peasants, which is only natural. The government rejects all demands of the peasants to close the gap between the purchasing prices of farm produce and the prices of manufactured goods, and does not take steps to prevent the latter from rising, which broadens the gap still more. At the same time it is laying a heavier burden on the family farms, reducing and in some cases even abolishing the discount granted them for the purchase of farm implements, increasing taxes, and so on.

This brief analysis shows clearly the objectives of the so-called stabilization plan:

1) to freeze as far as possible wages and salaries so as to preserve the capitalist profits and allocate an increasing share of government funds for the atomic strike force;

2) to keep the purchasing prices of farm produce at a level lower than that of manufactured goods, which suits the big industrial monopolies but does not benefit the consumer.

THE REACTIONARY CHARACTER OF THE DRAFT BUDGET

The government intends to intensify considerably this extremely reactionary policy with the help of the 1965 budget and the 5th plan.

According to de Gaulle, never before has a draft budget been so perfect, "so balanced and fair to all." However, reality is altogether different.

As regards the budget balanced "for the first time since Poincare," as de Gaulle has declared, it will be recalled that this has been done throughout cutting allocations to be made by the state at the expense of the loan and savings banks and Social Security, and through increasing the taxation of the working class and the non-monopoly sections. It is true that the budget has been taken out of the blind alley, but it is the masses who are to foot the bill.

The most important thing, however, is that the government wants to decrease again the share of the national income alloted for the state apparatus (excepting the machinery of coercion, the police and the army) and for the social needs of the masses.

The draft budget provides for greater military expenditure and heavier taxes on the workers and the middle classes, whereas the capitalists will be paying lower taxes. At the same time it does not envisage the necessary credits for the state employees, the aged, war veterans, etc.; for a 20 per cent family-allowance increase; for new housing and schools; for public health.

Thus, the draft budget follows the reactionary line of the stabilization plan.

A LONG-TERM REACTIONARY POLICY

The government is trying to delude public opinion with talk about its "good deeds" in the economic and social fields, and at the same time to put across the idea that these are only "temporary measures," that "this is a stage that has to be passed," that everything will be better tomorrow."

That this is mere demagogy is obvious from the cynicism and brutality with which the 5th plan orientates the future economic and social policy of the government to serve monopoly interests.

"Adaptation of structures," or monopoly concentration, and "regulation of prices and incomes," or lower incomes for wage labor and reduction of spending on social needs — such are the steps the 5th plan envisages to increase the profits of the monopolies.

The plan has this to say on the concentration of production: "This concentration should result in only a very limited number of groups, or even a single dominant group operating in many branches.

To be sufficiently fruitful, this concentration should pool together considerable financial resources and, moreover, the branches (the big monopolists, to be more precise) should enjoy the broadest freedom of action and decide on the closing down, regrouping or building of new plants in the search for the optimum economic solutions."

No comments are necessary. The employers are granted full freedom to carry through their readjustment policy with maximum

profit as the sole criterion; this can only aggravate all the manifestations of capitalist exploitation.

As is shown in Waldeck Rochet's report to the Seventeenth Congress, the income of 500 big companies has totalled 1,000,000 million old francs, which means an average annual rate of profit of 20 per cent and approximately a 70 per cent increase in profits as compared with 1958. But now the monopolies find even such profits insufficient.

Finally, the 5th plan admits that military expenditures will go up 35 per cent, at nearly double the rate in family consumption. But in reality they will be even higher.

Let us see what the 5th plan has in store for the vast majority of the French people.

The government wants to slow down the annual rate of economic development from 5.5 to 4.95 per cent. It will be recalled that since de Gaulle's advent to power the rate of industrial growth has decreased by about 2 per cent, although it should have increased due to the rapid scientific and technological progress.

Believing that the French consume too much, the authors of the 5th plan are out to reduce public consumption. Whereas per capita consumption was slated by the 4th plan to grow by 4.6 per cent, the 5th plan envisages only 3.4 to 3.6 per cent. In view of this the government would like to freeze wages for the coming years. Indeed, the annual increase in wages planned by it is only 2.8 to 3 per cent "for the average worker who does not change his qualification." If we take into account that the cost of living invariably outpaces wage increases, it will be clear that the government wants the purchasing capacity of the population to sink still lower.

The authors of the plan oppose shortening of the working week before 1970, and a reduction in the pensionable age. The plan contains the cynical "suggestion" that "in the nearest future official interference will be limited to reducing the maximum authorized duration of the working week," which is 60 hours at present.

It should be added that the 5th plan will, in effect, prejudice the rights and privileges of the Social Security beneficiaries and lead to an increase in taxes, the cost of gas and electricity, transport fares and postal tariffs. The plan stipulates less expenditure on social needs, such as public education, research and urban and rural development. It envisages building at most 470,000 new flats by 1970, whereas the Federation of Building Enterprises Owners comes out for the construction of the same number of flats by 1965.

The conclusion we can draw from the "stabilization plan," the draft budget for 1965 and the outlines of the 5th plan, convincingly confirm our appraisal of the nature of the de Gaulle regime, its objectives, and the means employed by it. On the whole, it is a policy of carrying out the orders of big finance capital in a period

characterized by the internationalization of economic life, integration in the Common Market, and U.S. competition.

This orientation clearly reflects the growing difficulties French imperialism is experiencing due to greater international competition and the growing economic and political struggle of the working people inside the country. The main thing, however, is that the solutions envisioned by the plan sacrifice the interests of the working people. Consequently, we must rebuff the de Gaulle government's new onslaught on the working class and non-monopoly sections of the people.

THIS NEW ONSLAUGHT CAN BE DEFEATED

The extremely reactionary policy so harmful to the interests of the majority of French people and of the country as a whole makes it imperative to strengthen unity and step up the struggle of all the social strata affected by this policy.

The only means of putting an end to this policy is, of course, to replace one-man rule with genuine democracy, which will enable our people to advance along the road of social progress, peace, democracy and socialism.

Even before that, however, it is possible to curb the appetite of the monopolies and compel them to satisfy the economic, social and democratic demands of the working people. Moreover, it is precisely in everyday struggle for these demands that the necessary conditions will be created for uniting all the working-class and democratic forces, which will make it possible to eliminate one-man rule.

During a recent seminar of de Gaulle's party — Union for the New Republic — Pompidou tried in vain to impress upon the working people and democrats that "we are ready to fight back" and "hold out at all cost against all."

Incidentally, if Pompidou found it necessary to make such pronouncements it was without doubt because the members of his party feel uneasy about the profound discontent of the masses and the growth of the opposition forces. It was precisely because the UNR fears isolation that Pompidou declared: "We are ready to accept everyone wishing to join in our activities."

As far as the government, which is "fighting back" and "holding out," is concerned, Pompidou should have been more modest about it. Experience shows that the militant unity of the working people and democrats not only can resist the government but can also force it to retreat.

For instance, de Gaulle was compelled to make peace in Algeria, thus enabling the Algerian people to embark upon the road of independence. By their joint actions the working people succeeded in restricting the claims of the monopolies and their government. They delayed the introduction of the government plan, won four-

week paid holidays, discommoded the government by forcing a wage rise above the level stipulated by it, compelled some employers to reduce the working day without wage cuts — also against the government's stout opposition — and won some other social demands.

Thus, experience proves that unity of action can defeat the de Gaulle regime and ensure the satisfaction of certain demands.

THE NEEDS OF THE WORKING MASSES CAN BE SATISFIED

The de Gaulle government is constantly busy trying to justify its anti-popular social policy by invoking the danger of inflation due to alleged "excessive popular consumption."

It is our duty to expose this lie before the working people. The real cause of inflation, the rise in prices and economic disorder is not "excessive popular consumption," but the vast increase in the unproductive expenditure of state funds, specifically those on the atomic strike force, and the policy which grants numerous privileges to the capitalist companies and in every way favors the monopolies.

Consequently, it is possible without raising the prices to meet the needs of the masses, enable them to enjoy the benefits of growing production and labor productivity, increase wages and salaries, and reduce the working day without cutting wages. It is possible to meet the needs of the working peasants, reduce direct and indirect taxes, satisfy the demands of the various social strata, and allocate necessary means for the construction of schools and houses and for public health.

This calls for curtailing capitalist profits and reducing military expenditure.

STRENGTHEN UNITY OF ACTION AND ALLIANCE

An essential condition for repelling the monopoly onslaught and satisfying the legitimate demands of the working class and the masses is consolidation of working-class unity and of the alliance of all the victims of monopoly policy.

That is why it is more necessary than ever before that our slogan should be: "We must have a unity of the working class and the middle strata!"

The 17th Congress demonstrated the progress made in building the unity of the Communists with the Socialists as well as with the Catholics and other democrats in the struggle for economic demands, for freedom and peace, and in various elections. It stressed the trend for rapprochement between the workers and the peasants.

New steps forward have been made in this direction since our Congress, specifically as regards Socialist-Communist rapprochement.

We can put on record, for instance, joint actions for the de-

mands of the working people; demonstrations in connection with such dates as July 14, to commemorate Jaures' death, and Liberation Day; the struggle in defense of the school and the liberties; unity in some elections to defeat UNR and reactionary candidates (in Longwy, for instance). To this incomplete list can be added the consolidation of peasant unity on the basis of rapprochement between the peasant organizations and agreements between the organizations of peasants' and the workers trade unions.

We sincerely rejoice in this progress towards unity and alliance. However, as was stated at the Congress, we consider that it is necessary to eliminate the still existing obstacles to broader unity of action.

All the conditions for this exist. For instance, the democratic parties and specifically the Communists and Socialists denounce the reactionary orientation of the government's economic and social policy; the Communists and Socialists put forward concrete proposals which coincide on many points. The same can be said about the trade unions.

In this context it is hard for the working class and the various social strata strangled by the monopolies to understand why these organizations should display the reticence that prevents them from acting in common for the legitimate aspirations of the people.

The struggle has grown in scope of late. The workers are fighting for their demands at factory level and, whenever possible, in whole areas or industries. The movement is mounting in the countryside. A two-week campaign in defense of the school is under way at present. A big demonstration of war veterans has been held. Many more such examples could be cited.

Actions in various forms should be prompted. The struggle for partial demands can and must be launched in factories, taking into account the local conditions and the demands made. This creates conditions for actions on a broader scale.

In order to break the growing resistance of the government and the big industrialists, large-scale coordinated actions of the workers of the private and state sectors are necessary. For instance, the workers in the state sector are intent on passing from numerous isolated actions to mass struggles coordinated by all the trade union organizations with the support of the democratic parties. One should rise above differences on partial issues and respond to these wishes, guided solely by the interests of the working people. We are prepared to do so.

Our party, for its part, will continue to be active in supporting the struggle of the working people, whatever form it may take, and of all the social strata ground down by the monopolies. The Party will continue to do everything in its power to promote unity.

We should work for unity and promote the struggle at enter-

prises for higher wages and a 40-hour week without wage cuts, against dismissals or shorter hours without wage cuts.

We should work for unity and promote the struggles in the countryside for a revision of the prices of farm products, in defense of the family farms, which are threatened with expropriation in favor of big industrial monopolies and agrarian capitalists.

On the question of schools, we should promote the unity and most diverse actions of all democrats for necessary allocations for the construction of schools and the maintenance of a sufficient number of teachers; for defeating the Fouchet reform which dangerously increases class discrimination in the educational system; for securing a genuinely democratic reform supported by the national symposium of the democratic parties and organizations held on April 18 and 19; for guaranteeing the right of the youth to culture, vocational training, and rest and leisure.

We should work for the unity of the consumers and taxpayers demanding that the taxes, one of the causes of the high cost of living, be reduced, a reform of the tax system effected, and the rich forced to pay up, as proposed in the Communist draft law submitted to the National Assembly. In the nearest future an agreement can be reached among the democratic organizations to launch a campaign to raise the tax-exempt income ceiling to 500,000 old francs from the present 240,000. If this is not done, another 700,000 wage-earners will start paying taxes this year.

We should contribute to unity in the struggle for higher family allowances and in defense of Social Security, against the growing rent and for bigger housing allocations. We should defend the interests of the old workers, war veterans and war victims.

With this aim in view, the Party organizations should do more to explain to the masses the real character of the monopoly onslaught and acquaint them with our Party's proposals and decisions, specifically its democratic program. The Party organizations should support the trade unions and mass organizations defending the interests of one or another section of the population.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Along with the struggle for the economic and social demands of the working people, it is also our primary task to work for a French policy of peace.

Waldeck Rochet noted in his report to the 17th Party Congress that two trends prevailed in the international situation: a certain relaxation of tension, on the one hand, and continued aggressive actions by the imperialists, on the other. This is due to the fact that although the peace-supporters of the world have grown strong enough to have measures conducive to an international detente adopted, imperialism remains aggressive in its nature, which is especially evident when it gets entangled in its own contradictions

or comes up against serious difficulties, such as in South Vietnam.

Developments since our Congress bear out the operation of this dual trend.

For instance, the recent agreement on passes signed by the German Democratic Republic and the West Berlin Senate should be regarded by us as a manifestation of the relaxation of world tension. At the same time the imperialists, the U.S. imperialists in particular, are perpetrating more acts of aggression endangering the peace.

Such acts include the armed intervention in South Vietnam, the atacks on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the interference in the domestic affairs of Laos, Cyprus and the Congo, and the continued threats against Cuba. If we add to this the actions of the West German revenge-seekers craving for possession of nuclear weapons, specifically through the establishment of a multilateral nuclear force, and the fact that the fascist-minded Goldwater has been able to become a U.S. presidential candidate, we shall see how active and dangerous are the forces hostile to peace and peaceful coexistence.

Therefore the struggle for peace should remain our prime concern, all the more so since de Gaulle's foreign policy remains deeply hostile to international detente and disarmament.

However, we regard as positive and realistic de Gaulle's stand for neutralization of South Vietnam in the spirit of the 1954 Geneva agreements. Some comrades have been embarrassed by this attitude of our Party. But they are wrong.

To begin with, had we followed them the masses would not have understood us, for de Gaulle has been compelled to come out for measures conforming to the spirit of our own demands. This is a success for our policy.

These comrades also fail to realize that the present reality, the aggravation of the imperialist contradictions and the struggle of our people. That is why the Communists welcome all measures the interests of peace and national independence. Therefore not a single positive step of the government should be ignored; moreover, it should be taken advantage of to intensify the struggle of our people. That is wyh the Communists welcome all measures promoting international relaxation, peaceful coexistence and the independence of the peoples, whatever the circumstances that have prompted them and whatever quarter they may come from.

And no matter what is said, this is not a sign of a conciliatory attitude to the de Gaulle regime on our part in any respect. We remain resolutely opposed to one-man rule, and we do not forget that de Gaulle's policy runs counter to the interests of peace, the nation and the country.

Proceeding with the establishment of the atomic strike force, which ruins France and imperils it security, de Gaulle aids the

proliferation of nuclear weapons. Moreover, he persists in refusing to sign the Moscow Treaty and prepares nuclear tests in the Pacific which will prejudice the prestige of our country.

Equally pernicious is the de Gaulle government's policy towards Bonn Germany. The Bonn-Paris axis and all kinds of concessions to the FRG rulers help to strengthen Bonn's positions and increase its military might. This, and the support of the U.S., encourage the West German revenge-seekers to advance claims and demands harmful to the interests of France and to the cause of peace.

In these circumstances we call upon our people to fight:

—for France's accession to the Moscow test-ban treaty, for her support in the international arena, the UN included, of an agreement on general disarmament that would also include the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons all over the world;

—for the dissolution by France of the Franco-German military treaty, for the recognition of the GDR and cooperation with the two German states, and for settlement of the question of West Berlin, which should become a free demilitarized city.

The future of France and the course of its international influence do not lie in the arms race. On the contrary, it could play a bigger role if it withdrew from the arms race and initiated a policy of non-alignment with military blocs. Such a policy would contribute to universal cooperation and disarmament.

In order to strengthen the unity and step up the struggle of all the peace-loving forces for these objectives, the Communist organizations will intensify explanatory work among the masses. At the same time they will give the utmost support to the numerous activities of the Peace Movement in favor of a French peace policy. They will assist in the consolidation of the Peace Movement by setting up numerous committees at enterprises, in towns and villages.

ALLIANCE BASED ON A COMMON PROGRAM

Waldeck Rochet pointed out in his report to the Seventeenth Congress: "Agreement between the democratic parties to pool efforts in effecting a common program is, in our opinion, a pressing necessity, for it is essential for victory over the one-man rule and a guarantee that it will be followed by a genuinely democratic policy in the interests of the people."

The idea of a common program has undeniably gained new ground since our Congress, which is borne out by numerous facts. Nevertheless no agreement has so far been reached, in view of the numerous obstacles that still have to be removed. That is why we must constantly revert to this problem in connection with the mounting struggle and carry on extensive explanatory work among the masses to acquaint them with the position of our Party.

Guy Mollet declared recently: "The problem of succession to

de Gaulle is the most difficult one." But it cannot be separated from the paramount problem, that of delivering the country from the regime of one-man rule. That is why we consider that the elaboration of a common program of the democratic forces is necessary in order to create appropriate conditions for ousting de Gaulle and at once ensuring the future of the country.

De Gaulle's power has undeniably weakened, whereas the democratic forces opposed to de Gaulle's policies and regime have, on the whole, grown much stronger.

It should be borne in mind, however, that an exceptionally powerful movement is needed to put an end to one-man rule. We, for our part, consider that to show a clear perspective to our people already now is indispensable for making such a movement a reality and for rallying all the democrats in it. Hence the main parties and democratic organizations should agree on the policy they will pursue tomorrow and put it before the people, thereby demonstrating their agreement to work together in the government in order jointly to implement this policy in the interests of the people and the nation.

Unless agreement on a common program is reached many democrats, though they want a change in the policy and in the regime, will hesitate to join the democratic opposition for fear of the unknown, while the Gaullists will continue to capitalize on the inability of the opponents of the government and its policy to come to agreement.

To postpone agreement on a common democratic program inevitably means playing into the hands of Gaullism.

In the same speech Guy Mollet spoke of the "unity of the democrats," making no mention of the Communists. Maurice Faure went even further, and stressed the need for "unity of the democrats standing between the Gaullists and the Communists."

Frankly, this is not a serious approach. The Communists make no claim to being able to end de Gaulle's rule and establish a new democracy single-handed. But no one can say that he can achieve this goal without the participation of our Party, which enjoys the confidence of the majority of the working people and other forward-looking forces of the nation. Indeed, to do so is tantamount to dooming our country and people to a long period of monopoly plunder. Besides, experience shows that debarring Communists benefits only the most rapid reactionaries — and it is precisely to this pernicious policy of the past that de Gaulle owes his power.

Hence the need for the earliest possible agreement on the common program of all democratic parties and organizations without exception —- excepting, of course, representatives of reaction, for the personify the same past to which the democrats do not want

to return. Indeed, one cannot hope to establish a new democracy and pursue a genuine policy of social progress, democracy and peace in the interest of the working class and the vast majority of the people while compromising with the reactionaries.

Our Party has worked out and specified, at its 17th Congress, a program which will make it possible to set up truly democratic institutions, ensure the full blossoming of democracy, guarantee the stability of the government and enable it to pursue a policy conforming to the needs of the country. Such a policy should be implemented on the basis of an economic plan fundamentally differing from that of de Gaulle's in its objectives, the democratic methods of its compilation, and the means of, and political conditions for, its realization.

We submit this proposal for discussion. We are always prepared to carry on a discussion with the Socialist and other democratic parties for the purpose of reaching agreement. Despite the differences on some issues, we think agreement is feasible, considering that the programs of our Party and the Socialist Party have numerous points that coincide. The recent statements by Socialist leaders on economic and social problems confirm this appraisal. As regards the differences, we certainly can discuss them, on the condition that this discussion does not hamper the common actions necessary to rebuff the monopolies.

We want a common democratic program to serve as the basis for agreement to nominate the presidential candidate of all the democratic forces opposed to the candidate of the one-man regime. But should these proposals be rejected, the Communist Party will be compelled to nominate its own candidate at a suitable moment.

Anxious to remove the obstacles to the achievement of a common program, the Communists will in the course of the everyday struggle redouble their efforts to cement the unity and alliance of all the working people and democrats.

As Maurice Thorez pointed out in his concluding remarks at the 17th Congress, "It is precisely the everyday joint struggle, more and more promoting unity of action, that will enable the Socialists and Communists gradually to overcome the surviving difficulties and reach agreement on more profound issues."

We propose that the Central Committee decide on holding a nationwide campaign of public meetings to acquaint the masses with the democratic program of the Party and to put forward the solutions it proposes to the cardinal problems of the day. This campaign will stimulate the srtuggle, help consolidate unity and alliance, and lead to a more vigorous voicing of demands for a common program.

WORK WITH INITIATIVE

During this period all Party organizations should carry an active work among the masses, display audacity and initiative in explaining all questions to them, help organize the struggle, and stimulate the unity of action of Communists and Socialists, the alliance of all the working-class and democratic organizations of all the victims of the monopolies.

Every effort must be applied to increase the circulation of our publications and, especially our newspaper *l'Humanité* which plays a vital role in our struggle, and print more newspapers of Party branches, specifically factory newspapers. Seclusion and self-isolation must be resolutely combated, for, despite the successes achieved, we know that some Party branches are still guilty of such shortcomings.

In view of all this we must work constantly to build the Party, recruiting into it tens of thousands of new members during the Maurice Thorez enrolment. By now over 6,000 people have joined the Party, but many more can and must be admitted. The steady growth of the strength, organizations and influence of the Party is inseparable from progress in building the unity and alliance of the working-class and democratic forces in the struggle to deliver France from one-man rule, for new democracy, for advance to socialism.

RESOLUTION* OF THE CC, FCP ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION

The Central Committee of the French Communist Party, in session in Ivry on October 9-10, approves the report of Georges Marchais on the political situation and the tasks of the Party.

The de Gaulle government intends to continue and intensify the policy which serves monopoly capital and runs counter to the interests of the working people and the nation as a whole.

To freeze wages and keep the purchasing prices of farm produce at the lowest level in order to preserve the capitalist profits and spend an increasing share of state means on the atomic strike force — such is the chief purpose of the so-called stabilizaiton plan which the government wants to perpetuate.

Prices, especially those of consumer goods, rents and the cost of services continue to grow. By reducing the purchasing capacity of the masses this plan contracts the home market. This policy increases capitalist anarchy and aggravates the consequences of the Common Market, with resultant difficulties in some industries. Tens of thousands of automobile, ship-building,

*L'Humanité, October 12, 1964.

engineering and textile workers are being dismissed or work shorter hours with lower pay.

The draft budget for 1965 envisages heavier direct and other taxes on the consumers and does not make adequate provisions for the people's vital needs, above all for public education, housing and public health.

Under the 5th plan the coming years will witness accelerated capitalist concentration, considerable growth of monopoly profits, restricted public consumption, and the freezing of the workers' incomes.

As regards the threat of inflation which the authorities invoke to justify their rejection of the demands of the people, the real cause of this threat is the steady growth of unproductive expenditure by the state in particular government expenditure on the atomic strike force. It is also a consequence of a host of privileges granted to the big capitalist companies. It is due, finally, to the policy of subservience to the vested interests.

An alliance of all the anti-monopoly forces and the mass struggle of the working people in town and country can defeat this, policy which is so harmful to the interests of the French people and to the future of the country.

Thanks to joint efforts the working class has arrested the implementation of the government plan and won certain gains at many enterprises, including shorter hours without wage cuts.

Consequently, a struggle can and must be effectively waged in various forms against all aspects of official policy, for the demands of the masses.

While continuing to fight for their immediate demands arising from their specific needs and the special conditions at every enterprise, the workers in the private and state sectors feel the need for coordinated actions on the broadest possible scale. Thus, the workers of the state and nationalized sectors express the wish that their respective trade unions agree upon the coordination of more extensive struggle with the support of the democratic parties. We should respond to these wishes.

Our Party supports the workers' joint actions in factories for a general rise in wages and salaries, pensions and benefits, for a return to a 40-hour working week without cuts in wages, for a lower pensionable age and against dismissals.

Our Party actively promotes the popular struggle, specifically against the heavier burden on the small and middle taxpayers, against higher rents, for the necessary allocations for public education and housing, against the threat to Social Security.

Our Party supports the toiling peasants whose struggle has been mounting as a result of the government's stubborn refusal to revise the purchasing prices of farm products at a time when

the prices of the manufactured goods needed in agriculture have grown considerably.

Trade union organizations of workers and peasants have already acted jointly on many occasions, supported by the democratic parties. This desire for unity should be encouraged vigorously throughout the country.

The French Communist Party will do everything to contribute to the success of all forms of struggle and work for the creation of a united front of all the victims of big capital.

The new world balance of forces, the growing contradictions between the imperialist countries and our people's struggle have compelled General de Gaulle to adopt more realistic positions on some international issues. Thus, he has proposed convening a conference of all the states concerned to search for a peaceful settlement in South Vietnam and Laos, victims to the U.S. imperialist aggression.

Consequently, a more active struggle for a French policy of peace can facilitate the realization of the idea of settling disputed international problems by peaceful means. This struggle is all the more necessary since de Gaulle's policy is, essentially, profoundly hostile to international detente and disarmament.

Whipping up the arms race, de Gaulle is preparing to explode a hydrogen bomb in the Pacific and refuses to sign the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests.

Despite the failure of his German policy he remains allied with German militarism and thus encourages the revenge-seekers in West Germany. He stubbornly ignores the German Democratic Republic and opposes a just settlement of the problem of West Berlin.

The peace forces have some successes to their credit, but the project of a multinational nuclear force designed to meet these forces opposed to peaceful coexistence remain active and dangerous. This is borne out, for one, by the actions of the West-German revenge-seekers reaching out for nuclear weapons, the aspirations, and the fact that a militarist like Goldwater has been able to secure enough support to become a candidate for the presidency of the United States.

All French men and women cherishing the interests and security of France and striving to eliminate the danger of a nuclear war will fight on for a French policy of national independence and peace, for France's accession to the Moscow treaty, for the renunciation of the manufacture of atomic weapons, for our country's participation in the disarmament conference, for withdrawal from military blocs and for peaceful coexistence among all countries. They will support the activities of the Peace Movement.

★ ★ ★

To make a policy of social progress, freedom and peace a reality, one-man rule has to be done away with and genuine democracy established.

But even before this great victory is scored the everyday struggles and unity of the Frenchmen suffering from the policy of the monopolies can defeat one-man rule or limit its pernicious effects. In their totality vigorous joint struggles are weakening one-man rule and creating conditions for removing it.

In the tireless struggle against all aspects of government policy the Communists, Socialists and other republicans will strengthen unity of action and eliminate the obstacles that still stand in the way of achieving a common program.

An alliance without any discrimination against democratic forces for the purpose of jointly elaborating and pursuing a common policy in the interest of France and its people, is indispensable to oust Gaullism. There is no other road.

The coinciding points in the programs of the democratic parties and organizations opposed to one-man rule can constitute the foundation of a charter on joint actions.

Recent denunciation by the Socialist Party of the government's economic and social policy is added proof that such a possibility exists.

To try, as Maurice Faure and some others are doing, to replace the fruitful idea of the unity of the Communists, Socialists, Radicals and other republicans, believers and non-believers alike, with the concept of an unprincipled alliance of the democrats, excepting the Communists, with the reactionaries, means only playing into the hands of one-man rule.

The French Communist Party will continue to work towards agreement among all the democratic parties on a common program that will unite the masses and open up the prospect of defeating de Gaulle's rule. A common program would make it possible to nominate the candidate of all the democratic forces at the forthcoming presidential elections. If, despite all the efforts, no agreement materializes, our Party will nominate its own candidate at the appropriate time.

The Central Committee has resolved to launch a nation-wide campaign of public meetings to familiarize the masses with the proposals which our Party submits to the democrats for consideration and which it is prepared to discuss without delay with all democratic parties and organizations.

Our program visualizes a genuinely democratic system based on the sovereignty of the people. The stability and efficacy of the government will be ensured owing to the confidence of the majority of the people and their representatives who will pursue a policy conforming to the interests of the people.

In order to place the riches of the country at the service of the French people and ensure a steady rise in their living standards, the Communists propose, in particular, the following measures: to restrict monopoly power through nationalization and the establishment of organs of working people's control in all the echelons of economic life; to channel capital investments to the most important fields: public education, housing, public health, etc.; to initiate an economic, social and cultural plan radically differing from de Gaulle's plan in its objectives and democratic methods of elaboration, as well as in the means of, and the political conditions for, implementing it.

In conformity with the decisions of the 17th Congress the activists and organizations of the French Communist Party come out for an alliance of the Communists, Socialists and all democrats. At the same time they will tirelessly strengthen their Party, recruiting into it thousands of new members in the course of the Maurice Thorez enrolment.

Ivry, October 10, 1964.

INTERVIEW* WITH HO CHI MINH

THE PRESIDENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM AND CHAIRMAN OF THE PARTY OF WORKING PEOPLE OF VIETNAM, IS INTERVIEWED BY A JAPANESE JOURNALIST

Question: Would you be so kind, Mr. President, as to analyze the present situation in Vietnam which is waging a struggle against U.S. imperialists, and the tasks of North and South Vietnam in this struggle? How does Vietnam's struggle against American imperialism affect the balance of forces between the socialist and capitalist system, and how does it affect the situation in Asia, especially in Southeast Asia?

Answer: South Vietnam has been carrying on a struggle against the United States and its henchmen for ten years now. Although the Vietnamese patriots began this struggle armed with little more than spears and arrows, they are winning bigger victories from day to day. At the present time a powerful army of liberation has been built up and two-thirds of the territory of South Vietnam with more than half of the country's population have been liberated.

The U.S. imperialists and their lackeys, despite their army of 500,000, despite the tens of thousands of American advisers, hundreds of airplanes, warships and guns, are suffering defeat after defeat and are sinking deeper and deeper into the morass from which they cannot extricate themselves.

South Vietnam is the front line of the struggle against the American imperialists. North Vietnam is the bulwark of the struggle for the peaceful re-union of Vietnam. The people of North Vietnam support their countrymen in the South. We respect the Geneva agreements of 1954. The U.S. government and its lackeys are violating those agreements.

The patriotic struggle in South Vietnam is not only aimed at the complete liberation of that part of our country;it is of major importance also as a means of preventing the invasion of North Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, by the American imperialists and their henchmen.

This struggle is part of the general national-liberation movement which is dealing crushing blows at imperialism, at old and new colonialism headed by American imperialism.

---

*Nyan San, Sept. 11, 1964.

It should be emphasized that the American imperialists regard South Vietnam as a proving ground in the "special" war which they intend to launch with the aim of crushing the struggle of other peoples. Hence the patriotic struggle of our compatriots in South Vietnam for the liberation of their country is at the same time an important contribution to the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and especially to the struggle of the peoples of Southeast Asia to frustrate imperialist aggression, and primarily aggression by the U.S. imperialists.

Question: Mr. President, will you be so kind as to express your opinion as to the prospects for the re-union of North and South Vietnam?

Answer: I have no doubt that the patriotic movement of our countrymen in South Vietnam, under the leadership of the National Front of Liberation, will be crowned with success, although great difficulties still lie ahead. South Vietnam will unquestionably be liberated and the struggle for the peaceful re-union of our country is bound to end in victory.

Question: What significance, in your opinion, Mr. President, will the specific features of socialist construction in Vietnam have for the future development of socialism in the world?

Answer: We are building socialism in a backward agricultural country, a former colony, a country which was devastated by aggressive war. These conditions, of course, created great difficulties for us. However, the initial successes achieved in the building of socialism have convinced us that countries like Vietnam can and should advance successfully toward socialism, by-passing the stage of capitalist development.

Question: Mr. President, what is Vietnam's attitude to the question of revisionism in the socialist camp?

Answer: The history of revolutionary movements knows of no few instances when differences have arisen and ideological struggle has been waged. In the end, however, Marxism-Leninism has always triumphed and the revolution has moved forward.

We are convinced that the ideological struggle in the socialist camp, notwithstanding the difficulties still ahead, will be overcome. In this struggle we have adhered firmly to the position of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, upholding the revolutionary principles set forth in the Moscow documents of 1957 and 1960.

Question: Mr. President, would you like to say something about the strengthening of ties of friendship between the peoples of Vietnam and Japan?

Answer: The Vietnamese people have the deepest admiration for the heroic struggle of the Japanese people against American

imperialism and domestic reaction, for a peaceful, independent and democratic Japan, for friendship with other nations.

We wish to express our gratitude for the sympathy and support displayed by the Japanese people for the patriotic struggle of our compatriots in South Vietnam and for the struggle of the entire Vietnamese people for the peaceful re-union of Vietnam.

May the friendship between the Vietnamese and Japanese peoples grow stronger from day to day in the interests of both our peoples, and also of all the peoples of Asia and of the entire world who are striving for peace, independence, democracy and social progress.

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, IRAQI COMMUNIST PARTY

The Central Committee of the Iraqi Communist Party recently held an enlarged meeting, the first of its kind since the fascist coup of February 8. The meeting was opened with a minute's silence in memory of the martyrs of the Party and the national movement—victims of the Baathist terror.

The meeting discussed and approved the report presented on the political situation, the Party's tasks in the present situation and the perspectives of the revolutionary movement in Iraq and in the Arab world. It also discussed internal problems of the Party.

In discussing the latest developments in the international Communist movement the meeting noted with regret that the leaders of the Communist Party of China are moving farther and farther from the Marxist-Leninist road. In the name of the membership it condemned their factionalist activities in the Communist move-movement and called for an active ideological struggle against them. The meeting declared its support for holding an international meeting in the middle of 1965 at which Communists would discuss the regrouping of their movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, would sum up and disseminate the new experiences gained during the past four years.

The meeting stressed that time has proved the correctness of the conclusions summarized and developed in the Statement of the Moscow Meeting. The balance of forces in the international arena has changed and is constantly changing in favor of the forces of peace, liberation and socialism and against the forces of imperialism and war. The influence exerted by the socialist world system on the trend of events in the world is growing day by day. People are turning to socialism in increasing numbers. This finds its concrete expression in the growth of the revolutionary movements and the popularity of socialist ideas, in the link-up of increasing new social groups and political forces into a front struggling against capitalism as a socio-economic system; and in the adherence of progressive governments to the non-capitalist path of development, the path of radical changes, and, finally, in the appearance of new means and forms of the transition to socialism.

The imperialist circles, mainly the American, are continuing their acts of provocation and naked intervention by various forms, including armed intervention in the affairs of other countries and also continuing the policy of increasing international tension and

arms race, in addition to seeking new forms for preserving and strengthening their positions. However, the struggle of the forces of peace and freedom, headed by the Soviet Union, is increasing day by day, scoring one victory after another.

On the Arab scene, also, the balance of forces has changed radically in favor of the people. Thirteen independent Arab states have appeared on the map (instead of the four that were nominally independent when the Second World War ended). Many imperialist military bases on Arab territory have been closed. Imperialist maneuvers aiming to bind the Arab countries to military blocs and pacts have been foiled. Imperialist political and economic positions have been lost for good. In the two biggest Arab countries (Egypt and Algeria) the revolution has moved beyond the framework of political independence from imperialism and has entered on a new stage, the stage of effecting important social changes which have brought these two fraternal countries onto the road of non-capitalist development, leading to socialism. The achievements of the Egyptian and Algerian revolutions are increasingly influencing the struggle of the Arab and African peoples as a source of inspiration and have placed the two fraternal republics in a vanguard position in the Arab world. In the course of the struggle for liberation and social progress, the militant solidarity between the Arab people is being consolidated, and the role of the Arab people as an important factor in influencing the trends in each Arab country, is growing. The movement for Arab unity is also acquiring a new and more progressive content.

The imperialist-reactionary circles exploited the isolation of the Kassem regime caused by the big flaws in his policy—persecution of the people and the democratic forces, deterioration of the economic situation, the aggressive war against the Kurds, his prolonging of the emergency and dictatorial conditions, etc.

The coup of February 8th was a counter-revolution in the preparation of which participated imperialists, reactionaries and other anti-Kassem groups. Never in the history of Iraq has there been such savage terror as that which took place during the Baath regime. Those who seized power on February 8, 1963, on the pretext of a rising against the Kassem dictatorship did not save Iraq from dictatorship, on the contrary they installed an infinitely more ruthless dictatorship and implemented the schemes of the oil company and CENTO circles against our people and resumed the dirty war against the Kurds.

The Baath fascist regime did not solve the contradictions which led to Kassem's fall, they deepened them and, hence, doomed themselves to quick collapse. The struggle of our people against the fascist regime enjoyed the sympathy and support of the fraternal Communist parties and of Arab and international public

opinion, a fact which helped to isolate the Baath regime at Arab and international levels.

The Central Committee meeting regarded the action of November 18, 1963, as an action which ended the nightmare of fascist rule and created more favorable conditions for the struggle of the anti-imperialist forces, for the preservation of national independence, changing official policy and returning Iraq to the camp of Arab liberation.

The new government took measures corresponding to the interests of the people (stopping the war against the Kurds, restoring the National Oil Company law—despite the gaps in it—improving relations with the UAR and signing an agreement of coordination with it, stressing the policy of peace and non-alignment, undertaking some steps to restore and improve relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and, lastly, the nationalization laws.

There are, however, serious defects in the policy of the present government: the Kurdish question is still without solution, prisons are filled with patriots, the country is living under emergency conditions, military courts are continuing to send more citizens to prison, the economic situation is still deteriorating and stability is almost non-existent, the administration is honeycombed with reactionary corrupt elements, and the policy of the government brings grist to the mill of the imperialists. This provides fertile soil for the imperialist-reactionary activities aimed at establishing a reactionary subservient regime similar to the Baath regime or the overthrown royal regime.

The CC of the Iraqi Communist Party urges the government to pay attention to the situation before it is too late, to rely on the masses and on all the anti-imperialist forces. The present regime, if it wants to strengthen and deepen the anti-imperialist trend, if it wants to pursue a progressive policy similar to that of the fraternal UAR and Algeria, must follow the example of the leaders in Cairo and Algiers in pursuing a clear and firm policy against imperialism and its agents; in this way it would safeguard the just oil rights of Iraq, implement and deepen the agrarian reform, release the political prisoners and detainees, stop shadowing Communists and democrats, guarantee liberties, satisfy the demands of the Kurdish people, establish a genuinely democratic government, block the penetration of imperialist capital and by so doing bar the way to imperialist plotting.

The Party will support all the patriotic and progressive measures taken by the present regime. It supports the Coordination Agreement between Iraq and the UAR and the steps towards unity which follow from it. It extends the hand of cooperation to all organizations and groups determined to uphold national independence

and would support the Government in following a policy similar to that of the UAR and Algerian governments.

Our Party will, as it has always done, continue to fight for the just rights of the people. It determines its position on the basis of the attitude of the regime vis-à-vis imperialism (in its old and new forms), the demands of the workers, peasants and the masses of the people, and the problem of planned economic development, industrialization and social progress.

The Central Committee meeting stressed that imperialism was and remains the chief enemy of our people. Despite the victories won by the liberation struggle of our people (the overthrow of the Monarchy, repudiating the Baghdad Pact and all the imperialist treaties), Iraq is still at the crossroads. It has not yet achieved economic independence and will not do so until it wrests its oil wealth from the grip of imperialist monopolies, until it establishes industries on the basis of modern technology.

The tasks facing our country are the complete liquidation of imperialist positions, namely the economic positions, and the realization of radical social and democratic changes and above all, agrarian reform.

The meeting notes that the new developments in the Arab world and on the international scene open before Iraq the possibility of taking the non-capitalist way of development now being followed by the UAR and Algeria.

The meeting sees the problem of Arab unity in the context of the new developments on the Arab scene—the non-capitalist way and social progress which enrich the progressive content of the Arab unity movement and make it a movement aiming at both national and social liberation.

The Party is fighting as it always has done, for the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces without exception, to uphold and consolidate national independence, for democracy and social progress. Our Party declares its readiness to conclude bilateral and multilateral alliances with all forces concerned with realizing social transformations and opting for the non-capitalist way for Iraq.

The meeting stressed the danger stemming from the continued deadlock in the Kurdish problem and the dragging out of its solution by the government. It urges a peaceful solution for it by granting the just demands of the Kurds within the framework of the Iraqi Republic. Our Party calls upon all patriots, Arab and Kurd, to enhance their vigilance and stand firm in the face of the maneuvers and conspiracies of the oil companies, CENTO and the ultra-reactionary and chauvinist elements who would like to embroil the country anew in another civil war, in order to facilitate realization of the imperialist conspiracies. Unity of the patriotic forces in Kurdistan is a basic guarantee for preventing a new outbreak of the war and for granting the just rights of Iraqi Kurdistan.

The meeting also discussed internal problems of the Party. It noted with satisfaction that our Party stood firm despite the Baath terror and, thanks to its close contact with the masses, emerged from this crisis victoriously despite heavy losses when large numbers of its members and leaders were murdered.

The importance of asserting the Leninist principles in intra-Party life was also stressed.

Collective leadership is the guiding principle any violation of which runs counter to a correct Party policy. Violation of collective leadership necessarily leads to political and organizational mistakes and to great harm.

The meeting called upon all the members to close their ranks, sharpen their vigilance, consolidate the unity of their glorious Party, strengthen discipline and to stand firm in the face of all forms of opportunism .The basic danger against which the ideological struggle should be concentrated by our Party in the present period is dogmatism and "Left" sectarianism which has its traditions in the revolutionary movement in Iraq and has now appropriate objective conditions on both the local and international levels.

The meeting adopted a number of amendments to the rules of the Party.

It expressed its appreciation of the activities of our Party delegation to the meeting of the Arab Communist parties and of the joint resolutions issued by the meeting.

The meeting ended by electing the central executive bodies of the Party.

OPEN LETTER*

TO THE MOVEMENT OF NOVEMBER 13 FROM POLITICAL COMMISSION OF CC, GUATEMALAN PARTY OF LABOR

Referring to the publication of the first number of *Revolucion Socialista,* organ of the Movement of November 13 (M-13), which carries a document entitled "The Tasks and Prospects of the Revolutionary Movement of November 13," the Political Commission of the CC, GPL, hails the birth of the newspaper but regrets that the above-mentioned document contains attacks on the Guatemalan Party of Labor. "In this open letter our Party intends to outline some of the major problems," the Political Commission declares. "It also plans to publish a series of articles in which it will state and substantiate its views on these problems."

"WELCOME TO SOCIALISM"

In the first part of the letter, thus headlined, the GPL expresses satisfaction at the fact that the Movement of November 13 has once again reaffirmed its revolutionary position and especially its devotion to the cause of socialism. Throughout the 15 years of its existence, the letter states, the GPL has invariably proclaimed communism to be the ultimate goal of its struggle; it takes part in and leads the struggle of the people for their socio-economic demands, popularizes the basic ideas of socialism, and explains what socialism means and how to build it. In other words, the GPL imbues the masses with socialist consciousness, which does not come of itself, instinctively, but is acquired through knowledge of the scientific principles of socialism.

"M-13 also speaks of the socialist revolution," the letter reads. "This is an important step forward in the development of its political concepts. The same thing is happening with many revolutionary-minded people today. This change in their consciousness is not fortuitous. It is not an isolated phenomenon characteristic of our country alone. Thanks to the successes of the socialist countries, hundreds of millions of people the world over are beginning to see the superiority of the socialist system. . . .

"Our proximity to revolutionary Cuba, which is building socialism, also exerts a salutary influence on the consciousness of the masses. Another factor is the example and activity of our Party,

*A summary.

the *only* political party in Guatemala which from its inception ... has fought for an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal program, for independent national development, and for socialism. This struggle has not been free from shortcomings, but we can say with legitimate pride that we are the only Guatemalan political party which publicly criticizes its mistakes."

SOCIALIST REVOLUTION OVERNIGHT?

The second part of the letter notes that determination alone is not enough in the struggle for socialism; one must know by what means and in what conditions socialism can be won. "It seems to us that in this respect the platform of M-13 fails to take into consideration the laws of social development, the real possibilities of the most politically mature revolutionary forces, and the present position of the democratic forces as a whole. Its documents speak repeatedly of the permanent mobilization of the masses in our country, although very little has been done in this respect to date."

It is true that some sections have grown more active and militant, but an objective analysis of reality shows that there are no grounds for being over-optimistic about the actual situation as regards the revolutionary forces.

Commenting on the examples of the "permanent mobilization of the masses" in Guatemala mentioned in the M-13 document, the letter says: "No revolutionary can have anything but the warmest sympathy for the actions of the workers and peasants in support of their demands. But it would be a mistake to regard such actions as an indication of the existence of 'anti-capitalist consciousness' and of the growing determination of the masses "to abolish capitalism." Still less is it possible to infer from this that the conditions exist for urging the masses 'to set up organs of dual power in order to prepare the downfall of imperialism and capitalism' and even to organize 'communes of Indians with the functions of Soviets'."

The letter calls upon the M-13 leaders, especially Yon Sosa, commander of the guerrilla movement and Turcios, detachment commander, to ponder over this, for "a dangerous provocation may be hidden behind this ultra-leftist talk." The Political Commission of the GPL Central Committee stresses its confidence in the profound devotion of these two leaders and the other outstanding revolutionaries and patriots of M-13 to the revolution, which cannot be said about some of those who have sided with the movement of late and are intriguing to split the rebel armed forces and separate the M-13 from the other revolutionary forces, the GPL in particular. Their behavior is beginning to look more and more like that of irresponsible provocateurs.

"To rouse the workers and peasants to revolt or to 'establish workers' control over production,' seize and distribute the land,

'tilling it collectively wherever possible and necessary,' and to put forward other such slogans only means deluding the masses and provoking premature actions which can only lead to repressions by the reactionaries.

"Conditions for revolutionary struggle do exist in Guatemala. Ever new sections are joining in the fight against the military dictatorship and the possibility of armed struggle is presenting itself. But it should be understood that at this, initial stage, it is in the nature of a resistance struggle and serves for the accumulation of forces which will eventually make it possible to launch an offensive and achieve victory."

EXAMPLE OF THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The letter refers to the tasks V. I. Lenin set on the eve of the 1905 revolution in Russia as an example of correct revolutionary strategy and tactics. Lenin pointed out that after coming to power the workers' and peasants' government would have to carry out the "minimum program" of the Party, i.e., a program of urgently needed political and economic reforms which were wholly practicable in view of the socio-economic relations existing in Russia at that time. That, in turn, would make possible the next step towards socialism.

BRIEFLY ON THE NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION

It is noted in the third part of the letter that the present conditions in the world are especially favorable for the social revolution. "But it is always necessary to take into account the actual correlation of forces, the actual ability of the revolutionary vanguard to lead the masses. . . ."

All the more important is it, the letter continues, to take account of "the socio-economic conditions, the socio-economic basis of the revolutionary process. In its document M-13 disagrees with us as to the character of the Guatemalan revolution at the present stage. We have declared that it is a national-democratic revolution. But it is only out of malevolence or ignorance that one can conclude from this that we are not fighting for the socialist revolution and that, moreover, we want the revolutionary movement to be headed by the bourgeoisie and not by the working class. On the contrary, according to the political line adopted by the Third Congress of the GPL, our Party "is fighting not only for the national-democratic revolution in Guatemala, but also for the socialist revolution, which will put an end to the division of our society into exploiting and exploited classes. Only when the working class assumes leadership of the national-democratic revolution is it conducted more consisently, thus removing the obstacles to the socialist revolution."

It is pointed out in the letter that the Third Congress of the GPL defined the strategic objective of the Guatemalan revolution

at the present historical stage proceeding from the basic contradiction in Guatemala's development, "the contradiction between the new productive forces seeking to break through and the old semi-feudal production relations and the imperialist rule which obstruct them." An analysis of the real correlation of forces led to the conclusion that at the present stage the Guatemalan revolution would be national-democratic in character and that the revolutionary power would represent the bloc of the forces accomplishing it.

It is absurd to think, the letter states, that in view of the similarity of the tasks of the national-democratic revolution and the socialist revolution the former is an end in itself. The GPL regards the national-democratic revolution as an historically necessary step which will make progress to socialism possible in Guatemala. "In what form we shall do this and how long the national-democratic revolution will take—months or years—will depend, not on slogans or ultra-leftist speeches, but on the concrete conditions in which the revolutionary classes take power into their hands, on their ability to unite the masses and inspire them to accomplish the revolution," the letter stresses.

UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WORKING CLASS

This part of the letter notes once again that the allegation concerning the GPL's refusal to recognize the leading role of the working class in the revolution is prompted either by ill-will or ignorance, in corroboration of which it quotes from some basic documents adopted over the past ten years, among them the resolution on "The North-American Intervention in Guatemala and the Overthrow of the Democratic Regime," adopted by the Political Commission of the CC GPL in 1955, which stressed that, though numerically small, the working class can and should head the revolutionary struggle of the masses. The mere fact that the GPL speaks of the national-democratic character of the Guatemalan revolution, the letter states, is interpreted by the *Revolucion Socialista* to mean that the GPL comes out for the bourgeois leadership of this revolution. Anything more ridiculous could hardly be imagined.

The letter stresses that "the working class, the peasants and the middle urban strata are the leading forces of the Guatemalan revolution, i.e., the classes which can and must accomplish the revolution. As for the bourgeoisie, it fears the revolution, but it is also afraid of imperialism, in whose omnipotence it still mistakenly believes. Therefore the national bourgeoisie vacillates or shuns revolutionary struggle and may even side with the reactionary classes.

"But it would be a harmful mistake to regard the national bourgeoisie from the same angle or on the same plane as the feudal landowners or the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie.

"International experience shows that the national bourgeoisie should not be discounted. We want to add that the revolutionary forces of Guatemala should strive to win the support of the national bourgeoisie or at least neutralize it, thus depriving the coalition of the reactionary classes, which will fight against the revolution to the end and with every possible means, of one of its potential allies."

STRANGE VIEWS

The M-13 document criticizes the concept of armed struggle "by stages through the so-called people's war" as being allegedly of a formal, bureaucratic and militaristic character. Our friends from the M-13 confuse armed rebellion with people's war. In conclusion they offer the following unexpected solution: "to bring matters to a general revolutionary strike, occupy the enterprises and set up armed self-defense groups." They also add that it will be up to the masses "to organize their own army . . ." but they do not say how this is to be done. "The masses," the M-13 document proclaims, "organize their own army—the workers' and peasants' militia."

It is pointed out in the letter that the GPL has always opposed coups and maintained that victory can only be won by the efforts of the people themselves, by their struggle, their organization and armed forces which will emerge in the course of this struggle. The letter quotes from the resolution adopted by Political Commission of the CC, GPL on December 20, 1963: "Support of guerrilla actions, consolidation and expansion of the armed movement is the main criterion of the correct political orientation of the democratic and revolutionary forces."

"At the same time the Party considers it necessary to do everything to stir the masses to action. To devote ourselves exclusively to armed struggle, to give up the countless actions that have to be carried out in defense of the political, economic, social and cultural demands of the people would mean isolating the armed struggle and making it dependent on the support of only the politically most advanced sections of the population."

It is impossible to understand how anyone could assert that guerrilla struggle is "bureaucratic and militaristic" when it was precisely *after* the militaristic tendencies among the democratic forces had been *overcome* that the guerrilla detachments were able to begin to operate in our country.

It is absurd to depict the guerrilla movement, and, above all, the difficult job of maintaining and developing it, as "bureaucratic," for in Guatemala, just as in any other country and in any historical period, guerrilla warfare requires efficient logistic support and communications, etc. Without these things the guerrilla detach-

ments would be isolated or exposed to the danger of being easily crushed by the armed might of the enemy.

Our Party regards armed struggle as a people's war which, far from replacing other forms of struggle, unites all the efforts of the people into a single revolutionary stream. In other words, we regard guerrilla struggle as the sacred war of the people against the oppressors, and therefore this struggle must have the sympathy and support of the people; it must stimulate the activity of the masses to a degree that would make it possible to remove the reactionary classes from power.

The letter stresses that the masses must be won over and the revolution thoroughly prepared. "Concentrated in these few words is the experience of history's greatest revolutions, especially revolutions accomplished under the leadership of the working class and other revolutionary classes." The Party warns the revolutionary forces against replacing these lessons with ultra-revolutionary slogans put forward in disregard of the concrete situation and the real possibilities of the revolutionary forces. Such an attitude only leads to defeat. As Lenin pointed out, "it is necessary to fight against revolutionary phraseology; we have to fight it if we do not want ever to hear the bitter truth said about us that revolutionary phraseology about revolutionary war killed the revolution."

ORIENTATION AGAINST UNITY

The Political Commission of the GPL Central Committee warns M-13 against statements such as were printed in *Revolucion Socialista* and points out that disdain for the other revolutionary forces may lead to a split in the democratic forces and to the isolation of the movement. It is true, of course, the letter says, that not all the democratic trends have the same level of revolutionary consciousness or the same clarity of political ideology, but in order to be able to extend a hand to them and propose a united-front policy one should proceed from that which promotes unity and wins forces away from the enemy camp, from the interests of the class represented by the given trend, from whether the interests of this class conform to the productive forces striving to force their way.

The Guatemalan Party of Labor stresses that no single party, trend or organization in the country could bring the revolution to victorious conclusion with its own forces only. In this connection the letter calls attention to the dangerous orientation against unity adopted by the M-13.

"This orientation, incredible as it may sound, affects Yon Sosa's rebel armed forces themselves. *Revolucion Socialista* goes so far as to assert that there is no need for a 'central military

command', since the masses with their organs of 'second power' (sic!) 'will exercise power today and build a workers' state tomorrow'!"

WHY THE ATTACKS ON OUR PARTY?

The Guatemalan Party of Labor stresses the contribution made by the Communists to the revolutionary cause and rejects the charge of the M-13 that they must be held responsible for the defeat of revolutionary Guatemala in 1954. The defeat of the Guatemalan revolution as a result of the United States' intervention in 1954 is explained in the letter by an unfavorable correlation of forces in the international arena. It is pointed out at the same time that in Cuba a similar intervention fell through because Cuba had the support of the USSR and the other socialist countries, whereas Guatemala did not have such support.

UNITY INDISPENSABLE FOR VICTORY

In conclusion, the Political Commission of the GPL Central Committee expresses confidence that despite all the differences of views on revolutionary tactics, there is much in common between the GPL and M-13 and all the democratic forces. This includes the striving to remove the reactionary classes from power and thus pave the way for revolutionary processes in Guatemala. The interests of the revolution come first, and in the name of the revolution the GPL urges the M-13 to ponder over the situation that has arisen following the publication of the document in question.

August 1964.

FIRMNESS OF PRINCIPLES OF CPSU AND CONTINUITY OF ITS LENINIST LINE

INTERVIEW* WITH R. ARISMENDI, FIRST SECRETARY, CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF URUGUAY

Editor: How would you assess the release of Khrushchov from his duties?

Arismendi: The question is posed in a very general and broad form. I think that first of all it is necessary to stress the role of the Soviet Union as the historical and political center of the socialist system and the influence of the CPSU in the world working-class, popular and national-liberation movements. This means that the change has taken place where the process of present-day social development is determined to a decisive extent. Hence the interest and even anxiety with which Communists and progressives all over the world have followed the events.

The circumstance that Khrushchov was First Secretary of the CC, CPSU in the period of the powerful creative ideological and political upsurge initiated by the 20th Congress of the CPSU, and that he made his appearance on the international arena in connection with the Soviet Union's active policy in defense of peace and peaceful coexistence of states with different social system, and in support of the liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries, has led to the fact that some people are inclined to attribute this policy exclusively to Khrushchov's personal activity. However, it is well known that this mature and fruitful policy which has profoundly influenced and accelerated social development was not charted by one man alone, but is the result of the collective efforts of the Central Committee and the whole Party which are closely connected with the proletariat and the broad masses. Individual persons can impart to this process either positive or negative features; they can give brilliant leadership to the struggle, but they also may at certain moments, because of erroneous assessments or a difficult character, even hamper the forward movement which they themselves have helped to bring into being.

Editor: A leader who held high posts has been relieved of them. What might be the political consequences of this change?

Arismendi: The appointment of Brezhnev and Kosygin, who

*El Popular, October 23, 1964.

prior to that had held the posts of Secretary of the CC and a First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers respectively, and the complete unanimity of the CC, CPSU when it voted testify that there is no change either theoretically or politically in the approach to the major international issues of today, to the problems of the socialist system and communist construction in the USSR. On the contrary, it is a question of coming out against certain distortions and erroneous assessments and actions, against hasty decisions made on complex problems without consultation or regardless of the opinion of the Central Committee of the Party. In short, it is not at all a question of a crisis of leadership, of a reversal of the fundamental concepts and methods underlying, for example, the decisions of the 20th Congress. Everything points to the very reverse: to a reaffirmation of the principles of the 20th Congress both in the sphere of theory and as regards the observance of the norms of collective central leadership and inner-Pary democracy. In this respect the *Pravda* editorial is equivalent to a policy statement.

Naturally, the news about the sudden change caused anxiety among some and malicious speculation among others. The references to Khrushchov's age and health, although they could be accepted along with other more serious reasons, were not a very satisfactory explanation first, because of the suddenness of the change and, second, because of the brevity of the communication. This, understandably led one to think that there were other reasons connected with ideological or political factors, or methods of work affecting the activity of the leadership and, consequently, the common interests of communist construction in the USSR and the international working-class and Communist movement.

Editor: And what about the suddenness of the decision?

Arismendi: First of all, it is necessary to repudiate the malicious attempts by the imperialist press and news agencies to describe this change as a coup d'etat or something like that. This is one of the usual lies and calumnies spread by them. Everything points to the fact that the decision was adopted by the Central Committee which, according to the Party Rules, is the highest body in the interim between congresses of the Marxist-Leninist party. This decision was also endorsed by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, as prescribed by the Constitution of the USSR.

Khrushchov however remains a member of the Central Committee and deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. I might also note that since the 20th Congress political decisions against leading members charged with having committed serious mistakes, were never followed by repressions.

Having explained this clear matter which was necessary, however, for the benefit of the misinformed, I think the question should be answered also from another angle: Should the Central Committee of the CPSU have submitted the question of Khrushchov's release for public discussion and accompanied this with detailed information? In our opinion it is still to early to speak about the abrupt nature of this change or about the possibilities for gradually taking this step which is of such momentous internal and international significance. First, because the time we are living in is one of sharp and constant clashes between socialism and capitalism in all spheres. It would be naive to demand that the CC, CPSU, the ruling party of the leading socialist power, should settle its complex internal problems in a manner that would satisfy the demands of liberalism, in the meantime giving international imperialism rich food for speculation.

Second, it would be illogical if the Central Committee decided to inform the world of the difficulties and contradictions in the activity of the leadership, all the more so considering the fact that it is hard to know in advance whether the differences of opinion or criticism of methods will necessitate a change in the leadership.

Hence we think it would be illogical to speak about the suddenness of the change, lacking sufficient information to judge what made this step necessary — the course of events or the beraviour of Khrushchov himself. When it is a question of the common interests of the Party, the Soviet people, the socialist system and the international working-class and Communist movement, things cannot always be described in the most decorous way. Besides, it is to be assumed that being as it is a tested Marxist-Leninist leadership the CC, CPSU was fully aware of its responsibility when it adopted this decision, and that it also took into account the need to inform the public.

What is most important always is the content, the essence of events if we are to assess them from the standpoint of the interests of the world socialist revolution. The basic thing for us, as for everybody else, are the issues bearing on policy, the problems of an ideological and political nature.

First of all let us answer the following question: Does Khrushchov's release from the positions he held signify a turning point or the beginning of a revision of the conclusions and decisions made on the basis of the 20th Congress of the CPSU?

This question is indeed a pertinent one, it touches the heart of the matter, for as we know the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement of the international Communist and working-class movement, and also the propositions of the 17th and 18th congresses of our Party, are based on the assessment of our epoch, of contemporary world development and the course of the world

socialist and national-liberation revolutions first made by the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

The communication of the CC CPSU, and the *Pravda* editorial reprinted in *El Popular* clearly answer this question. Both stress the all-important thing: loyalty to the line chartered by the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU. What is more they insistently underscore the essential aspects of the resolutions adopted by these congresses: the program of communist construction and a foreign policy of active defense of peace and the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

It is these aspects that are the most important ones when assessing present developments. We should not forget what these congresses signified, that they adopted fruitful decisions which inspired the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 which pay tribute to the international signifificance of the 20th Congress.

The principal characteristic of our time is that socialism has become a world system and this process is irreversible; not only is there no force in the world that can restore capitalism in any one of the countries in the socialist camp, but this camp is itself constantly changing the balance of forces in favor of socialism. New nations are taking the road of socialism. A case in point is glorious Cuba. Another example is the specific Algerian path. We are living in the age of the collapse of the colonial system. The socialist revolutions, the national-liberation revolutions, the struggle of the masses in the capitalist countries are merging into a single world revolutionary process. The socialist system is more and more becoming the determining factor in social development.

All this highlights the fact that the central factors of our day are the international working class and its supreme gain—the socialist system. Our epoch is the epoch of the development and triumph of socialism, of the decay and inevitable breakdown of capitalism.

By their example in building the new life, by their political, economic and military support of the new states that have won their independence, by foiling the aggressive counter-revolutionary plans of imperialism (and in the cast of the Latin Americans the Soviet Union's solidarity with Cuba is, as Fidel Castro has said, the most splendid expression of internationalism), the socialist countries constitute the main revolutionizing factor of our time, the most reliable support for all peoples who are fighting to smash the chains of oppression.

At the same time the socialist system has become "the natural center of attraction for all the peace-loving forces on earth." A

vast peace zone has appeared in the world, which includes the socialist states, the newly-free countries, all the states that have refused to align themselves with the aggressive blocs of imperialism. Already at the 20th Congress of the CPSU the thesis was advanced that an imperialist world war is no longer inevitable in our time. War can be averted by the joint efforts of the socialist camp, the international working class, the national-liberation movement and the peace-loving forces.

It was the 20th Congress that fully confirmed, on the basis of the new perspectives that emerged as a result of the change in the balance of world forces, Lenin's proposition regarding the diversity of ways to socialism, in conformity with the basic laws of social development but also with due regard for the specific features of each given country.

The 20th Congress again raised the question of the possibility, in certain concrete conditions, of the socialist revolution triumphing without a civil war. As our Party has stated, this possibility, although a rare one in Latin America, should not be excluded from the perspectives of revolution.

When speaking of the congresses of the CPSU mention should be made of what was one of the most vivifying contributions to the Communist movement, introducing a new, creative spirit into it, namely the denunciation of the cult of the individual which is alien to the very nature of Marxism-Leninism, and which hampered the advance of the USSR, the other socialist countries and the Communist movement as a whole. We recall in this connection how the Soviet leaders, after objectively assessing the role played by Stalin in history, boldly and in full awareness of their responsibility denounced his grave mistakes which caused such great harm.

Editor: The *Pravda* article emphasized the need to combat all manifestations of the personality cult.

Arismendi: Yes. The whole article is a vigorous reaffirmation of the Leninist principles of collective leadership as the basis for creative initiative by the Party and the people. Here I should like to note that our Party has defined its attitude to every one of the propositions mentioned earlier and that they constitute our general line. On the other hand, our Central Committee has grown stronger in the struggle against the personality cult and has charted the program and tactical line of the Party guided by the principle of collective work.

STRUGGLE OF OUR PARTY IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

In this respect we too, like the entire international Communist movement, came up against "Left" and "Right" deviations. When

Right opportunism tried to rear its head inside and outside the movement we waged a resolute struggle against it. Later we had to combat "Left" opportunism represented, in particular, in the theses of the Chinese leaders. Proceeding from incorrect concepts rooted in nationalism and dogmatism, the CPC leadership by revising the 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement, by their violent campaign against the CPSU and other parties brought the movement to the brink of a split.

Editor: That is true. Although ours is not a big party we have always taken part in the struggle when it concerned cardinal questions.

The Statement of the 81 parties, which we naturally subscribed to, notes that "every Party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working-class and Communist movement as a whole."

Our attitude has always been determined by considerations of principle. Hence, it is our duty to combat, first and foremost, any "Right" or "Left" deviations. Our attitude is based on the following basic tenets: 1) firm defense of the principles of Marxism-Leninism; 2) application of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete conditions of our country and of Latin America, without binding ourselves to set formulas or prescriptions, but not "throwing out the child (principles) together with the dirty water" (dogmatic mistakes); 3) we proceed from the fact that it is our internationalist duty to define our position on all questions of principle debated on the international plane, but not to forget that it is our urgent task to help advance the revolution, to be at the head of the masses, to make our contribution on the basis of a correct line which can be verified in practice.

WE NEVER RECOGNIZED THAT A SPLIT IS INEVITABLE

True to our internationalist duty we made clear our position when the polemic with the Chinese leaders flared up as a result of their actions at the end of 1962 and in 1763. But we always strove to discuss this problem from the angle of unity, and are continuing to do so.

We never accepted the thesis that a split was inevitable; at the same time however, we never considered, and still do not consider, that unity can be achieved by taking a passive attitute, without stating your position. In conformity with the established norms of behaviour, we stated our position on fundamental issues. We stated this when we criticized the Chinese comrades for their violation of the norms that should be observed by all fighters for the common cause during the debate.

THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES MUST CONTRIBUTE TO UNITY

Editor: How do you assess from this point of view the forthcoming international meeting of Communist parties?

Arismendi: This meeting, in favor of which our Central Committee adopted a decision, is not and should not become a meeting to formalize the split, on the contrary it should contribute toward the ideological consolidation of the entire movement, toward achieving unity.

It should be noted that position of the CPSU, the initiator of the meeting, is absolutely clear in this respect. The object of the meeting is clearly expounded in the letter which the CC, CPSU addressed to the CC, CPC on July 30, 1964: "We want to stress once again that as far as we are concerned the question of a meeting is inseparably linked with the problem of preserving and promoting the unity of the world Communist movement. . . .

"The meeting is being called not in order to condemn or 'excommunicate' somebody from the Communist movement and the socialist camp, to attach offensive labels and make irresponsible charges; in that case the result may be further dissociation rather than greater unity. We believe that the Meeting should concentrate on bringing out what all the fraternal parties have in common and what unites them in finding ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen."

The same letter contains another expressive paragraph showing how the CPSU regards the meeting and the relations between the parties: "Like the other fraternal parties, the CPSU realizes that it is a difficult and complex matter to hold a meeting at a time of sharp differences. It is possible that despite the efforts of the consistent supporters of unity the Meeting will not succeed in reaching unanimity on all problems. But it is our firm conviction that this would not signify "formalization" of the split, and would not be an obstacle to finding new ways to unity. In that case we should try to come to an agreement that the participants in the meeting pledge to take each other's views into consideration, conscientiously to cooperate in those spheres where their positions and interests coincide, to abstain in future from any action that may aggravate difficulties and only gladden our class enemies."

As far as we are concerned (and unlike those who think that the meeting would irremediably formalize the split), we have always considered such a meeting in the spirit of the aforementioned letter, as a means of restoring the dialogue, as a dam to check the flood, as a supreme effort to achieve unity in the movement.

The meeting can, of course, be called to formalize the split

or to secure unity. In questions of principle we are opposed to extremes and to the ideological "hybrids" of conciliators. We stood, and continue to stand on the principled positions of the CC, CPSU, Marx, Engels and Lenin always combined firmness of principle with flexible defense of unity, contributing towards this both in its higher forms (monolithic ideological unity) as well as in its lower forms (i.e., those which are the precondition for unity in its higher form). Negation of these preconditions (flexibility of methods, the spirit of dialogue, fraternal polemics, democratism in debate) would mean negation of the ways leading to the higher forms of unity, to fruitful ideological and political unity.

In this respect we think that there are two points in the well-known Togliatti Memorandum—it contains propositions that call for consideration alongside with propositions which evidently cannot always be accepted—that are basically correct: a) the struggle against the disrupters should be conducted without name-calling and rude epithets, without creating additional difficulties; b) the correctness of a political line should be proved in practice.

In our statements in which we took issue with the Chinese leaders at the end of 1963 it was the rude tone, name-calling and unfounded accusations made by the Chinese leaders that we protested against. All this made it hard to discuss problems on their merits and draw the right conclusions.

This question was comprehensively examined by Suslov in his report which we widely circulated; his concise analysis of the problems debated fully coincides with the analysis made by our Party. In May 1964 the Central Committee of our Party discussed and approved the report I made on this subject. We think the Central Committee has accomplished fruitful work in this respect.

STEADY UPSURGE OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Editor: Do you think that the international Communist movement might find itself in a state of confusion and perplexity?

Arismendi: I emphatically reject this idea. After the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the subsequent broad discussion nobody can fall a prey to confusion if he follows a principled stand. Besides (and this is a cause of great worry to our enemies) the Communist movement is steadily gaining ground thanks to the changes taking place in the world and also to the maturity of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

It is pertinent to note once again that the *Pravda* editorial has given an explicit explanation of all the cardinal questions. We consider this a good document, although like any newspaper article, it has its limitations. It is also absolutely clear that despite the flood of speculation let loose by the imperialist press and news agencies with the object of causing confusion, despite

the pseudo-theoretical debates with their undertones of primitive anti-Sovietism and which aim to split the Communist movement, the party of Lenin remains, regardless of the replacement of one person by another in the leadership, a party united on a principled basis.

As you know, the press is doing its best to falsify the *Pravda* editorial. *El Pais*, for example, has been trying in several issues running to prove that the *Pravda* editorial is a sharp attack on Khrushchov. As a result of deliberate mistranslation the moderate tone of its assessments reads like rude epithets.

El Pais, the unscrupulous mouthpiece of the Yankee Embassy, tries to present the matter as follows: only yesterday Khrushchov was lauded, today he is suddenly being reviled. Who are they to judge of the situation? Still, they have to be answered, and not only they.

We are of the opinion that it is necessary to distinguish between the reasons for Khrushchov's release from leading positions in the Party, in conformity with the rules of the CPSU, and from the government and the assessment of the role he played in the period following the 20th Congress. Although time alone will show what contribution Khrushchov made to the activity of the CC, CPSU, the fact remains that he was First Secretary of the Central Committee in this period. Only a better knowledge of the details—and this, too, will require time—will help to answer the question: On how many occasions did the Central Committee have to correct Khrushchov's erroneous assessments and methods, from what particular period and to what extent did Khrushchov's actions run counter to the decisions of the Central Committee, ignore or distort the decisions of collective leadership? It is obvious from the Pravda editorial that this is the crux of the matter, apart from the state of Khrushchov's health which often prevented him from being in the center of collective leadership to discuss urgent matters.

PRINCIPLED STAND OF THE CPSU IN STRUGGLE AGAINST THE PERSONALITY CULT AND FOR COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP

It stands to reason that the Central Committee of the party which is the "recognized vanguard of the international working-class movement," to quote from the 1960 Statement, cannot allow cardinal questions to be settled behind its back, by one person and even contrary to decisions already adopted; it cannot afford to have any person, no matter how well known he may be, to make erroneous decisions under the influence of subjective impressions. All the more so when it is a question of a party which resolutely exposed the Stalin personality cult. This does not at all

mean belittling the role of outstanding leaders. The more intelligent, the more developed they are theoretically and politically, the more flexible and militant, the better. But it does not follow from this that one or several persons can replace or be above the collective leadership of the party.

Considering the circumstances and his position it was precisely Khrushchov who more than anybody else in the party had to zealously uphold these principles.

The personality cult which is still preserved in some places is a gross distortion of Marxism-Leninism and again shows that it is a potential danger.

Naturally, the CPSU which fights for these principles resolutely opposes any deviations from them. This is evident from the *Pravda* article:

"When uniting and directing the creative activity of the masses toward a single great goal the Party is guided by an exact compass—the life-giving theory of Marxism-Leninism. It deeply analyzes the complex processes of economic, political and cultural life and on this basis elaborates correct decisions. The Leninist Party is the enemy of subjectivism and spontaneity in communist construction. Harebrained plans, hasty conclusions, precipitate decisions and actions divorced from reality, boasting, idle talk, a passion for administrative methods, disregard for what has already been elaborated by science and practical experience—all this is alien to the Party. The building of communism is a living creative matter. It does not tolerate bureaucratic methods, one-man decisions, and disregard for the practical experience of the masses.

"The growing creative initiative of the Party and the entire people can be guided and promoted only on the basis of the Leninist principle of collective leadership. Only by relying on this principle can the situation be analyzed correctly, the successes achieved assessed soberly and objectively, shortcomings seen and eliminated in good time. . . .

". . . in pursuance of its general line the Party has always waged an irreconcilable and consistent struggle against the ideology and practice of the personality cult which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, to the very nature of our socialist system."

Editor: Still, was this measure (Khrushchov's replacement), the outcome of a difference of opinion or of a chance violation of the methods of collective leadership?

Arismendi: Although I do not know the details I don't think so. Mistakes call for organizational changes if they become a tendency either of an ideological or personal nature (i.e.; when erroneous methods become a system of work). Of course the magnitude of the mistakes depends on the personal qualities and

on the importance of the issues in question. When the helmsman loses his head in a crucial situation it may become necessary to relieve him of his post immediately; we are of the opinion, however, that although we learned of this decision very suddenly it does not mean that there were no previous internal discussions or no accumulation of partial mistakes that precipitated Khrushchov's replacement. It is very possible that in the face of important world issues and serious problems pertaining to the unity of the international Communist movement this replacement became necessary in order to ensure the realization of mature measures that have nothing in common with subjectivism or the arbitrary method of resolving complex and vital issues without consultation.

It is to be regretted that Khrushchov had to be replaced, especially considering that he became so widely known in connection with the many important policies adopted by the CC, CPSU. Such a change in any party is regrettable. But such changes strengthen the parties which, like the CPSU, act on a principled basis. It is this that should be stressed: the firmness of principles of the CPSU, forged over the years of its history has no parallel. It is this that constitutes the solid foundation of the CPSU's leading role in the international arena.

We are confident that the international prestige of the CPSU, far from diminishing will continue to grow and that the ill-starred prophets of the pro-imperialist press, and our enemies in general, will suffer a new fiasco.

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

27

Included in this Issue

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF CUBAN REVOLUTION
Blas Roca

PRESENT STATUS OF IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT
Gus Hall

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 27

contents

A COURSE TOWARDS VICTORY
A. Cunhal **3**

LABOR PROGRAM OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE NETHERLANDS **27**

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION
Blas Roca **29**

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT
Gus Hall **39**

GREAT BANNER OF BUILDERS OF COMMUNISM
Pravda Editorial **52**

PLENARY MEETING OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY
Report by G. Marchais **66**

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANAD.

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
December 17, 1964

A COURSE TOWARDS VICTORY

Tasks of the Party in the Democratic and National Revolution

SUMMARY OF REPORT BY A. CUNHAL, GENERAL SECRETARY, PORTUGUESE COMMUNIST PARTY, TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, PCP, APRIL, 1964.

The crisis of the fascist regime in Portugal, the report notes, has deepened in the last three years. The international situation too is developing in a direction favorable for the working class and other democratic forces in Portugal. The building of communism in the USSR and of socialism in the other countries of the socialist community, the national-liberation movements in the colonies and dependencies, and the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries are a tremendous support to the Portuguese people in their struggle for democracy, national independence and peace. "But the Portuguese people can win their liberation only by their own efforts," Cunhal said.

The Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class, bears a special responsibility. It must "not only assess the situation obtaining in the country, but also find the appropriate political and tactical solutions and, heading the struggle of the working class, resolutely lead the Portuguese people to the victory of the democratic and national revolution."

1. PORTUGAL LAST AMONG EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Cunhal examined the economic situation in the country and exposed the falsity of the contention advanced by the ruling element that Portugal's backwardness and poverty are due to "scant natural resources." He cited numerous facts showing that "the natural resources of the country are sufficient to guarantee a high standard of living to all the Portuguese. Portugal is backward and her people live in misery only because its natural resources are in the hands of a dozen monopoly groups, a few hundred latifundists and foreign imperialism which exploit them in their own interests, and also because the country is ruled by a fascist government subservient to these forces. Portugal occupies the last place among the European countries."

In order to maintain the top-heavy bureaucratic machinery whose sole function is to defend the privileges of the monopolies, lati-

fundists and imperialism, the fascist regime is constantly increasing the tax burden borne by the people. The country can overcome its backwardness only through "rational utilization of the natural resources, industrialization, modernization of agriculture, and the ending of parasitic government spending. . . ."

Owing to the fact that Portugal is at once a dependent state and a colonial power, the ruling classes are not interested in promoting its economic development. And this too tends to aggravate the situation in Portugal.

2. END MONOPOLY RULE

The report examines in detail the process of the concentration of the country's principal wealth in the hands of a few monopolists and latifundists and shows how the fascist dictatorship has promoted this process, how the various groups of monopoly capital have been ruining the small and middle bourgeoisie by taking over their enterprises, banks, etc. Cunhal points out that although these groups naturally are rivals, this rivalry is manifested not nearly as sharply as the conflict between their interests and those of the small and middle businessmen. The interests of the monopolists are becoming increasingly interlinked. They all stand opposed to the other classes of society. Together with foreign imperialism they are the unchallenged rulers of Portugal.

The fascist government of Salazar is doing its utmost to help these groups seize more and more wealth. "Throughout the 38 years of its rule and especially after the Second World War," Cunhal says, "the Salazar government has been conducting, at the behest of the big monopolies, a real crusade aimed at crushing and expropriating the small producers in industry and agriculture as well as the small shopkeepers.

"Abolition of the power of the monopolies alone will make it possible to use the national wealth rationally, to promote vigorous economic development, to build an industrial base which would ensure the independence of the country and remove the social basis of reaction and fascism.

"To fight the fascist dictatorship means to fight the monopolies. To fight for Portugal's liberation from fascist rule means to fight for its liberation from the rule of the monopolies. Abolition of the power of the monopolies is the chief objective of the democratic revolution.

3. AGRARIAN REFORM

Portugal's two main agricultural zones, which are separated by the River Tagus, differ from another as regards types of land tenure. Small holdings predominate to the north of the river, while in the south "practically all the land belong to big owners." In the latter zone 50,644 farms of less than 50 hectares each (more

than 90 per cent of all holdings in the zone) possess approximately 18 per cent of the cultivated land, whereas 777 big estates of 500 and more hectares each, accounting for only 1.4 per cent of the total number of farms, have half of the cultivated land.

Despite the sharp difference between the two zones it would be a mistake to assume that the small holdings possess commanding positions in the northern zone. According to the 1952-54 census, 400,469 of the 801,162 farms of that zone had less than one hectare each, whereas 3,546 big farms (barely 0.4 per cent of all holdings) possessed 45 per cent of the land. In other words, they had ten times more land than 400,000 small owners!

Hence the urgent need for an agrarian reform which would give land to the agricultural laborers and poor peasants. The problem is complicated by the fact that the latifundists' lands lie for the most part in the south of the country, while a large number of the land-hungry peasants live in the north. Two agrarian reforms may have to be carried out: one for the zone where large-scale ownership predominates and another for the zone with numerous small holdings, taking into account the peculiarities of each region, the relative proportions of the rural proletariat and the peasantry, and so on. Resolute steps in this direction would at once benefit almost the entire active rural population.

Cunhal criticized those comrades who fear that the agrarian reform would deprive the revolution of potential allies from among the big landowners. He showed that this view stems from the fact that there are some contradictions among the big landowners, industrialists and banks. But although there are such contradictions, he said, the interests of the big landlords and the land-owning capitalists are becoming more and more intertwined with finance capital. "The big landowners cannot be expected to adopt a favorable attitude towards the democratic revolution. The democratic revolution cannot conform to their interests, for it is directed against them. The few thousand parasites exploiting almost a million rural proletarians and semi-proletarians and owning more land than half a million small peasants, are the bitterest enemies of our people and of our country. The agrarian reform should dispossess them of the land and give it to those who till it."

Cunhal noted that the entire policy of the fascist government was directed at doing away with small-scale production and placing agriculture in the hands of a diminishing number of latifundists and capitalists.

"The Communists have every reason to welcome the bigger role played by the rural proletariat," he said, "for this broadens the social basis of the democratic revolution in the countryside and creates objective conditions for the victory of the socialist cause. The rural proletariat in the south, the zone of big estates, has demonstrated its revolutionary spirit in thousands of heroic actions

against the fascist dictatorship. Our Party may pride itself on the trust the rural proletariat reposes in it. . . .

"But this does not mean that we should welcome or facilitate the policy of exploiting, ruining and expropriating small holdings because it tends to increase the numbers of the rural proletarians. We tell the small peasants that under capitalism they have no way out of their plight. . . .

"The agrarian reform should not be limited to handing over the expropriated land to the peasants. In addition to guaranteed work and higher wages to the agricultural workers, it should provide for credits to and lower taxation of the small farmers . . . help them acquire machines and implements, eliminate the feudal forms of exploitation, reduce or abolish rents, cancel the poor peasants' debts to credit institutions and middlemen, ensure complete reorganization of trade in agricultural products and fair prices.

4. HIGHER LIVING AND CULTURAL STANDARDS OF THE WORKING CLASSES

"The disparity of the standards of living of the exploited and the exploiting classes is enormous, the rapid growth of the profits of the latter far outstripping the increase in the wages of the factory and office workers and the incomes of the peasants."

A. Cunhal showed that this was due to the constant intensification of labor in industry and often also to cheating pure and simple. No "rationalization" of production of which the fascists talk so much about is in evidence. Workers' participation in profits, allegedly ensured by share-distribution schemes, etc., is likewise a myth. The cultural backwardness is appalling. Yet 40 per cent of the budget is spent on military needs and only 10 per cent on education. More than 40 per cent of the population are illiterate, and education, not only higher and secondary but also elementary, is virtually denied to the working people. In these conditions, Cunhal stressed, "an immediate improvement in the living conditions of the working classes is one of the chief objectives of the democratic revolution."

5. FOR LIBERATION FROM IMPERIALIST DOMINATION

The domination of foreign imperialism lays a heavy burden on the people and is one of the causes of the backwardness of the country, which offers ideal opportunities for the foreign investor. This results in the loss of not only economic, but also political independence, for economic domination is followed by interference in national policy, demands for a political, diplomatic and military character, and assistance to the fascist government.

Exposing the contention of fascist propaganda that foreign investments promote the country's development and raise the living standard of the working people, Cunhal pointed out that while

foreign investments give rise to new enterprises they only promote the development of capitalism, accelerate the liquidation of small enterprises and the emergence of new monopoly groups. All this makes for the accumulation of wealth by a handful of monopolists and dooms ever greater sections of the working people to poverty.

The fascist government is also turning over the country's natural wealth to the imperialists in exchange for support in waging colonial war. Hardly a week passes without new foreign concessions being granted. Foreign companies are increasingly penetrating and subordinating the domestic monopolies. The imperialist grip on Portugal is further tightened by its participaion in the Common Market.

"For a democratic system to be established in Portugal it must be freed from imperialist domination," the report says. "If the democratic revolution, while overthrowing the Salazar dictatorship, leaves the imperialists' positions intact, it will not only fail to steer Portugal along the road of progress and prosperity, but it will also expose the future democratic government to the danger of being stabbed in the back at any moment. The viability of the democratic government will not be ensured unless the country is freed from imperialist domination through the nationalization of the key branches of our economy now in the hands of the imperialists (mines, transport and communications, electric power, oil, shipbuilding, fertilizer production, insurance, foreign trade). By fighting against imperialism we are fighting against the fascist dictatorship. To fight for democracy means to fight for Portugal's liberation from imperialist domination and exploitation, for the genuine independence of our country."

6. FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE PEOPLES OF THE PORTUGUESE COLONIES

The spirit of the times has forced the Salazar government to strike out the word "colonies" from its political vocabulary and to replace it with the term "overseas provinces," but this does not change the colonialist essence of the regime.

Exposing the fascist propaganda about the "civilizing mission" of Portuguese colonialism, Cunhal showed that in reality the Salazar government is continuing the old colonial policy. More, it vaunts this policy in order to make a show of strength. But a big share of the colonial loot is appropriated by foreign imperialists, who support Salazar's colonial policy financially, militarily, diplomatically and politically. Foreign businessmen combine with the Portuguese monopolies in exploiting the population of the Portuguese colonies.

Anxious to preserve its colonies, the Salazar government is waging colonial wars in Angola and Guinea and preparing for war in Mozambique, the Cape Verde Islands, and elsewhere.

"Continuation of the policy of colonial wars . . . will cost the Portuguese people ever dearer. . . . When the Communist Party

urges the people and the soldiers to come out against the war in Angola and Guinea and demands the immediate cessation of hostilities, the return of the expeditionary corps and the granting of civil rights and the release of the political prisoners in the colonies, this does not mean that we shall accept any settlement of the colonial question which does not recognize the right of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies to self-determination and independence. It only means that we must, want to and can obstruct the implementation of Salazar's criminal colonial policy; that in the struggle against the colonial war policy we must, want to, and can rally broad sections of the Portuguese population to the struggle against the fascist dictatorship."

The Communist Party is doing its utmost to support the struggle of the colonial peoples for freedom which, in turn, greatly helps the Portuguese people in their struggle for democracy.

"The liberation of the Portuguese colonies is not only a matter of justice with respect to these peoples. It is also indispensable for the liberation of the Portuguese people themselves. If Portugal wants to be free, the Portuguese colonies must also be free. To defend the right of the people of the Portuguese colonies to independence means to defend—in the literal sense of the word—the right of the Portuguese people to genuine national independence."

Cunhal stressed that it was a mistake to say that the Portuguese democrats should pin their hopes on Angola and Mozambique winning independence. "When voiced by Portuguese, such ideas express an egoistic hope that others will do their work for them. We are working to free Portugal from the fascist dicatorship and sparing no effort to achieve this as soon as possible. Whether the Portuguese people or the peoples of the colonies free themselves first depends on internal as well as international factors. It is premature to say who will win freedom first. It can only be said that the liberation of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea, if it precedes the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, will be a blow which it will be hard for the Salazar regime to survive. Likewise, the winning of democracy by the Portuguese people would be inevitably and rapidly followed by the liberation of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies, which is essential for the genuine national independence of Portugal."

7. FOR A POLICY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP WITH ALL PEOPLES

Economically dominated by the imperialist powers, Portugal follows them obediently in the international arena as well. For one thing, it is involved in the aggressive NATO bloc. "Portugal's participation in NATO is not only a manifestation of the imperialist and fascist rule in Portugal and her colonies. Many Portuguese do not

realize yet that the presence of military bases in the country endangers the very existence of the nation. . . ."

Further the report notes that, with the exception of Cuba, Portugal does not maintain relations with the socialist countries.

"The Portuguese Communist Party has always urged the establishment of close friendly relations and cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries. Economic contact with the socialist camp would help solve some of the most painful economic problems of the country. . . . Cultural relations are indispensable for defending and enriching our national culture. . . . Scientific and technological cooperation with these countries would help Portugal to overcome its backwardness and stagnation.

"Close friendship and cooperation with the socialist camp in all fields will be one of the essential aspects of the policy of the future democratic government of Portugal."

The question, however, has a bearing not only on the actions of the future democratic government after the victory of the revolution, Cunhal pointed out. The Portuguese Communist Party advocates the establishment of relations with the socialist countries already now. Some people ask: "If Salazar were to take the initiative in extending trade relations with the USSR and other socialist countries, what would the stand of the Communist Party be? If the USSR and other socialist countries were to agree to establish such relations, would this not strengthen the fascist regime?"

Granting the possibility of such relations being established under certain circumstances, Cunhal stressed: "This would be, in the first place, a resounding defeat for the fascist government itself, an admission that its previous policy has completely failed. It would signify a weakening of the positions of foreign imperialism in Portugal. . . .

"The Portuguese democratic movement today also has a foreign policy of its own. . . . The viability of the democratic Portugal of tomorrow will not be ensured without a foreign policy of peace and friendship with all the peoples of the world, based on equality and respect for each other's interests. Democratic Portugal can and must be a peace-loving Portugal."

8. FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

In view of the resistance of the people, the anti-popular and anti-national policy of the monopolists and latifundists can be implemented only if democratic freedoms and civil liberties are completely abolished. In an effort to overcome its growing difficulties, the Salazar government is resorting more and more to repressions. The police persecute all democrats and especially the Communists.

As soon as the revolution is victorious the present fascist state, its machinery of coercion and armed forces will have to be destroyed, for they cannot be placed at the service of a democratic system.

The National Assembly, the Corporative Chamber, the PIDE and other repressive bodies, as well as the corporative organization and the existing military, legal and bureaucratic machinery will have to be disbanded.

"The classes opposing the power of the monopolies and latifundists have varying interests. The various anti-fascist forces have different programs. But the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the winning of political freedom is the demand of all the Portuguese with the exception of a handful of millionaires and the small gang of fascists serving them .This common aim calls for unity. We Communists are ready to work together with all who are ready to fight for this."

In stressing political freedom as one of the objectives of the democratic revolution and the most important task of the anti-fascist movement, the Communist Party visualizes this not only as a matter of meeting an urgent demand of the Portuguese people, but also as a necessary step towards the achievement of the other aims of the democratic revolution: liquidation of the monopolies, an agrarian reform, improvement of the material and cultural standards of the working classes, national independence, peace, and recognition of the right of the peoples of the colonies to independence.

To speak of overthrowing the fascist dictatorship and winning political freedom means to speak of taking over power, Cunhal pointed out. What kind of government should take over after the abolition of the fascist dictatorship? In the opinion of the Communist Party, it should be a provisional government which will establish democratic freedoms and hold free elections to a constituent assembly. And this calls for the participation of the Communist Party in this government. "The Communist Party is prepared, acting jointly with the other democratic forces and relying on the support of the working class and the masses generally, to overthrow the fascist government and to install a provisional government. This means setting up a government consisting of the representative of the forces which will have overthrown the fascist dictatorship, the Communist Party among them. In this provisional government the Communist Party will defend the interests of the working class and all toilers in general. Although it does not make its participation in the provisional government conditional on the latter's acceptance of its program, it will press for measures to achieve the aims of the democratic and national revolution. This does not mean searching for 'a compromise giving the bourgeois the leadership of the revolution.' The objective is to ensure the decisive role of the proletariat in the entire revolutionary process."

Irrespective of whether the Communists will be represented in the government or not, the Communist Party sees it as its task to

carry the democratic and national revolution to completion and to wage a struggle for the following aims:

1. Abolition of monopoly role and nationalization of the key branches of the economy.

3. Liberation of Portugal from the domination of foreign imperialism.

2. An agrarian reform to give the land to those who till it.

4. Recognition of the right of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies to self-determination and independence.

5. A rapid rise in the material and cultural standards of the working classes.

6. A foreign policy of peace and cooperation with all countries on the basis of equality.

7. Complete destruction of the fascist state and establishment of a democratic system.

Such, essentially, is the program of the Communist Party at the contemporary stage of the revolution. In fighting for the realization of this program the Communist Party seeks to open the way to a socialist Portugal. The struggle for democracy is a component part of the struggle for socialism.

9. UNITY OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND PATRIOTIC FORCES IS A PRESSING NECESSITY

The policy of the fascist government subservient to the monopolies and linked with foreign imperialism and the latifundists, runs counter to the interests of all other classes and social strata—the proletariat (industrial and agricultural workers), the peasantry (small and middle peasants), the small urban bourgeoisie, the middle bourgeoisie, and the intelligentsia.

The establishment of an anti-monopoly front does not remove the contradictions between its participants—between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the industrial bourgeoisie and the peasantry, between the petty and middle bourgeoisie. These contradictions are bound to manifest themselves in the anti-monopoly front itself, for the forces making it up will pursue, in addition to common interests, their own particular aims which often clash with one another.

It should not be inferred from this, as is done by some people, that such a front is impracticable, useless or ineffective, and that the working class should forge ahead alone towards socialism as its immediate aim. Already today there exist in Portugal common interests uniting these classes in the struggle against their common enemy, the fascist dictatorship, interests which are stronger than what divides these classes.

The unity of the anti-monopoly and anti-fascist forces is founded on the unity of the working class and its alliance with the peasantry and the small urban bourgeoisie. An alliance with the peoples of

the Portuguese colonies also assumes decisive importance today.

As Cunhal stressed in his report, working-class unity in Portugal has some specific aspects. The Communist Party is the only working-class party in the country. The Anarchists, who wielded considerable influence among the workers at the time the dictatorship was set up, have failed to hold out against the repressions and disappeared from the political scene. So have the Socialists who had some links with the working class. The Socialist groups existing at present consist of intellectuals. There are no trade unions other than fascist ones. Nor is there any other organized movement of a trade-union nature apart from the various united action committees owing their existence largely to the Communist Party. In these conditions the problem of working-class unity must be approached in a way quite different from other countries. In Portugal this unity is realized chiefly under the leadership of the Party and expressed in economic and political struggle and in the establishment of various united action organizations.

Cunhal pointed out that the problem of alliance with the peasantry is sometimes viewed without taking into consideration the specific features of Portugal. Strictly speaking, the agricultural workers, although called "peasants," are part of the proletariat. In some regions they make up from 70 to 90 per cent of the active agricultural population. Although the importance of work among the small peasants, whose interests should be defended and whose militancy should be awakened, should not be underestimated, it is the agricultural workers who are the decisive force. We can say with a sense of gratification, Cunhal goes on, that the South is on our side. It favors not only the democratic revolution, but also socialism. It should be said, however, that the small peasants are not taking an active part in the anti-fascist struggle as yet, many of their actions being of an unorganized, sporadic character. The rallying of these forces to the struggle is the principal manifestation of the alliance with the peasantry and an essential condition for the progress of the anti-fascist movement.

The working class and the masses generally have demonstrated in the course of the struggle that they support the policy of the Communist Party. "Working-class unity, the unity of the popular masses has been constantly in evidence in all battles, big and small, economic and political, against the dictatorship, and has always served as an inspiring example to all the political forces. . . . The Portuguese people are accustomed to seeing Communists at the head of the struggle against the regime. They know that the Communists have made the greatest sacrifices in the struggle to liberate Portugal from the fascist tyranny, that nobody enlightens, helps and guides them better than the Communist Party does. Therefore they have never endorsed the policy of isolating the Communist Party which some political groups have at different times tried to pursue."

The setting up, in late 1962, of the Patriotic Front of National Liberation consisting of Communists, Socialists, republicans, Liberals, progressive-minded Catholics, monarchists and constitutionalists was a major step towards the unity of all the anti-fascist forces. As is admitted by everybody today, this alliance owes its existence in large measure to the Communist Party's policy of unity, to its initiative and tireless efforts to unite the opposition in a single front.

"Statements to the effect that we are associated with those who are least of all interested in this, and the charge that the Party's policy of unity is capitulationism, trailing behind the bourgeois leaders, etc.," Cunhal said, "can only be explained by a lack of knowledge of the facts, theoretical ignorance or dogmatic and sectarian blindness.

"We shall not," he said, "adopt the sectarian line which, under the cover of demands for proletarian hegemony and leadership and for 'a real revolution,' may lead to the isolation of the Party, to the transfer of leadership wholly to the bourgeoisie, to the creation of conditions, not for accomplishing the democratic and national revolution, but for establishing a new form of the bourgeois dictatorship."

Along with efforts to unite the masses in the struggle against fascism, to awaken their class political consciousness and to win them over to the program of the Party, the Communists will continue to work to bring all the political forces opposed to the dictatorship into a single movement. "In such a broad unitary movement as the opposition, in which different classes and political groups are taking part, differences of opinion and even some serious disagreements are bound to exist."

Experience shows that if the democratic forces do not work together before complete agreement is achieved they are doomed to fail; that when they undertake joint actions their positions will come closer together in the course of the common struggle, and they can better define the line of the entire movement.

The emergence of any united movement inevitably gives rise to the political problem of what its program should be. The Communist Party has always been opposed to attempts to work out the program of the future government in detail. As a rule, such programs rapidly become hopelessly outdated.

"This does not mean, however, that the united democratic forces have no need for a clear political platform or at least a concise program setting forth the main political aims. The prime task of the anti-fascist movement that has been put forward is to overthrow the fascist dictatorship and install a provisional government which would establish democratic freedoms and conduct free elections to the constituent assembly. We believe that all those who support this objective should unite in the struggle to free

Portugal from the fascist tyranny." This alone provides a reliable basis for unity and constitutes, as has happened repeatedly in the struggle against fascism, an adequate program for common action by the democratic forces.

At the same time, in view of the successes of the unitary movement, the Patriotic Front working for the establishment of a provisional government should be in a position to state what the initial actions of this government will be not only as regards democratic freedoms and the holding of elections, but also to solve the vital political problems the solution of which cannot be put off until after the elections. Those include the problems of whether to continue or end the war in Angola, whether to change the country's foreign policy or leave it unchanged, whether Portugal's economy is to depend, as before, on the monopolies and latifundists, and so on.

Some people ask: If the Patriotic Front accepts the program of the Communist Party already now, will this conform to the interests of all monopoly-oppressed classes and strata?

"Objectively, this accords with their interests," Cunhal said. "But these classes and strata, as well as the political forces representing them, do not necessarily realize this. In fact, they are not aware of this. There is vacillation among them which hampers the realization of such a program. They have not yet made up their mind as to the problems of the anti-imperialist struggle, the liquidation of the rule of the monopolies, the agrarian reform and foreign policy . . . Therefore, when some group or individual in the unitary movement voices readiness to accept the program of the Communist Party as the common program, this does not mean that the political forces participating in this movement are ready to adopt it. And if petty-bourgeois and anarchist-minded radicals consider that some points of the program do not promote unity at the present time, but on the contrary, tend to divide the democratic forces, we shall have to withdraw some of our proposals unhesitatingly, even if the Party were to be accused (as is fashionable nowadays) of being 'more to the Right' than others . . ."

In the opinion of the PCP, the unitary movement based on the Patriotic Front should continue its efforts, undertaken at the Second Conference in January 1964, to specify the tasks of the Front and work out a platform acceptable to the majority of the Portuguese democrats. While putting forward and popularizing its program and working to win mass support for it, the Party should at the same time take part in elaborating and adopting a minimum program of the unity movement.

The movement is also faced with serious tactical and organizational problems, one of the most important of them being to decide upon a line of common action. The issue is not so much one of adhering to one or another form of action, as of determin-

ing jointly the *main directions* of the activities of the movement. For it unites different forces some of which favor a military coup, others, individual means of struggle, and still others, a mass movement, and so on.

Serious difficulties arise due to the insufficient organization of the political groups making up the opposition. In spite of the breadth of the anti-fascist movement in Portugal, the PCP is the only big anti-fascist party. The Patriotic Action Juntas (PAJ), the organizational form of the Patriotic Front, have achieved certain successes and represent today the only political unity organizations which are capable of heading the struggle and on which the anti-fascist movement can rely.

Attitudes to the PAJ in the anti-fascist camp differ, with some people supporting them and others objecting to their establishment. This is due partly to opposition to any genuinely revolutionary forms of activity, partly to the old fear of being confronted with a strong Communist Party, or to the unstable legitimist policy marked by fear of the people pursued by some liberal bourgeois circles.

At present the PAJ constitute the only form of united political organization of the Patriotic Front. But they are by no means the only possible form. While working to set up these juntas and taking part in them, the Party should combat the idea that unity can be established only through these juntas. The Second Conference of the Patriotic Front adopted a similar stand.

Leadership is another problem. For several years the unitary movement was headed by the Central Patriotic Junta, which functioned very irregularly and served as an organ of liaison rather than leadership.

In December 1962 representatives of the opposition forces, Communists included, held a round-table conference in one of the West-European countries and decided to organize, within the framework of the already existing unity, a Patriotic Front of National Liberation. This conference marked a step towards stronger unity and opened up new prospects for consolidating the leadership of the anti-fascist forces. The conference, while recognizing the Central Patriotic Junta as the supreme leading body of the unitary movement, decided to set up a Commission of Delegates.

In January 1964, on the initiative of the PCP and with the approval of almost all anti-fascist trends, the Second Conference of the Patriotic Front was held, with the participation both of anti-fascist leaders in emigration and of representatives of the PCP and delegates of the Patriotic Juntas in Portugal. At this meeting it became clear that the Central Patriotic Junta had failed to become a real leading body.

The conference assumed the functions of the supreme leading body empowered to "discuss all problems pertaining to leadership

of the movement." All the participants in the conference and some other anti-fascists were declared to be its permanent members. The conference decided on a broader representation of the various political groups at future sessions. The constitution of the conference as the supreme leading body is of tremendous importance for the progress of the unitary movement. With some of the main political groups directly represented in it, all problems of the anti-fascist movement can be discussed within its framework on a very broad basis.

The general leadership of the national anti-fascist movement is vested in the conference. For activities abroad, an executive organ, the Portuguese Revolutionary Junta, was set up under the chairmanship of General Umberto Delgado. Its powers extend to the political, diplomatic, organizational, propaganda and financial activities of the Front in other countries. The Junta includes representatives of the Communist Party.

All these decisions however, do not fully solve the problem of leadership of the anti-fascist movement. Neither the Conference nor the Junta can replace a leading body within the country. The Conference itself "once again reaffirmed the need for setting up a permanent and effective organ of central leadership in the country."

In the opinion of the CPC, the establishment of a central leadership of the anti-fascist movement is the main problem. "We disagree," Cunhal said, "with those democrats in exile as well as at home who consider that the central leadership should have its headquarters abroad and that there is no need for setting up such a leadership in Portugal itself. Such views are apt to create new difficulties for the democratic forces. We hold that all activities abroad should be viewed in the context of the struggle in the country. It is in Portugal that the fate of the democratic movement is decided. The unity of the leaders in emigration is certainly a powerful stimulus to the unity of all the democratic forces . . . But nothing can replace an effective central leadership inside the country."

The Communist Party should work in two directions. There is need to set up a leadership "at the top," with the participation of prominent anti-fascists and representatives of the most active organizations, and to establish contacts with both the old groups and new organizations, especially those of the students and servicemen. At the same time it is necessary to improve the organization of the Patriotic Action Juntas, acting through Party members in them and establishing contacts between their local and provincial organizations for the purpose of creating a national leadership.

In view of the fact that it unites considerable forces and constitutes the only organized movement of the opposition, the Patriotic Front has every possibility of becoming the center of attraction for all the political forces. It should not limit itself to securing

their support (which it in effect already has) but strive to include these forces organizationally in the movement, either through the Patriotic Action Juntas or through other forms of contact and coordination.

In order to join in united actions with these forces instead of merely enjoying their support, the Front should take new measures to consolidate itself politically and organizationally, define its objectives and tactics, heighten its prestige by vigorous actions and competent guidance of the popular struggle. Otherwise the Front will not become an effective united opposition movement, the leading political force in the struggle of the people against the fascist dictatorship.

Referring to the problem of unity with the Catholics, Cunhal pointed out that Catholics occupy a special place in the political life of Portugal. Catholicism is a religion and not a political trend. Being a Catholic does not presuppose supporting the government or opposing it. The higher Catholic clergy openly favor the fascist dictatorship, systematically side with the monopolies in their struggle against the masses, urge the persecution of Communists, and support Salazar's colonialist policy and the colonial war.

However, despite the intimidation and excommunication the overwhelming majority of the Catholics oppose fascism and the reactionary policy of the top clergy. There are many Catholics among the workers, students, soldiers and intellectuals who are fighting side by side with the Communists against the policy of hunger, terror, obscurantism and war, against the Salazar government. Still greater efforts are needed to help the Catholics and make their participation in the struggle more regular and active.

The Communist Party has always taken a clear-cut attitude to religion. We Communists are Marxist-Leninists, we are atheists. We propagate our ideas. But we respect the religious convictions of others and resolutely oppose any persecution for religious reasons. The democratic Portugal of tomorrow will have freedom of religion. Like all citizens, Catholics will enjoy political rights.

Of all the anti-fascist forces, the liberal bourgeoisie is the most unstable one. This is due to the contradictory nature of the interests of the middle bourgeoisie, which, on the one hand, is crushed by monopoly rule and, on the other, is alarmed by the rise of the working-class movement. The liberal bourgeoisie is interested in overthrowing fascism, but it fears the democratic revolution. Cunhal criticized the opinion that the liberal bourgeoisie cannot be regarded as an anti-fascist force, that it should be fought against. The Party, while exposing the vacillation of the bourgeoisie and calling attention to the danger presented by its tendency to compromise, works for its participation in the national anti-fascist movement, for alliance with it. Apart from everything else, this

policy facilitates the spread of the Party's influence to some sections of the petty bourgeoisie. Various forms of common actions are possible with the liberal bourgeoisie, even when some of its leaders do not want this.

Some comrades have said that the document *Perspectives*, issued by the PCP Central Committee in January 1963, "overestimates" the "breakaways from the regime," that "certain hopes are pinned on them in the matter of overthrowing the fascist regime." The document, Cunhal stressed, exposed the maneuvers and backstage intrigues (some of them U.S. inspired) aimed at replacing Salazar fascism with fascism without Salazar. The CC warned against entrusting the solution of Portugal's political problems to the "breakaways" and sharply criticized those who would sacrifice development of the democratic movement to compromise with the "breakaways" and the imperialists. At the same time the CC justly pointed out that the elements which have broken away from the enemy camp are influenced not only by the "internal contradictions of the regime, but also by the rise of the democratic movement and especially the popular mass struggle."

It is stressed in the report that the Party should follow closely all manifestations of discontent and doubt in the enemy camp, be able to discern the anti-Salazar trends developing among some fascists, and keep an eye on the reactionaries' intrigues. The political forces aiming to win power cannot afford to ignore the maneuvers of the ruling class, Cunhal pointed out. Seeing the approach of the revolution, these classes may effect some sham changes. They may resort to conspiracies, palace coups, "liberalization" measures, etc. But the working class and the democratic forces should be on guard against deceit and *take advantage* of such attempts on the part of the ruling classes to save their positions in order to give a fresh impetus to the democratic struggle, to the development of the democratic revolution.

The solution of Portugal's political problems does not depend on the "breakaways." But this does not mean that former supporters of the regime are incapable of turning against it or even of joining the anti-fascist movement. We want unity with all opponents of the fascist dictatorship regardless of when they decided to join the opposition.

Cunhal pointed out that the Patriotic Front is an alliance uniting the main political trends of the country and possessing it own organization, means of propaganda, and a considerable base abroad. But it would be a mistake for the Front to insist on excessive centralization in the sphere of orientation and political action. That would in no way help to strengthen it ideologically and organizationally or enhance its unifying role and its influence and prestige in the anti-fascist movement.

Cunhal criticized the view that an anti-fascist "superparty" should be created to subordinate all the forces affiliated with it. The "super-party" idea has been put forward by those who hope to turn the unitary movement into a party of their own. This, however, would create serious difficulties and expose the movement to the danger of a split.

"The Communist Party has never tried to turn the unitary movement in which it is taking part into its branch. And it will never participate in a unitary movement converted into a party of other political forces."

At the same time, the Communist Party will not tolerate any belittling or concealing of the role of the Communist Party in this movement. "The Communist Party is a member of the Patriotic Front. No one can deny that the party has worked to carry out jointly adopted decisions. Our line of action continues to be aimed at building the front into a great and powerful movement of unity capable of leading the Portuguese people to victory over fascism. In this movement, which embraces different political and social forces, we shall remain the party of the working class, the vanguard of the working people. We shall continue our independent activity as a Marxist-Leninist party and under no circumstances shall we renounce it."

10. THE NATIONAL UPRISING—THE REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE OF THE ANTI-FASCIST MOVEMENT

The Portuguese people have long been convinced that the fascist dictatorship can be overthrown and democracy established only by means of force. On this score there are no differences of opinion among the opposition. But this does not rule out unexpected turns in the situation. The dictatorship may be confronted with such unforeseen difficulties as might make it possible to take the peaceful road. But so long as the present conditions exist the only possible way is through the use of force.

The fascist dictatorship has eliminated all legal possibilities for defending the vital interests of the people. It has turned the constitution, elections and other elements of democracy into a sham designed to create a semblance of popular support. Salazar and his camarilla regard the regime as perpetual and sacrosanct, and any means of defending it as perfectly lawful.

The overthrow of the fascist government and the advent of a democratic government may come about as a result of a national popular uprising, of armed struggle waged by the people and the revolutionary element in the army who will destroy the fascist military and repressive machine. Pointing to this perspective, the Party has warned against the ideas propounded by irresponsible "revolutionaries." "An uprising cannot be decreed by those who seek to win power," Cunhal stressed. "If the conditions are not

ripe, no calls to armed struggle issued by the vanguard will help. The vanguard may rush to the battle, but the masses will not follow it. Under such circumstances insurrection is doomed to defeat."

As Marxist-Leninists see it, the conditions are ripe for an uprising when there exists a revolutionary situation (the objective conditions) and the revolutionary classes are ready to take resolute action to overthrow the existing power (the subjective conditions).

Analyzing in this light the situation in Portugal, Cunhal comes to the conclusion that as yet there is no revolutionary situation in the country, although all the objective facts indicate that it is maturing. The task of the Party and of all democratic forces is not only the popular struggle, which in itself aggravates the crisis of the regime, but also to prepare to lead the people into the final and decisive battle in the conditions of the approaching revolutionary situation. We should bear in mind that the approach of the revolutionary crisis may be hastened by unexpected events causing an outburst of popular discontent and sowing confusion in the ruling circles. For instance, serious military defeats in the colonies would undoubtedly serve as catalysts of the revolutionary process.

The Communist Party draws attention to the fact that the political and organizational work of the democratic forces, the Communist Party included, does not meet the demands of the political situation. If this shortcoming is not removed, a revolutionary situation may develop before the anti-fasicst forces are in a position to launch a successful uprising. Such is the real state of affairs which no pseudo-Marxist phraseology can change.

It is not accidental that the Communist Party defines the coming uprising as "national." The final and decisive blow will be delivered at the dictatorship not as a result of a conspiracy isolated from the popular struggle but in conditions of intensive political mass struggle on a nationwide scale. To this end it is necessary to draw ever broader sections of the people into mass actions, to make these actions more consistent, to set up organizations capable not only of leading mass actions but also of expanding their scope. These actions of various sections of the population (workers, peasants, soldiers, students, intellectuals), although taking different forms and pursuing different concrete aims, will channel the discontent and anger of the broad masses and their resolve to fight into a single revolutionary torrent that will sweep away the fascist dictatorship.

"A popular uprising should not be confused with one or several mass demonstrations, no matter how big they may be," Cunhal points out. "It is the culmination of a broad and powerful mass movement in which strikes and demonstrations follow one another and a general political strike will probably be declared."

The Communist Party has criticized those who have no faith in

the forces of the people, in their ability to organize and rise in revolt, and also those who claim that the people are ready to rebel right now. The revolutionary organizations preparing to take over power should know the enemy forces well. The popular movement has been developing over a comparatively long period of time. But the resolve to enter the decisive battle matures when the popular struggle has attained maximum intensity, when the masses have proved by their own political actions under the leadership of their political vanguard that they are ready to give their lives for the revolution, and when the forces of the enemy waver and begin to disintegrate.

11. MASS STRUGGLE—THE MOTIVE FORCE OF THE REVOLUTION

Mass struggle is the only road to the national uprising. The decisive battle must be preceded by powerful actions which, like ocean waves, batter the walls of the fascist state, drive breaches in it and make its defense ever more difficult, sowing panic in the enemy ranks and thus creating the conditions for the final assault, for the armed uprising. All the activities of the Party and the other democratic forces should be directed at this.

Analyzing the popular struggle over the recent years, we see that the struggle of the industrial workers for their demands, the struggle of the agricultural workers for higher wages and an eight-hour day, the actions of soldiers and officers against the colonial war, the struggle of the students for university autonomy and for freedom of association, the actions of the intelligentsia in defense of culture, the openly political actions to bring about the resignation of the government and to win democratic freedoms, actions sometimes isolated and sometimes coinciding, taking place at different levels and in different forms from mere presentation of demands by some committee to strikes and huge demonstrations in the streets—all these broaden the front of attack, influence one another, inspire one another, assume more and more concrete forms, and point out ever more clearly the direction to the entire anti-fascist movement.

Cunhal stressed the need to combine legal forms of struggle and organization with illegal ones, economic struggle with political struggle, and pointed out that the economic struggle in Portugal is increasingly asuming a political nature.

"In certain historical conditions economic struggle may not be of a political nature: for instance, when it is a fight for some concession without questioning the existing political regime or at least the existing government. But in the present political situation in Portugal the struggle of the working classes against the government, even when the issues are economic, raises the question of the continued existence of both the government and the fascist

regime. In the present conditions the economic struggles against the government, as well as other economic demands which bring down police reprisals on the workers, are of a political nature. They are political not only by virtue of the objective conditions, but are regarded as such by the working people themselves. This does not mean, of course, that the Party has ever reduced the struggle against the fascist dictatorship to an economic struggle. The Party links the economic struggle with open political struggle."

12. VICTORY IS IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT ORGANIZATION

The party holds that organization is the chief and decisive task. It holds that it is necessary to strengthen not only its own organizations but also all others—legal, semi-legal and illegal. It considers it imperative to make wide use of the existing legal organizations and to set up new ones. Without this, victory of the anti-fascist movement is unthinkable.

All of the more impressive successes of the party of the working class and of the toiling masses in the struggle against fascism are closely bound up with the organizational preparation of this struggle. The Communist Party attaches particular importance to work in legal organizations, especially the government-controlled National Trade Unions.

"The need to work in the National Trade Unions," Cunhal said, "has long been generally recognized in our country. The Party and the working people have scored signal successes in this field. The Party organizations and the working people have seen from their own experience that the National Trade Unions can be used to advantage." Cunhal severely criticized the Leftist refusal to make use of the government-run trade unions to fight for the interests of the working people and stressed that a situation had developed in these unions that served to impart a political character to the workers' struggle.

Today even those who would prefer not to recognize the role of the Communist Party are compelled to concede that it is the only political organization of the opposition which is a party in the true sense of the word. This is so obvious to all that when a person is said to be "from the Party" everybody understands that he is a Communist. True, there are other anti-Salazar political trends wielding influence over broad sections of the population. But although they consist of numerous small groups and have in their midst prominent individuals, they are not organized as parties. This causes serious difficulties for the anti-fascist movement.

It is necessary, Cunhal stressed, to set up a broad, strong organization rooted in the masses, to have hundreds and thousands of leaders of the people's struggle participating in organized work, constantly to draw new vanguard fighters into the leadership of

the mass movement, and to carry on organizational work among the masses.

13. ERRONEOUS TRENDS AND THE DANGERS THEY PRESENT

Three erroneous trends have manifested themselves in the democratic movement: terrorism, putschism and legitimism. Which of them gains most ground and hence presents the greatest danger at any given time depends on the situation. Inspired by the petty bourgeoisie and some sections of the middle bourgeoisie, these trends are marked by lack of faith in the proletariat and the masses generally. They all are indicative of the striving of the petty and middle bourgeoisie to gain the upper hand and prevent the proletariat and its party from playing the decisive role in the democratic revolution.

"A comparison of the statement made by certain leaders," Cunhal noted, "reveals an interesting fact: the less support they command, the easier they think it will be to overthrow fascism. Their tactics conform only to their own possibilities and not to the demands of the situation. If their forces are negligible and they do not know how to rally them to the struggle, they choose the road of coups; if they lack forces even for a coup, they advocate organizing direct action groups; if they cannot set up such groups, they limit themselves to fiery speeches. . . Today the petty-bourgeois radicals and 'revolutionary' phrasemongers are insisting on one thing only: immediate 'direct action', immediate violence, immediate armed struggle. . ." This anarchist trend is particularly harmful in view of the orientation it is out to impose on the democratic struggle. Terrorism should be combatted.

Cunhal pointed to the harm done by the striving to form so-called combat groups and provoke "armed clashes of demonstrators with the repressive forces." It is one thing to organize mass self-defense of street demonstrations and obstruct the actions of the repressive forces, and quite another to try to equate street demonstrations with terrorism, to initiate large-scale armed clashes during demonstrations. The Communist Party is resolutely against this.

The Portuguese Communist Party has also shown how harmful putschism is to the democratic movement. In certain conditions resolute revolutionary actions by anti-fascist officers, many of whom are in favor of coups, may be useful. But in the present circumstances this would only cause harm. Addressing the anti-fascists in the army, Cunhal said that despite these and other differences of opinion "there are many points on which our views coincide. Both you and we consider that the help of the armed forces is essential for overthrowing fascism. So let us work persistently towards this goal, let us work together and help each

other. If you want to cooperate with us, we shall jointly set up a strong revolutionary organization in the armed forces".

Analyzing the experience of the "elections" conducted by the dictatorship, Cunhal stressed the futility and harmfulness of the hopes of the "legitimists" and the need to combat this trend.

14. A MASS COMMUNIST PARTY IS INDISPENSABLE FOR THE VICTORY OF DEMOCRACY

Throughout the 38 years of fascist tyranny the Communist Party has been in the forward lines, always linked with the working class and the people generally, defending the interests of the exploited and the oppressed and the interests of the Portuguese nation against foreign domination.

Stressing that the ripening of the revolutionary situation made it imperative to strengthen the central leading nucleus of the Party and to protect it against repressions, Cunhal pointed out that in order to carry out this task it was necessary to improve the functioning of the Central Committee as the Party's leading body; to ensure the participation of all other leading bodies of the Party in carrying out the line of the Central Committee; to coordinate the organizational and propaganda work of the Party; to employ methods of work safeguarding the Party against repressions and to observe the strictest discipline in this respect; to pursue a correct cadres policy which would make it possible better to know, select, educate and promote new cadres.

It is pointed out in the report that the Party should carry on an ideological struggle on two fronts; against Right-wing opportunism and against Leftism and sectarianism, the main danger at the present moment.

Referring to the operation of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism in the conditions of underground work and to the need to increase Party membership, Cunhal said: "It is sheer nonsense to say that the Party leadership intends to build a 'mass party' in the sense that it will take in the 'masses.' Even if the Party had five times more members than it has now it would still be a 'party of leaders.' In the conditions of underground work we indeed want to build a 'party of leaders.' But for such a party to be able to carry out its tasks it must have the best fighters in its ranks and launch work in many important areas which we have not yet reached."

Concluding his report, Cunhal said:

"The Portuguese Communist Party is a Marxist-Leninist party. It is a member of the great community of Communist and Workers' parties, which constitute the greatest political force in mankind's history. Ever since its founding, marching shoulder to shoulder with the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the

recognized vanguard of the international Communist movement, and with all the other fraternal parties, the PCP has been fighting for democracy and socialism in our country, thereby fulfilling not only its duty to the Portuguese proletariat, but also its internationalist duty. Its struggle, in turn, is facilitated by the solidarity of the fraternal parties and by the fact that it is in Portugal the standard-bearer of international Communism whose epoch making victories are transforming the world."

LABOR PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE NETHERLANDS*

Since 1958 economic activity in the country has been on the upgrade. Industries are operating at full capacity, productivity of labor is steadily increasing and profits are fast multiplying as a result. In short, wealth is pouring in.

But this wealth in the shape of dividends and interest is finding its way into the pockets of the shareholders and directors of large enterprises. Meanwhile industrial production is growing by leaps and bounds and the process of concentration is proceeding apace with the result that small enterprises are being swallowed up by the big ones.

According to the Central Planning Bureau employers will make a profit of 5,000 gulden on every worker in 1964.

The wealth of the country is growing. But what share of this wealth does the worker get? As the Trade Union Federation of the Netherlands notes there is no such thing as "harmonious distribution of the wealth" in the country.

The time has therefore come to fight for a greater share of the wealth, for better conditions for the working people.

The Communist Party of the Netherlands proposes to all workers the following social program calling for:

1. Substantial wage and salary increases in 1965. Establishment of strict price control.
2. Shorter working hours. An additional week's vacation.
3. Bigger allocations for social needs. Lowering the pension age.
4. Enterprises to have the right themselves to determine wage rates. No right of veto for the government.
5. Factory councils to have the right to conclude additional wages agreements.
6. Reduction of taxes on working people. A higher income tax exemption ceiling.

WAGES

Substantial wage increases are possible and necessary. The rise in prices and taxes must not be allowed to reduce them to naught.

To prevent this, price control must be established. The government is procrastinating on the tax issue; the tax burden is growing ever heavier. Taxes must be reduced without delay. This is an imperative necessity. Parallel with raising real wages it is neces-

*De Waarheid, October 2, 1964.

sary to establish legislatively a minimum wage for the lower paid categories of working people, ensuring them a sufficiently high standard of living. Wages must be increased as prices go up. This must be a law.

It is high time that the interests of municipal workers and employees are taken into account and their salaries raised.

WORKING TIME AND VACATION

In Holland not only wages are lower than in the other member-countries of the EEC. Also the working day is longer and vacations shorter. A 9-hour day is much too long, especially in view of the growing drain on the physical and spiritual strength of the worker owing to the intensification of labor. Many workers have to spend two to three hours travelling to work and back. The working day should be reduced while preserving the 5-day working week. Vacations should be increased with a corresponding increase in pay during vacations.

HIGHER PENSIONS AND A LOWER PENSION AGE

Pensions should be raised to a level guaranteeing a secure old age. The pension age should be lowered in view of the intensity of labor. Other social benefit payments too should be increased to ensure a tolerable standard of living.

Dues paid into the social insurance funds which continue to be a heavy burden on the workers should be paid largely out of public funds.

DETERMINING WAGE RATES

When deciding wage issues, the Marijnen government uses its right of veto in the interests of the big manufacturers and monopolies to keep wages down. An end must be put to this. It must be left to the enterprises to settle all questions of wage rates and working conditions. The government should not be given the right to annul agreements concluded between employers and trade unions.

RIGHTS OF FACTORY COUNCILS

The factory councils must be given greater rights. This concerns, first of all, the right to settle with factory managements wage issues not covered by collective agreements. Council members should not be victimized for their defence of the interests of factory and office workers.

The Communist Party of the Netherlands believes that the demands put forward in this social program can be realized already at the present time, for the workers at the factories and the unions affiliated with the Trade Union Federation represent a strong force in the country.

September 27, 1964.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION*

Blas Roca

MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED PARTY OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

In the years since its triumph the Cuban revolution has not only repelled all the intrigues of the counter-revolutionaries and imperialists, but has also made rapid progress.

Within a short space of time Cuba has become not only the first free territory but also the first socialist state in the Americas. As it develops, the Cuban revolution is more and more manifesting its international significance as the harbinger of the downfall of U.S. neo-colonialism in Latin America and the establishment of socialism in this part of the world.

The Cuban revolution has shown that it is invincible, that it is not something transient and accidental but an inevitable result of historical development in the modern epoch. It is a revolution born to live, and it lives.

The advance of our revolution along the road of socialism proves convincingly the correctness of the policy of its leadership; it testifies to the fact that we live in an epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism and of a new correlation of world forces.

The objective conditions for the victory of the revolution in Cuba had ripened long ago. But revolution, like history, is made by people not when they suddenly decide to make it, however, but when it is prepared by the entire previous development and favored by the socio-political and economic factors operating in society.

When such factors exist, the development of events is determined by the actions of the revolutionary forces caused by these factors, by their correct orientation in solving problems posed by history. It depends on these forces whether the revolution will be accomplished or the opportunity will be missed.

Revolutionaries must take advantage of the revolutionary situation in good time, they must not miss the moment when the ob-

*Abridged from **Cuba Socialists** No. 29, 1964. Subtitles are ours.—Ed.

jective conditions make the success of the revolution possible. It is in this that the art of revolution consists.

The Second Havana Declaration contains a proposition the significance of which would seem to be self-evident. Yet it is not always fully grasped. The Declaration stresses that "the duty of the revolutionaries is to make the revolution."

Revolutionaries must, over a long period of time, propagate revolutionary ideas, a revolutionary program and revolutionary demands which as they penetrate into the masses become a mobilizing force determining their actions.

The masses have to be educated, organized and prepared with the help of all forms of partial actions—strikes, demonstrations, election campaigns, etc. The masses have to be influenced with the help of propaganda and agitation, through propagating revolutionary ideology among them and developing revolutionary consciousness in them, which lead them to the conviction that although it is necessary to fight for partial demands, none of them, whether political, economic or social, can satisfy their needs. They have to be convinced that changes of a political nature are necessary for the full realization of their aspirations and demands—not merely changes in the military and civilian representatives of the ruling class in government, but the winning of power by the revolutionary forces.

The problem of power is the main problem of the revolution.

The entire activities of the revolutionaries should be directed towards one chief goal: establishment of revolutionary power headed (in the conditions of our countries) only by the proletariat and founded on the alliance of the workers and peasants.

In the long process of struggle, preparatory work and rallying of the vanguard the revolutionaries determine the program of the revolution which is based on the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism and which conforms to the conditions of the country, gives clear and concrete answers to the questions posed by life, expresses the aspirations and demands of the masses, and is capable of inspiring the masses to resolute struggle.

The conditions characteristic of the neo-colonialist, latifundist and bourgeois regime—the chronic misery of millions; the inability of this regime to ensure economic growth so as to eliminate poverty; the ruthless repressions with which the regime seeks to preserve its power and which lead to the rule of military and police camarillas, to military coups and outrages of the "gorillas;" the increasing penetration of imperialist monopolies aggravating the internal contradictions not only between the exploited and the exploiters, between the people and their oppressors, but also between various groups of the exploiters, between monopoly and non-monopoly groups, etc.; the political, economic and social activity of the masses and the work of the revolutionaries—all these

determine the possibility for accomplishing an historically ripe revolution.

It is of vital importance in this period to realize that the revolution does not develop and triumph automatically, of itself.

In the course of the past five years of the revolution we have been able to appreciate the importance of the development of revolutionary consciousnes before the winning of power; of the ideological defeat of the Plattist, anarchist, Trotskyist and reformist trends; of the mass-scale propagation of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism; of the elaboration of cardinal points of a national- liberation program oriented on socialism. We have also been able to see the importance of resolute and correctly guided revolutionary action at the proper moment.

The Cuban revolution was prepared both by the entire previous historical development, internal and international, and by the practical and ideological struggle that preceded it.

Comrade Fidel's tremendous historical service which enabled him to play an outstanding role in our revolution, the role of the great leader of our working class and all our people, is that he correctly timed the launching of armed struggle as the chief means of leading the revolution to victory, overthrowing the Batista dictatorship and establishing the revolutionary power of workers and peasants capable of effecting the social and economic changes our country so needed. He not only saw this possibility, but set out resolutely to prepare and launch armed struggle and led it to victory in January 1959. Had not this been done the opportunity of accomplishing the revolution would have been missed, the liberation of our country and people would have been delayed, and we would not be building socialism today.

THE CHARACTER OF OUR EPOCH AND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

What were the international factors favorable for the victory and progress of the Cuban revolution?

In their most general form and in their decisive features, these factors were determined by the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917; by the victory of the socialist revolution in some European and Asian countries after the Second World War; by the changed world correlation of the forces of imperialism and socialism in favor of the latter.

The full definition of the character of our epoch is given in the Statement of the 1960 Moscow meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties.

The present correlation of world forces is such that undisguised capitalism is becoming ever more intolerable, that almost any country, big or small, in any part of the world can accomplish the re-

volution and go over to socialism, while world imperialism has no reliable means of preventing this.

The international solidarity of the peoples is expressed today not only in mass movements in the countries still dominated by imperialism, but also in the actions of the peoples of the imperialist states and chiefly in the strength and actions of the socialist countries, which can defend the independence of newly-free countries and give every support to peoples taking their destiny into their own hands.

The example of Cuba has proved the correctness of these conclusions. It has shown that any Latin-American country can accomplish the revolution, shake off the imperialist yoke of the United States and of its bourgeois and latifundist lackeys, and proceed to building socialism.

The international conditions making the revolution possible in any country and facilitating it do not replace the revolution itself, do not obviate the need for the peoples to fight for liberation from the pro-imperialist and oligarchic governments, for the establishment of people's revolutionary power. But these were not the only elements of the international situation that facilitated the victorious march of the Cuban revolution.

It is also necessary to take into consideration the peculiarities of the situation in Latin America.

As a result of the post-1917 changes in the world, the struggle of the Latin-American peoples delivered a blow at the interventionist trends with regard to our countries which prevailed in U.S. policy till the 1930s.

In the twenties a powerful movement developed throughout Latin America against the ever more frequent U.S. interference in the affairs of the Caribbean countries, for the observance of the principle of non-interference, for respect for the right of the peoples to self-determination.

In Cuba, Machado, this dictator and flunkey of U.S. imperialism, openly supported the United States' claim to the right to interfere in Latin-American affairs. But the Cuban people not only came out against this claim, but toppled Machado himself and annulled the notorious Platt amendments*, the "legal" instrument of U.S. military interference in the affairs of our country.

The elimination of the "Platt amendments" forced by revolutionary actions in 1933, and the official recognition of the principle of non-interference in 1934 created favorable international conditions for the development of the Cuban revolution and prevented

---

*These amendments to the Cuban Constitution, made in 1901 under U.S. pressure, legalized the country's dependence on the United States, allowed the latter to set up its bases in Cuba, etc.—Ed.

open U.S. interference both during the armed struggle against the Batista dictatorship and after the victory of the revolution.

In 1956-58 U.S. interference was expressed in the form of political and diplomatic support to the tyranny and in supplying it with arms. The U.S. engineered many provocations but did not dare to order its troops to take a direct part in the punitive operations against the Rebel Army. One of the reasons for this was the annulment, in its time, of the "Platt amendments" and the official recognition of the principle of non-interference.

Since the end of the Second World War the United States has been acting as an international gendarme. Such has been the case in Korea, the Congo and South Vietnam. For the same purpose anti-guerrilla troops have been stationed in Panama, where they are being trained for interventionist actions against Colombia, Venezuela, Guatemala and other Latin-American countries where the revolutionary movement has been mounting irrepressibly.

The imperialists are openly trying to abolish the principle of non-interference. This is a component part of their aggressive policy against Cuba and of their struggle against the Latin-American peoples. In this they are actively assisted by their most loyal lackeys, among whom Romulo Betancourt stands out for impudence and cowardice. He is trying, under all kinds of anti-communist and anti-Soviet pretexts, to turn the Organization of American States into something like a continental central police department, into a punitive force against the Latin-American peoples.

The military intervention which the imperialists and their lackeys are anxious to launch is doomed to failure in advance. It would draw the United States into a colonial war in Latin America in which it would stand no chance of winning.

Military intervention against Cuba would escalate today into a world conflict in which the United States could not hope for success either, and which would lead to thermonuclear catastrophe.

Latin-American problems can only be solved in a revolutionary way. Their solution would be greatly complicated by U.S. military intervention, for one of their chief causes is the fact that the Latin-American countries are dominated and exploited by North-American imperialism, by its trusts and monopolies, banks and investors, stooges and agents.

THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION

We have noted already that the factors determining the advance of the revolution have been developing, on a definite economic basis, over a long period in the history of our country.

The fact that Cuba was the last Latin-American country to wrest independence from Spain gave us one advantage: the struggle for independence in our country had an extensive social back-

ground: it was headed, not by owners of sugar-cane plantations, but by radical revolutionary leaders from among the peasants and the middle urban strata who not only fought against Spanish colonialism but also opposed the emerging imperialism of the United States.

Marti's revolutionary thinking was so profound that even today, when we have launched socialist construction, some of his ideas retain their force. The heroes of the liberation struggle and in particular such outstanding personalities as Marti and Maceo came out against both Spanish colonialism and U.S. imperialism and thus initiated a tradition which greatly influenced our subsequent revolutionary struggle.

During the organization of the Cuban revolutionary party in 1892 Marti recruited into it representatives of workers' clubs, and its leadership included Carlos Balino, a Marxist Socialist who in 1925 became one of the founders and leaders of the Communist Party.

The class origin of the heroes of the struggle for independence, their progressive and radical political views, the participation of the working class in the liberation struggle not only predetermined after 1895, the revolutionary form of the war against Spanish colonial rule and the prevalence of positions opposed to the U.S. intervention, but also provided highly important ideological prerequisites for the subsequent stages of the struggle.

The relative strength of the working class in Cuba is greater than in other countries, where the survivals of semi-feudalism are much stronger and more widespread.

The working class not only was organized into trade unions, but also strove for the establishment of its independent political organization, its own party. The Workers' Party was founded back in 1904. The following year it adopted the international socialist program and was renamed the Socialist Workers' Party. A short-lived party though it was, it helped greatly to disseminate Marxist and anti-imperialist literature, and contributed to the formation of the socialist consciousness of politically active workers and posed specific problems whose theoretical solution was outlined in the program. Carlos Balino was the soul of that party.

In 1917 the October Socialist Revolution stirred the Cuban proletariat, and Communist groups uniting members of the disbanded Socialist Party, young workers, intellectuals and students began to be formed. In 1925, some time after dictator Machado became President, a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party came into being. Among its leaders were Carlos Balinos and Julio Antonio Mella.

The Communist Party helped to establish the Anti-Imperialist League of Cuba, which advanced and advocated a national-liberation program demanding not only the abolition of the "Platt

amendments" and full political independence (the same demands had been made in 1868 and 1895), but also the return to the country of its riches unlawfully appropriated by the imperialist monopolies, and the transfer of the land to the peasants.

National liberation and socialism are concepts which are inseparable in the minds of the working people. The revolution should be anti-imperialist, it should bring about national independence, open the way to socialism and culminate in the building of socialism.

Such are the principles which have been advocated since the twenties, when the political consciousness of the Cuban working class reached, with the establishment of Communist groups, a higher level.

FROM THE MACHADO AND BATISTA DICTATORSHIPS TO THE REVOLUTION

The Machado government represented the power of the most reactionary terrorist circles of the ruling classes. Above all, it was a lackey of imperialism. Machado was a loyal servant of the latifundists, big tradesmen and the bourgeoise, who dreamed of complete freedom to exploit the working people—without strikes, trade unions and peasants' movements. Pursuing a policy of the monopolies, he was notorious for his regime of ruthless repressions, characterized by military orders instead of court legislation, imprisonment without trial for unlimited periods of time, torture, arbitrary implementation of the law on attempts to escape, and outrageous murders.

The struggle against Machado strikingly demonstrated the role the working class was called upon to play in the new situation that had developed in Cuba and throughout the world. The strike, as a specific means of this mass struggle, assumed a nationwide political and revolutionary character. Protracted strike struggles decisively contributed to the overthrow of the Machado dictatorship.

The movement of the masses for their immediate demands stirred up the country. It inspired broader sections of the people to the struggle, influenced the soldiers and NCO's and led to actions which accelerated the political crisis.

Betrayal by the bourgeoisie, of whom Batista was the main instrument, resulted in the defeat of the revolution, but now it was no longer possible to abolish all the gains, some of which were given legislative embodiment in the 1940 Constitution. However, these gains were insufficient. They did not conform to the demands of the historical situation. Imperialist domination, latifundism, economic backwardness, chronic misery and unemployment — all that remained.

These circumstances were used by the exploiters for attempts to fully restore their political power, weakened in 1933, but at the same time they served as the basis for the struggle of the masses for the solution of problems that remained outstanding because of the betrayal by the bourgeoisie.

The coup of 1962 brought the political crisis to a head; it intensified and crystallized all its manifestations and simplified the situation by categorically putting the question: with the dictatorship or against it.

The dictatorship of Batista, just as that of Machado, sought to smother the discontent and disobedience of the people by rabid terror combined with corruption and demagogy. Imprisonment, torture, murder and persecution alternated with election swindles, conciliatory maneuvers, wooing of some sections of the population through handouts, and ruthless repression against others. But, as before, terror did not help.

This political situation, aggravated by the economic conditions of an underdeveloped imperialist-oppressed country where more than 500,000 were unemployed, young people had no prospect of finding work, poor peasants led a beggarly life, and the plight of the workers was aggravated by the extortions and treachery of trade union officials, set the stage for a new upsurge of revolutionary struggle.

Such was the situation in which a leader appeared who led the revolution in its new stage. It was Comrade Fidel Castro.

The revolutionary Movement of July 26 became the weapon for resuming the armed struggle, interupted in 1953, with new methods worked out on the basis of the new experience. It united and led to the struggle revolutionary-minded young people who did not yet side with the proletariat but who were already prepared to cooperate with it. The working class, for its part, strove for this cooperation. Drawing ever closer to the working people, this movement expressed their cherished aspirations, and this added to the revolutionary schooling of the young leaders.

In the course of other actions there emerged the Revolutionary Movement of March 13 in which in the grim period of preparing the victory merged with the common struggle for the "revolution of the disinherited," i.e., the revolution of the workers and peasants, the revolution of the poor against imperialist domination and all exploiters.

TRIUMPH AND CONSOLIDATION OF THE REVOLUTION

The historic victory of the revolution was won on the red-letter day of January 1, 1959. But not everything had been done. It was not enough to overthrow the dictatorship and seize power.

In order to carry the people's revolution forward, defend the new

power and enable it to effect basic economic and social changes it was necessary to destroy the machinery of the neo-colonialist latifundist and bourgeois state and build a new state, the state of the people. This historical task was carried out in a short period of time.

A government apparatus was created capable of acting in a revolutionary way in carrying out the program of the revolution and achieving its aims without the delay and sabotage which would have been inevitable if the old apparatus had been preserved.

This also made it possible to frustrate the conspiracies which the imperialists organized in order to destroy the newly-born people's power before it was consolidated and before resolute steps were taken which determined the economic and social essence of the revolution.

In the course of the struggle against these intrigues and during the implementation of the agrarian reform, the first major revolutionary measure, the polarization of forces took place finalizing the people's attitude towards the main problems of the revolution.

Every new measure, beginning with the agrarian reform, cleaned our ranks, isolated those who vacillated, united the revolutionaries and confronted them squarely with the counter-revolution.

The unity of action of the various revolutionary organizations developed to the point of their complete merger into the United Party of Socialist Revolution, which bases its activities on Marxist-Leninist principles and on the program of building socialism and communism.

The events and circumstances that ensured the victory in January 1959 determined the trend of the revolution after the seizure of power and its rapid advance in the past five years.

Developing at a very impressive pace, the Cuban revolution carried out within a few months the tasks of securing national liberation, achieving complete independence and genuine sovereignty and delivering the country from imperialist domination or patronage, both economic and political; it effected a radical agrarian reforme which liquidated latifundism and proceeded to the building of socialism.

In January 1959 the imperialist agents and all their supporters in Cuba launched an anti-communist propaganda campaign against the revolution. Just as the Kronstadt mutiny broke out under the slogan of "Soviets without Communists," so the imperialists and counter-revolutionaries attempted to delude the people with their slogan, "Long live the revolution, down with communism." This dirty provocation proved a dismal failure.

Before being defined in words, the revolution had proved in deeds what it actually was. To the dismay of the imperialists and their flunkeys, less than five months after the victory of the revolution

the radical agrarian reform demonstrated the actual dissociation of forces and at the same time predetermined the future course of the revolution.

This gave added impetus to the political development of the revolution. Those who hampered the revolution showed their cards by going over, one after another, to open actions, and were defeated. They were forced to seek shelter in Miami and Puerto Rico, making a common cause with diehard counter-revolutionaries.

The progress of the revolution was accelerated also in the socio-economic sphere. It began with abolishing the United States' monopoly of our foreign trade and went on, in retaliation to imperialism's repressive measures, to establish control over oil refineries, nationalize sugar refineries, banks and other imperialist enterprises and big industrial establishments whose owners supported their North-American masters and engaged in sabotage.

There began the stage of practical construction of socialism.

Having failed both in their attempts to sow confusion and interfere in the first months and in their conspiracies, the imperialists went over to direct military actions. They staged the invasion from Miami which, for the purpose of camouflaging the real inspirers, was headed by counter-revolutionary mercenaries. But the revolution was prepared for this as well.

With characteristic foresight Comrade Fidel, head of the revolutionary leadership, took measures to repel this blow. He stepped up the formation of the militia, the arming of the people and the purchase of weapons necessary for defending, heightened vigilance towards the counter-revolutionaries with the help of Defense Committees, and helped to raise the fighting spirit of the masses.

As a result, the U.S. imperialists, the CIA and the Pentagon generals suffered at the Bay of Pigs their first military defeat in America. The defeat was all the more historically significant in view of the fact that it took place within less than 72 hours in conditions of modern warfare and despite the initial advantages accruing from the suddenness of the attack.

The Bay of Pigs is historically significant also in the sense that it explains one more aspect of the revolutionary process. The Cuban Revolutionary forces fought in the name of the officially-proclaimed Socialist Revolution, in defense of the socialist homeland and the workers' and peasants' power.

This brief analysis of the main aspects of the development of the revolution is primarily an attempt to emphasize the importance of experience, which all of us Marxist-Leninists should study and apply as a weapon necessary in our constant struggle against imperialism and capitalism, for building a new society which will free man forever from all exploitation and oppression.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT

Gus Hall

BASED ON A REPORT MADE TO A MEETING OF COMMUNIST LEADERS IN SEPTEMBER, 1964

By now it is clear that the splitting line pursued by the Communist Party of China over the past four years has caused considerable damage in the world Communist movement and among the anti-imperialist forces generally. In the past we have spoken about the possible negative effects that might result from this line. Now they have become an actuality—a factor in the molding of today's political reality.

We must, of course, avoid any tendency to explain everything on the basis of the split. But to continue talking only about the *possible* negative effects would be to deceive no one but ourselves. We must soberly assess the damage and place the responsibility where it belongs. To ignore these things in the name of working for unity would be an illusion. It is an obvious fact that the anti-imperialist forces of the world have not been able to develop their full potential because of the split; that it has resulted in confusion and the forces that should be united are instead working in different directions.

It is difficult to conceal the damage which the political line and the splitting actions of the CPC have inflicted, for example, on the progressive forces of India. In large measure, thanks to this, at the most crucial moment in the history of India, a land of 450 million people, the forces of anti-imperialism and socialism are in disarray. This has obviously strengthened and emboldened the forces of reaction in that country. There the negative effects are especially evident. But to one degree or another there have been similar effects elsewhere.

The CPC policies and splitting activities have been a negative factor in the struggles in countries like Venezuela, Brazil and Chile. A month before the Chilean elections, the Chinese distributed a reckless, irresponsible and slanderous document directed against the policies and the leadership of the Communist Party of Chile. It most likely did not change the overall election results, but it did cause considerable confusion.

For us the most disturbing of all the negative consequences of the CPC's line are its negative effect in the struggle against U.S. imperialism. How to use this split for its aggressive purposes has now become the main preoccupation of the CIA. The State Department and the Pentagon, together with the CIA, have set up a number of study centers for this sole purpose. More and more they are coming to the conclusion that it is possible to use the split to the advantage of U.S. imperialism.

The incidents in the Bay of Tonkin and the attack on the installations in North Vietnam are case studies of the increasing dangers resulting from a continuation of this split. I think it can be strongly argued that U.S. imperialism would not have dared to attack the shore installations in North Vietnam if the countries of socialism were united.

That U.S. imperialism thus takes the split into its aggressive calculations is serious enough. But equally, if not more serious, is the danger that imperialism may miscalculate the depth of the split and thereby take the world over the brink to nuclear war.

In this situation, it is incumbent on our Party to call attention to this calculated use of the split by U.S. imperialism, and the dangers of possible miscalculation, and on these grounds to project the urgent need of world unity. This must be our point of departure in pressing for unity in the ranks of the working-class parties of the world.

The situation now facing the world Communist movement is extremely critical. We face this crisis because of the four-year development of an opposing line — of a basic departure from the line of Marxism-Leninism — on the part of the Chinese party leadership. They have diverged from the path of Marxism-Leninism on such questions as the estimate of the present relationship of world forces and the strategic line of march of the Communist movement, and consequently on almost all tactical questions. They have abandoned Marxism even on such elementary basic questions as the role of classes and class antagonisms and they have developed a system of philosophical concepts to support this departure.

What the world Communist movement faces, therefore, is the task of defending and further developing the concepts of Marxism-Leninism and of rejecting the erroneous concepts of the CPC based on narrow nationalism, petty bourgeois radicalism and the use of anti-Sovietism as an instrument of their nationalist policies. The world movement is now face to face with the results of four years of deterioration and frustration, four years of fruitless efforts to halt or limit the public debate and to keep the discussion within the bounds of Marxist standards of conduct. The struggle is to strengthen and sink deeper roots for the working class, communist ideology and to reject petty-bourgeois ideology. The task is to

raise to new heights proletarian internationalism and to reject narrow nationalism.

Such is the nature of the problem. The question is: Where do we go from here?

I have emphasized the fact that all this has been going on for four years because we should not approach the problem as if we were starting from scratch.

The 1960 world conference was an attempt to prevent such a development. I believe it did succeed in limiting the split. There have also been numerous regional meetings. There have been many world conferences organized by the *World Marxist Review* on specific questions, such as the struggle for democracy, the fight against imperialism, the growth of state monopoly capitalism, the building of socialism in new nations, problems of the trade unions, and others. There have been delegations to China from a number of the parties, and meetings, exchanges of letters and delegations between the CPSU and the CPC. In making proposals for the future, therefore, let us keep in mind the experiences of the past four years. Without exception, all overtures to return to the path of unity have thus far been rejected by the CPC.

If we are to make a serious contribution, there are some aspects of these developments that we need to probe into more deeply. In particular, we must try to determine why it has been impossible either to bring this debate to a conclusion or to limit its public expression. The answer to this question will go far in helping us assess the nature of the controversy.

There are some who argue that the divergence of positions is a natural outgrowth of the greatly increased diversity of specific situations in which different parties operate. But this is wrong. Diversity of circumstances does not mean diversity in theory or ideology. It does not eliminate the existence of universal laws applying to all situations.

To attribute the split to diversity of circumstances is to apologize for the Chinese position. Such differences are no excuse for the fragmentation of the world working-class movement. Nor are they an argument against the need for exchanges of experiences and views between parties. The real issue is whether parties should be permitted to use "diversity" as a cloak for concepts that depart from Marxism-Leninism while other parties remain silent. But the roots of the failure to end or limit debate go even beyond this.

There is one fundamental reason — and only one — why the world Communist movement has not been able to return to the path of unity. The reason is that the leadership of the CPC does not look upon this debate as a mere discussion of differences and has not done so for a long time. It now seems clear that their splitting approach can be dated back to the beginning of 1960. Starting with

January 1960, the line of the CPC has been one of conducting *not a discussion but rather a full-scale assault, designed to capture or to split the world movement.* Its aim is to reverse the course set by the 20th Congress, to destroy the influence of the CPSU, and to destroy the leadership of any party that does not go along with their non-Marxist policies.

Hence, instead of a discussion they have conducted, and are conducting, a political- organizational drive to create a split in the world Communist movement, unprecedented in working-class history. There is no match to its recklessness, to its provocative and irresponsible nature, and their use of slander and falsehoods is without precedent.

While they have formally kept contact with other parties, they have been engaged all along in building a world organizational structure consisting of groups in different countries. They have built, and are building, regional centers with big staffs, located in Switzerland and a number of other countries. They have labored to build in every country a cadre consisting of anti-party groups, irresponsible adventurers. Trotskyites and assorted petty-bourgeois radical sects. They have withdrawn from the *World Marxist Review* and have set up their own magazines. They speak against a world conference of Communist parties aimed at unity when at the very same time they are organizing their own, using the Tokyo peace meeting as the occasion for calling a conference of their forces in Peking afterward. And they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to build this world organization.

It seems clear that if both sides viewed the controversy as a discussion of differences, it could follow a logical course even though the differences are very sharp. But if one side uses the discussion only as a cover for other activities and to cloak its real aims, that also has its logic. That is why this debate has taken on the nature of a split. Under these circumstances, for the world Communist movement to continue to act as if this is a mere discussion of differences, is, in my estimate, the road to continued weakness. It is a path to disintegration.

Lenin once said, speaking about a group which indulged in pleasant phrases about internationalism but in fact followed a nationalist line, that they viewed it "as a holiday walk through the gardens of internationalist phraseology." There are, I feel, some tendencies to look upon the present controversy as a "holiday walk through the gardens of unity phraseology" — to mistake for a flower garden what is in fact an undergrowth of thistle and cactus.

It seems to me that to close one's eyes to the real nature of this split is the most harmful of all mistakes. It is the path to opportunism and capitulation. And to try to pass it off as only a disagreement between the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union and China,

or to suggest that somehow it is a personal feud between Khrushchov and Mao Tse-tung, is but a further step along an opportunistic path.

Lenin was entirely right when he said one cannot defend or apologize for opportunism without becoming an opportunist oneself. Compromise with opportunism is not a road to unity. The only real road to unity is an unyielding struggle against departures from the path of Marxism, where other opportunistic weaknesses did not come to the surface. In this sense the present struggle is no exception.

Neutrality to any degree in the struggle against a departure from Marxism-Leninism is itself a reflection of opportunism. "Autonomy," "national peculiarities," "diversity" are all very important concepts that need to be developed. But if these concepts are all that motivates or guides a working-class party, then they can very well become the vehicles for opportunistic and petty-bourgeois concepts. In the field of ideology there is the need for a constant struggle against the penetration of non-working-class ideas.

While there is general agreement that the tactical positions of the Chinese leaders are wrong, there seems to be a continuing reluctance to face up to what underlies these wrong policies. For example, the question is not only one of differences concerning relations between socialist states. There is also the question of the different ideological influences which mold people's attitudes toward the resolution of such differences. There are working-class concepts and there are petty-bourgeois concepts. There is a Marxist-Leninist approach and there is a departure from that approach.

What does it mean to speak, as some do, of the relation between working-class ideology and peasant or petty-bourgeois ideology in terms of adopting a position "big enough to embrace both ideologies?" An ideology is based on the relations of a given class in a society. We must distinguish between different ideologies and understand them in these terms. But we must try not to equate them or to fuse them with the idea that "each contributes to a synthesis of Marxist concepts." To do so would be only to obscure the affinity of Marxism-Leninism and working-class ideology. The alliance of the working class and the peasantry is based not on a fusion of ideologies but on the joint struggle for mutual interests. It is an alliance based on mutual self-interests. A victory for socialism is a victory of working-class ideology. Working-class ideology does not become fused with other class ideologies. The working class wins the other class groups to its ideology.

What is the nature of the unity of the world Communist movement that we are striving to establish? First, however, perhaps we should ask whether there is a need for a new look at the question

of establishing better coordination—of setting up some system of relations and exchanges within the world movement.

I am convinced this is a crucial question, that it is a key historic task now facing the working-class parties. I believe it is as crucial for us as it was for Marx and Engels when they fought for the First International, and as it was for Lenin and his co-workers before the Communist International came into existence.

Of course, the nature, the methods employed and the organizational structures established reflected the problems and conditions of those periods. Certainly they are not applicable now; our solutions must be a reflection of present-day developments.

Some warn that we must not try to build a system of relations based on the concept of the monolithic-organizational unity of the Communist International. But this is arguing about a non-existent problem. Not only are such concepts completely outdated, but also, as far as I know, no party has made any such proposals. We should not allow ourselves to be diverted by such phantoms. What can be wrong with a fresh look at this problem? Maybe we will conclude that it is not possible to establish a new system of ties, but let us do so on the basis of a new study.

I consider it also an illusion to think, as some of the parties apparently do, that they can continue their present course of immersing themselves in their own affairs and confining themselves to occasional general comments about the world problems, while the Chinese proceed to set up regional centers in different parts of the world, establish magazines and newspapers, conduct schools, creating confusion and distortion, and spreading nationalist and racist ideas.

The larger, older parties may go on in this way, at least for a time. But what about the smaller, newer parties — parties with less experience and a smaller weaker working-class base? Is it a responsible attitude, is it proletarian internationalism, to ignore these problems? Does this not reflect an over-emphasis on autonomy? Rather, we should boldly and creatively tackle the question of coordination without being gun-shy because of past mistakes, and without getting bogged down with past concepts.

Is there a contradiction between upholding the autonomy of each party and maintaining a system of relations and exchanges among the various working-class parties? I do not think so. The fact that such conflicts have arisen (or may arise again) only argues that we must learn from our mistakes and set up safeguards.

Is the safeguarding of autonomy a real question? Undoubtedly, in the past it was a problem. However, I cannot in all honesty see it from here as being such a problem today. I mention this because I feel that the question of autonomy is sometimes raised only as a smokescreen for concepts of narrow nationalism. To this, there is

only one exception, one real threat, namely, the attempts of the CPC to invade our autonomy as a party. When they set up and support anti-party cliques, this is an invasion of our autonomy.

What are some of the political questions on which exchanges and discussions are necessary? One area is the nature and role of U.S. imperialism, and methods of struggle against it.

We can agree that U.S. imperalism is the center of world imperialism and that it is as aggressive as it dares to be. But we cannot agree that it is the only imperialism worth mentioning or that the bourgeoisie is one monolithic, aggressive mass. We cannot successfully combat U.S. imperialism on the basis of such mistaken ideas. Such concepts have a built-in apology for other imperialist powers, and a cover for the most aggressive and reactionary sections of U.S. imperialism. Nor can we agree that fighting for peaceful policies of coexistence is incompatible with fighting against U.S. imperialism. On the contrary, the record shows that it is the *only* basis on which such a struggle can be successfully conducted in today's world.

And we must reject two closely-related questions regarding U.S. imperialism which have appeared in a number of places lately. American finance capital, to be sure, faces a growing crisis. The United States has been forced to retreat somewhat as a world power, thanks both to the growing strength of the socialist world and the continued success of the colonial liberation movements, and the increasing economic weight of its imperialist rivals. In addition, American ruling circles face a constitutional crisis provoked by the tremendous upsurge of the civil rights struggle. It is these developments that have given rise to two misconceptions.

One is that because of the nomination of Goldwater and the bid of the ultra-Right for the presidency, it is a foregone conclusion that the *whole* political front will necessarily—or already has—swung to the right. Such a conclusion betrays a lack of faith in the American people. It embodies a wrong estimate of the character and history of our people. True, such an outcome is *possible*. But it is not inevitable, or even probable. On the contrary, the present situation contains the ingredients for giving our country a push to the left. To make policy on the basis of an inevitable or already existing shift to the right is wrong and uncalled for.

Related to this erroneous conception is the idea that the crisis of U.S. imperialism can lead American ruling circles in only one direction—reaction and war. If this is so, then war is inevitable. This raises again an old question: Because of the relationship of forces, among the American people as well as on a world scale, can U.S. imperialism be made to retreat without a major world or nuclear war? To this question our reply has been, "Yes—it is possible!"

To reject this possibility is to reject one of the fundamental concepts of the policy of peaceful co-existence. We cannot base our policy on any concept of an inevitable path to reaction and war. What has happened to the positive estimates of the balance of world developments? Are they only operative as phrases in public resolutions, or are they factual estimates of present reality? I am convinced that our estimates are correct and that is why I cannot go along with such sweeping negative assessments that everything has swung to the right. One must see the danger of reaction. But not to see the growth of the people's democratic movement is to be one-sided. One must see the danger of war—but one must also have the confidence to win peace.

A second area in which we can contribute is the role of state monopoly capitalism. Its development has taken a different course here than in Western Europe, and has posed certain questions in a different light.

The European experience has given rise to questions of whether or to what extent the working class can use these state monopoly capitalist developments for purposes of transition to socialism. The question has arisen in this way because in the postwar reconstruction in Western Europe three elements were involved: domestic capital, the state, and U.S. capital. The struggle among these three sectors has provided room to maneuver and has opened up certain new possibilities.

But state monopoly capitalism here is quite different, particularly with regard to the way in which the state is involved. For us to project ideas similar to those emerging in some European parties would, therefore, be illusory, although it is impossible for us to foresee what might happen to the state-monopoly setup under an anti-monopoly government. At the same time, I feel that some opportunistic concepts have developed on such matters as state monopoly capitalism and the Common Market.

A third area to be examined is the spread of narrow nationalism. This is a new and special problem in the world Communist movement. There are many reasons for its development which I can only touch on here. One is the emergence of new relationships of the working classes to their nations. A second is the fact that in the struggle for national liberation, nationalism has played an important and a positive role. Third, the growth of Communist parties in newly-liberated countries and those still seeking their freedom has produced a changed class composition among the parties making up the world movement. Fourth, and most important, there has been no serious struggle against it. Weeds that are not fought against, grow. The positive role of nationalism in struggles has become transformed into an acceptance of nationalism in ideology.

Nationalism can be utilized as a progressive force only condition-

ally and temporarily, and then only when it operates in alliance with the ideology of the working class. Unless this is freely recognized, and unless there is a constant fight for the dominance of the ideology of working-class internationalism, it can all too easily get out of hand. When it does, then narrow nationalism replaces the working-class ideology of internationalism.

It is one thing to understand the role of national pride, or the role of nationalism in the struggle for independence and freedom. It is quite another matter when we are discussing the need for a struggle for working-class ideology.

Lenin stated it very well. He said, "Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the 'most just', 'purest,' most refined and civilized brand. In place of all forms of nationalism Marxism advances internationalism, the amalgamation of all nations in the higher unity, a unity that is growing before our eyes . . . The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society, and taking this society into account, the Marxist recognized the historical legitimacy of national movements. But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 34.)

In the present situation, an overdose of emphasis on "independence of parties" can lead to nationalism. A cadre spoon-fed only on ideas of autonomy and independence will be a cadre that succumbs to policies of narrow nationalism.

Every party must struggle consciously for an internationalist ideology. Every party must have its own key issue in that struggle —its own grindstone on which it molds a cadre shaped by internationalism. In our country that key issue in the struggle against great-power chauvinism and its internal counterpart, white chauvinism.

I believe that a fully successful struggle against all non-working-class ideological influences, whether it is great power chauvinism or nationalism, requires a system of exchanges and international relations. Without this, one-sidedness inevitably develops on most questions. To some, for example, the events in Brazil were proof of too much reliance on peaceful methods, but to these same people the developments in Venezuela prove nothing. Without a system of exchange there can be no collective sharing of theoretical conclusions. No one party can draw theoretical conclusions from events in this most active and explosive epoch of the history of mankind.

There has been a four-year process of schooling of Communist parties of the world in the course of this controversy. All have moved in the same direction, but some have been slower than others. The reason for this slowness is that some have retained illusions about the nature of the split. Thus, the Chinese at one

point put out feelers about their own world conference, which they later dropped when they found that they could not get the support of enough parties. But it shows that as long as they had hopes of winning support, they kept pushing. And it shows that a firmer stand by all parties would have halted the aggressive drive for a split more effectively and sooner.

In our own party cadre, we have encountered instances in which each new wrong tactical position of the CPC has been met with exclamations of "unbelievable," "a surprise," "unfortunate," "harmful." Each new act of the Chinese leaders has forced these comrades reluctantly a little further along the road toward grasping the full nature of the split and the depth of the departure from the path of Marxism-Leninism.

But doesn't this indicate a weakness? To hesitate for a time is understandable, but to be pushed, step by step, by tactical developments for four years without drawing conclusions is another matter. Again, I think this reflects a reluctance to come to grips with the fundamental reasons for the wrong tactical positions. If we examine it, I think we will find that there is no clear understanding of the questions involved.

Disagreeing with the Chinese tactically is no real measure of understanding. Few, even of the anti-Party groups, dare openly to support them on many of their tactical stands. However, we hear all-too-often the remark: "I don't agree with the Chinese on this—*but*." The discussion then centers about the *but*—which proves to be an attack on the Soviet Union. Or it is said, "We all know full well how wrong the CPC is *but* we must not answer them in kind.

There are a number of questions which it would be well-worth posing to ourselves. How have we explained the Chinese position on the test ban? Do we say, yes they are wrong, *BUT* "they operate under different relationships?" Or, how do we explain the charge that the "CPSU is in collusion with U.S. imperialism?" Do we remain publicly silent in the name of "autonomy," while we privately tell the Soviet Communists in one breath that these Chinese attacks have no effect but that even Communists are wondering how there can be such a sharp dispute between *two* countries of socialism.

It should not surprise us that it is not difficult to get our members to reject these tactical positions. But if we stop there, we leave them "wondering" about basic questions: If they are wondering, it is only because they are given no explanation of the fundamental cause of the erroneous tactical positions. Again, the question is not whether we reject the tactical positions, but how we explain what leads the CPC to them. These questions cannot be left on the level of "good guys and bad guys." We must get at the class roots of this basic departure from Marxism-Leninism.

We need to explain that this is a basic departure from Marxism-Leninism on such questions as the class struggle and the role of classes, the main contradiction of capitalism, the nature and role of nationalism, the estimate of the relationship of world forces, the new quality of the struggle for peace. We need to explain the Chinese advocacy of ideas like "the worse, the better" (which all-too many of our friends mistakenly believe to be our policy). We must explain the historic role of anti-Sovietism as a *key* ingredient of bourgeois ideology.

There are apparently some who think that we should be silent, or at least muffle our criticism, so that the Chinese leaders will keep focusing their attacks on the Soviet Union. Then there are some who lean toward the opportunist use of anti-Sovietism to prove their independence and autonomy or as a payment for a trade treaty with the imperialist powers. We cannot argue too strongly against any such ideas. Anti-Sovietism remains the key weapon in the capitalists' ideological arsenal. The imperialist forces are ready to pay a high price for any expression of anti-Sovietism. This remains the key to their attempts to split and demobilize the progressive forces of the world.

Why is this so important? Because we cannot defend Marxism-Leninism without this approach. We can only reject tactical positions one by one. And if that is all we do, we will encounter situations in which comrades who go along for a time on tactical questions *seemingly* swing overnight to the opposite position. For example, comrades may "suddenly" become confused on our electoral policy. We are now winning people over to that policy, but mainly because it is almost impossible, without appearing insane, to follow such policies as that of the *Monthly Review* which apes much of the CPC position. If we are satisfied, we should not be. Rather, we should seize this favorable tactical situation to explain more fundamentally the basis of our electoral policy; to explain the deeper meaning of our policy and tactics.

Or to take another example. In the thirties the main obstacles to Left unity were: a) anti-Communism, b) the sectarian policies of our Party, and c) the role of Trotskyism. But this has changed. We must still contend with anti-Communism, but a new obstacle is now created by the coming together of Trotskyism and the new brand of petty-bourgeois radicalism that strives to isolate the Left to a narrow sectarian corner. They say they now see the danger of fascism and Goldwaterism, but they refuse to do anything about building a people's democratic front against it. All this in the name of "purity of conscience" and radical phrases. The Goldwater candidacy has forced some tactical retreats, but the basic obstacle remains.

We need to deal with such questions as the relation between the

struggle for reforms and the struggle for socialism. We must convincingly show how the latter is a continuation of the former. If we do not, the petty-bourgeois radical line of the Chinese Party takes over: "the worse, the better." Our followers become infected with the enormous idea that reforms are not only futile, but are obstacles to the fight for socialism. And if reforms are frauds, why worry about winning the American masses to struggle for them? Why worry about what differences exist in the ranks of the bourgeoisie? And so on. Is it not a fact that some Left forces have accepted the position of the CPC that the Civil Rights Bill is a fraud, etc.?

What are the prospects for the ultimate re-establishment of ideological unity? Some say there are no such prospects, that the achievement of such unity is a hopeless task. I cannot accept so negative an estimate of the Chinese Communist Party or its leadership.

For some this negative estimate becomes an excuse for not conducting an ideological struggle. Because if this is so, why fight on ideological questions? Why not confine ourselves to appeals for unity on tactics in specific cases?

We fight for ideological unity because we believe we can succeeed —because we do not believe the Chinese Party is so hopelessly in the camp of petty-bourgeois radicalism and nationalism that there is no hope. Such negative contentions become an excuse for *not* fighting on the ideological front. It is one thing to argue against a monolithic world organizational structure. But this cannot be interpreted as an argument against the struggle for monolithic concepts in ideology or theory. This must always remain a goal toward which the world movement strives.

Nor can I accept the argument that the world movement is not ready for an international conference as the next step. I have a higher estimate of the world Communist movement than this, and I cannot see the logic of a position which says, "We have problems and differences; therefore we dare not get together and discuss them, for such a discussion may lead to a split."

The real danger is a continued process of drifting, or being driven apart by the centrifugal force of nationalism, each party in its own direction, while the leaders of the CPC go ahead full blast with the establishment of their regional centers and a world organization of their own.

Because we are for every possible step towards unity, we support the CPSU's proposal to call together an editorial commission to prepare materials for a world conference. We are for world conferences on the problems of today, for better facilities for the collective drawing of theoretical conclusions, for the establishment of a better system of relations between Communist parties. And we are

for discussions with the fraternal parties of the Americas about some regional system of ties.

We feel the editorial commission should prepare documents on recent world developments, on how to achieve peace, defeat world imperialism, and how the newly independent countries can move toward socialism. The commissions should also deal with the struggle against international monopoly capitalism, and should go further into the question of roads to socialism.

It should give particular attention to the problem of containing the influence of narrow nationalism, and of strengthening that of proletarian internationalism—of making proletarian internationalism a badge of honor and a mass political weapon. And it should go further into the central question of peaceful coexistence and its relationship to the struggles for peace, democracy and socialism.

Whether there are differences or not, there is always the need within the fraternity of autonomous world Communist parties to meet, to exchange experiences.

What is this fear in some quarters about a world conference?

In the capitalist press there has been much talk about the fear of such a world conference "expelling," "condemning" or "excommunicating" some parties. This is utter nonsense. Only those who view a world conference through the eyes of the long past can conjure up such fantasies, for the simple reason that there is no such world body with such powers. There are no thoughts—nor is it possible to set up such a body within today's realities. When all of those participating in such a conference have one aim—that of starting the process that will lead to the re-establishment of unity in the world Communist movement, how can anyone draw the conclusion that it can only result in a split? It is impossible for me to understand any concept that admits that there are disagreements and differences, states they are for unity, yet refuses to take part in discussions that surely must lead to unity. The healing of the split in the world community of Communist-Marxist parties is a challenge without precedent in working-class history.

Let the editorial commission, if nothing else, explore what the areas are on which an international conference can be called. Certainly no party can object to taking part in such a meeting.

GREAT BANNER OF BUILDERS OF COMMUNISM*

The peoples of the Soviet Union, of the community of socialist countries and the working people of the entire world are preparing to celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Progressives everywhere are again and again assessing the significance of the first victorious socialist revolution and analyzing the course of historical development from the day the Great October Revolution ushered in a new epoch, the epoch of the triumph of the ideas of socialism and communism.

The international significance of the October Revolution and the role of the Land of Soviets in accelerating society's progress towards communism was excellently described by Lenin:

". . . We have a right to be and are proud of the fact that to us has fallen the good fortune to *begin* the erection of a Soviet state, and thereby to *usher in* a new era in world history, the era of the rule of a *new* class, a class which is oppressed in every capitalist country, but which everywhere is marching forward towards a new life, towards victory over the bourgeoisie, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat—and towards the emancipation of mankind from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars" (*Collected Works,* Russ. ed., Vol. 44, p. 148).

More than four decades have passed since these glowing words were written. How the world has changed in these decades! More than a third of mankind is following the path of socialism illlumined by the ideas of the October Revolution, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The system of colonialism has collapsed and in place of the colonies and dependent countries there have arisen dozens of young independent states in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Marching in the vanguard of the revolutionary struggle of the peoples are the Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' parties and steeled in class battles, in the fire of the national-liberation movement.

By its successes in communist construction and its consistent policy of peace the Soviet Union, the homeland of the October Revolution, the homeland of Lenin, is strengthening the positions of socialism and peace in the international arena and exerting a revolutionizing influence on the struggle of the peoples against imperialism and colonialism, for peace, freedom, and social progress.

The Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted three years ago by the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, is the

*Pravda, November 1, 1964.

great banner of the builders of communism. Just as the two first programs of our Party, drafted with Lenin's direct participation, the third Program is permeated with fidelity to the Marxist-Leninist teaching, an ardent revolutionary spirit, deep faith in the creative forces of the masses, and belief in the triumph of the historic cause of the working class—socialism and communism. The great theoretical and political significance of the CPSU Program, which expresses the collective wisdom of the Party, lies in the fact that, taking into account the experience of the revolutionary movement throughout the world, it has creatively generalized the practice of socialist construction, and has advanced as an immediate practical task the building of communist society in our country.

The CPSU Program has for the first time worked out a scientifically-grounded plan and ways and means of building communism. It regards as an integral whole the economic, political and ideological tasks of full-scale communist construction—the building of the material and technical basis of communism, the shaping of communist social relations and the education of a new man, the man of communist society.

The fraternal Communist and Workers' parties received the CPSU Program as an outstanding document of creative Marxism-Leninism. At the time when the CPSU Program was being discussed leaders of the international Communist movement noted that beginning with the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels the Communists have always been able to show the peoples the road to achieving great goals. In the new Program of the CPSU the working people of all countries see the concrete features of communist society, and the entire experience of modern history beginning with the October Revolution of 1917 is irrefutable proof that the goal which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has set itself will be reached.

True to Marxism-Leninism, our Party consistently pursues its general Leninist line worked out at the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses and expressed in the Program of the CPSU.

I

The CPSU Program formulates the main economic task of the Party and the people—the creation of the material and technical basis of communism.

In defining what this basis means the Party proceeded from the fundamental propositions of scientific communism and the revolutionary experience of the masses. It gave all-round consideration to the latest achievements of science and engineering. In order to secure a rapid development of productive forces and growth of production making it possible to meet amply the requirements of society and all its members, in order to ensure the highest labor

productivity in all fields it is necessary, in the first place, to achieve:

—complete electrification of the country and improvement, on this basis, of techniques, production processes, and organization of the entire social production;

—comprehensive mechanization and ever greater automation of production;

—widespread use of chemistry in the national economy;

—vigorous development of new, economically effective branches of production, tapping new types of power and new materials;

—all-round and rational utilization of natural, material and manpower resources;

—organic fusion of science and production, and rapid scientific and technical progress;

—a high cultural and technical level for all working people.

The CPSU Program stresses that, along with a powerful industry, a highly-productive agriculture is indispensable for the building of communism. The chief means of achieving progress in agriculture is comprehensive mechanization and steady intensification in farming.

Under the guidance of the Party of Lenin the Soviet people are enthusiastically carrying out the tasks set by the CPSU Program. Only three years have passed, but a great deal has already been done.

New sizable raw material sources have been found, such as the big oil deposits discovered recently in Siberia. The electric power resources of the national economy are expanding. New capacities of thermal and hydro-electric stations are being constantly added. The chemical industry—the production of mineral fertilizers, synthetic fibers, plastics, resins, etc. — is developing at an accelerated rate. Chemical products are finding ever broader application in different branches of the national economy. Big successes have been scored in the engineering and instrument-making industries and especially in such a new field as electronics. The outstanding achievements of the Soviet Union in the exploration of outer space marked a new decisive step in scientific and technical progress. Capital construction is acquiring ever greater scope. Considerable success has also been achieved in agricultural development, as testified to by the fulfilment of the grain procurement plan.

The Party and the people assess the achievements in communist construction in a realistic way. They do not shut their eyes to the difficulties. They see and soberly analyze shortcomings. This makes it possible to move forward with greater confidence, to concentrate on the immediate tasks.

The CPSU Program stresses that at all levels of economic planning and management attention should be focused on steadily raising labor productivity, promoting the initiative of the working people and their participation in managing production, making the most

rational and effective use of the material, man-power and financial resources and natural wealth, and eliminating excessive expenditure and losses. The law of economic endeavor in our country is to achieve in the interests of society, the highest results at the lowest cost.

Is this requirement complied with always and everywhere? Not always, and not everywhere by far. Take capital construction, for instance. Parochial departmental tendencies are often not properly rebuffed by Party, planning and economic bodies. Hence, the scattering of allocations on numerous projects, dragging out of construction time and higher building costs. Engineering plants often fail to keep to delivery timetables. Furthermore, this equipment has both design and technological defects. In conformity with the demand of the CPSU Program, it is necessary most resolutely to put an end to the scattering of capital funds, to concentrate capital investments in decisive construction jobs, and to accelerate the commissioning and full-scale operation of new capacities.

At times new, progressive ideas are realized all too slowly. The stages from laboratory experiments to factory tests, and from factory tests to mass-scale production take too much time in some instances, and the national economy suffers considerable losses as a result. Scientists, designers and production workers often act apart, and do not concentrate their efforts on basic economic development problems. Many enterprises have for years been putting out goods which are obsolete and below the present standards of science and engineering.

Insufficient attention is still being given to production economics, improvement of quality, choice of the most economic trends, and consistent implementation of the Leninist principle of providing material incentives. Using all the material resources in a national way, with maximum economic effect and saving of time requires great competence. It should be clearly understood that we have not yet fully acquired that competence. Our people have much to learn here, to study and adopt the best experience, and improve methods of economic management and planning.

It should be pointed out that the idea still widespread that it is possible to solve complicated economic tasks by administrative methods, that what is necessary is merely to rearrange the management, to amalgamate some two departments, or to divide one economic body into two, and things will start moving in the proper direction. This is a highly fallacious approach. Methods of socialist management and planning should rest on a strictly scientific foundation, leaving to the enterprises ample scope for independent decision on economic issues and contributing to a continued display of creative initiative by the working people. It is important to remove all elements of subjectivism in planning, to be able correctly to

apply the economic instruments and methods of management—cost-accounting, prices, credit, and profit—and with their aid to create effective stimuli for the growth of production and acceleration of technological progress. All that accords with the interests of Soviet society as a whole should also accord with the material interests of each production group and each working man.

One of the cardinal problems confronting our industry is that of sharply improving the quality of output. As applied to machines, instruments and materials, the matter, first of all, concerns their greater reliability and longer service. This is the path conserving social labor and social wealth, to saving costly materials, and funds spent on overhauls and spare parts.

The material well-being of the Soviet people is growing, and so is their demand for better-quality goods. "Take what you're given" —this survival of times gone by is no longer in in keeping with the times. People do not want to buy any kind of fabrics, any kind of garments or footwear, or any kind of furniture; they want things which are attractive, fashionable, and of good quality. The customer turns his back on the things he does not like. That is why shelves in the shops and warehouses are often overstocked with what are known as goods "not in demand."

A radical improvement in the quality of all consumer goods and in construction of houses, and, especially, the finishing of flats, improvement in trade and other public services—this should be a constant concern of Party, government, planning and economic bodies.

Creating the material and technological basis of communism is not free from some difficulties, both in industry and agriculture. But the nature of the Soviet system, the specific features and advantages of the socialist system make it possible to quickly overcome these difficulties, to develop social production step by step, directing it towards the fulfillment of the great motto of our Party inscribed in its Program: "Everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man."

II

The Party Program defines communism as a classless society with single ownership of the means of production by the entire people and complete social equality. This definition reveals the essence of social relations under communism. Introduction of the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will make a reality of the workers' dream of achieving the most just of societies on earth.

Explaining the difference between the "first form of the new society," socialism, and its "higher form," communism, Lenin pointed out that "socialism implies . . . social labor accompanied

by the strictest accounting, control and supervision on the part of the organized vanguard, the most advanced section of the toilers. Moreover, it implies that the amount of work done and the amount of compensation for it must both be determined" *(Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 40, p. 33.) Lenin defined communism as a system under which people become accustomed to the performance of public duties without any specific machinery of compulsion, when voluntary work for the common good becomes the universal phenomenon.

In Lenin's assessment, the changes in relations between production and distribution are directly linked with educating the new man, for whom labor will become life's prime requirement, with the development of the socialist state into communist public self-administration. These ideas of Lenin have been further developed and substantiated in the Program of the CPSU.

Education of the new man who will live and work in a communist way is advanced as a primary task of our Party. The Program singles out two aspects of the matter—promotion of the production initiative of the members of society, and moulding their communist world outlook and communist morality. Communism is a system in which the abilities and talents, the finest moral traits of the free man are revealed and developed to the full. The genuine humanism of the new society is manifested in that it creates all the conditions for the blossoming of the human personality, for man's life and work. Successes in education and culture in the Soviet Union have already brought about the extensive development of the abilities of people, which in turn serves as a powerful accelerator of social progress.

Of great importance for building communism is *ideological education.* Thanks to the large-scale educational work of the Party a scientific world outlook, ability to work for the common good and to suit one's actions to the vital interests of the people, of society as a whole, and of the cause of communism are becoming inalienable features of the Soviet citizen. The Party consistently opposes the vulgarizers who belittle the role of ideological work.

The moral code of the builder of communism, elaborated in the Party Program, serves to educate Soviet people in the spirit of organically combining communist ideas with communist deeds. This code embodies the historical experience of the working people, of the working class, accumulated in the long liberation struggle, and the moral standards evolved by the Soviet people in socialist society.

The October Revolution realized the main behest of Marx and Engels—to establish the political rule of the working class. The dictatorship of the proletariat made it possible to crush the resis-

tance of the overthrown exploiting classes and organize successful socialist construction in our country.

The Party Program, noting the complete and final victory of socialism in our country, draws a profound scientific conclusion about the transformation of the Soviet state, which arose as a state of proletarian dictatorship, into a socialist state of the entire people in which the working class plays the leading role, into an organ expressing the interests and the will of the entire people. The state of the entire people does not stand in opposition, nor it is counterposed to the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat which operated at the earlier stages of socialist construction in our country; it is its historically natural continuation, the full development of what was basic in the dictatorship of the proletariat from the very outset—broad democracy for the working people.

All-round promotion of socialist democracy, the active participation by all citizens in administering the state, greater democracy in the operation of all organs of state power from top to bottom, improvement in the work of the state apparatus, and greater control by the people over it—this is the main trend of development of socialist statehood during the period of building communism.

The Party regards promotion of socialist democracy, strict observance of socialist legality and prevention of any violation of law and order as its prime task. The transition to communism, it is stressed in the Program, signifies the utmost development of the freedom of the individual and the rights of Soviet citizens.

The role of the Soviets, trade unions, Young Communist League and other mass organizations of the working people is enhanced in the course of communist construction. This requires the resolute elimination of shortcomings in their work. All too often, instead of business-like discussions of urgent problems there are ostentatious meetings held with hackneyed all's-well reports. An atmosphere of free, business-like criticism, wide publicity as regards the work of state and public bodies at all levels, an irreconcilable attitude towards boasting and phrasemongering—all this is a requisite for successfully accomplishing the tasks of communist construction confronting our country.

Development of socialist statehood is leading to and will gradually bring about its transformation into communist public self-administration, it is ensuring the ever more active participation of all members of society in administering its affairs.

Full-scale communist construction also signifies a new stage in the development of national relations in the USSR. The nations are drawing ever closer together, their economic and ideological community is growing, and the common communist traits of their spiritual make-up are taking shape.

The Leninist idea of democratic government is being steadily

applied. The most advanced class, the working class, plays the leading role in Soviet society. The forms of its leadership have changed, become richer and more diverse. In the state of the entire people, the political, ideological, moral and organizational influence of the working class remains decisive for successful communist construction.

The strength of Soviet society lies in its unity, in the cohesion of the entire people around the Leninist Party, in the growing constructive initiative of the millions inspired by the great ideas of communism.

III

The CPSU, all Soviet people, regard communist construction in the USSR as their great internationalist duty.

The complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR and our country's transition to the full-scale building of communism, the successes of the socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, the rise and development of the socialist world system—all this has radically changed the alignment of forces in the world and facilitated the struggle of the peoples for national and social emancipation. Imperialism has irrevocably lost its power over the majority of mankind, while socialism, the forces fighting against imperialism, determine the main content, main trend and main features of historical development.

"Our epoch, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism, is an epoch of struggle between the two opposing social systems, an epoch of socialist and national-liberation revolutions, of the breakdown of imperialism and the abolition of the colonial system, an epoch of the transition of more and more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale," says the Party Program.

Guiding themselves by the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution, proceeding from a concrete analysis of reality, our Party and its Central Committee put forward a number of important theoretical propositions approved by the world Communist movement. The documents of the 20th and 22nd congresses and the Program of the CPSU contain a profound analysis of the crisis of world capitalism; define the basic contradiction of our epoch, the contradiction between the two opposing systems—socialism and capitalism; examine the laws governing the development of the socialist world community and the new type of economic and political relations; stress the tremendous role of the national-liberation movement and analyze its specific features; develop Lenin's propositions regarding the diversity of ways for transition to socialism by different countries and the variety of forms of socialist

construction, and examine important questions of the international working-class movement.

Reality and the experience of the revolutionary struggle confirm the correctness of the theoretical and political theses advanced by the world Communist movement on the basis of creative application and development of the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, firm and consistent struggle against bourgeois and reformist ideology, against chauvinism and petty-bourgeois adventurism, Leninist irreconcilability towards any form of opportunism, of dogmatic or revisionist distortion of theory and towards stagnation and conservatism of thought — these are a guarantee of success in developing the world revolutionary process.

The CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee steadfastly adhere to the general line of the world Communist movement elaborated by the collective effort of the fraternal parties and embodied in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960.

Our Party is actively advocating the convocation of an international meeting of all the Communist parties to discuss urgent problems of the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism, for the consolidation of the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The meetings of representatives of fraternal parties and visits of party and government delegations of a number of socialist countries which have taken place recently, attest to the identity of views on the basic problems of our time, to the common striving for the further development of all-round cooperation of the equal and sovereign peoples marching along the road of socialism and communism.

Guided by Lenin's propositions on questions of war, peace and revolution, and fully aware of the grave consequences for mankind that a world thermonuclear war could bring, our Party, the world Communist movement devote special attention to the struggle for peace. They consider this struggle an integral element of their revolutionary strategy and policy. "To abolish war and establish everlasting peace on earth is a historic mission of communism"— these words of the Program express the main purpose of the activities of the CPSU in foreign policy.

In our days, war cannot and must not serve as a means of resolving international disputes. We must not permit the unleashing of a world thermonuclear war in which hundreds of millions of people would be killed and irreparable damage inflicted on the development of society's productive forces and on the world revolutionary process.

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is

the sole alternative to war. Presupposing settlement of disputes through negotiation, it is based on equality of states, non-interference in domestic affairs and strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, and provides for the development of economic and cultural cooperation.

Having made the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence the cornerstone of its foreign policy, the Soviet Union is actively working to improve and develop relations with all the capitalist countries. The Soviet Government has initiated, and is initiating, important measures aimed at solving the problems of general and complete disarmament, creating an effective security system in Europe, strengthening the United Nations, and easing international tension. The struggle of the peoples for normalizing the international situation has yielded positive results, as shown in particular by the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in three spheres, signed by the overwhelming majority of states. This is the beginning which should be followed by measures designed to prohibit nuclear weapons and to achieve general disarmament.

The decisions of the 20th Congress and the Program of the CPSU the Statement approved by representatives of 81 parties contain the highly important conclusion that it is possible to prevent another world war and banish world wars from the life of society even before the complete triumph of socialism on earth. This conclusion, corroborated by the entire experience of international relations in recent years, is based not on utopian wishful thinking but on a sober analysis of the correlation of class forces in the world.

The growing economic and defense potential of the USSR and the entire community of socialist states, their economic, scientific and technical achievements and their unity are a prime factor in the struggle against the war danger and for safeguarding the peace and security of all the peoples. The CPSU and the Soviet Government stand for the utmost strengthening of the socialist world system, for the development of fraternal relations with the socialist countries on the basis of complete equality and voluntary cooperation, for taking advantage of the international socialist division of labor in the interests of all the socialist countries, for coordinated action in the struggle against imperialist reaction and war.

The role of the young sovereign states of Asia, Africa and Latin America is steadily growing in the world. The friendly ties and cooperation of these states with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are becoming stronger in the struggle for peace and against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. The Soviet Union regards as sacred the right of every people to independent development; it has supported and is supporting all forms of struggle by the masses for national and social liberation. The

Soviet government highly values the policy of non-participation in military blocs pursued by a number of countries, it supports Afro-Asian solidarity and cooperation of all the revolutionary forces.

With the existing balance of world forces the newly-free peoples have a real possibility of accomplishing the tasks of national rebirth, of taking the non-capitalist, socialist road.

The alliance of world socialism with the national-liberation movement, based on the community of their vital interests, is a mighty force in the struggle of the peoples for peace and the emancipation of mankind from all forms of national and social oppression.

The possibilities which the masses have for actively intervening in the solution of international problems have immeasurably grown in the present epoch. The international working-class and mass democratic movements are playing a big part in the struggle to prevent another world war. The CPSU will continue to do everything necessary to strengthen the militant solidarity of all the contingents and organizations of the international working class; it has worked and will continue to work for the unity of all the forces opposing war.

It is beyond doubt that as long as imperialism exists there will be soil which breeds the danger of aggression and military gambles. Suffice it to turn to such facts as the activity of the "wild men" in the United States or the growth of the revanchist forces in West Germany. But the time has come when it is possible by the combined efforts of the socialist states, the international working class, the national-liberation movement and all the peace-loving forces to curb the attempts of the imperialist aggressors to unleash a world war.

The forces of peace, democracy and socialism, exceed now the forces of war, reaction and imperialism. This is a result of the perserving and selfless struggle of the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist countries, a remarkable result of the heroic battles fought by the international working-class, the national-liberation movement and all the democratic forces.

IV

The great aims and tasks set forth in the Program of the CPSU have raised still higher the prestige and role of the Communist Party in the life of Soviet society.

Our Party, created by Lenin as the vanguard detachment of the working class, has traversed a glorious revolutionary path. Under its leadership the working people of Russia accomplished the socialist revolution and raised the banner of socialism and communism over the world. Overcoming tremendous difficulties and repulsing the frenzied attacks of the class enemies, the Party led the Soviet people to the complete and final victory of socialism. As

a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the strengthening of the socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet society, the CPSU has become the Party of the entire people.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people are engaged in the full-scale construction of communist society. The people see in the Leninist Party, equipped with Marxist-Leninist theory, in its policy which rests on a well thought-out, strictly scientific foundation, in its leadership and many-sided organizational activities a guarantee of success in the building of communism.

Our Party is strong because it expresses the vital interests and aspirations of all the people. The Party exists for the people and sees its supreme goal in serving the people, in strengthening the might of our socialist Homeland, and it devotes all its energies to the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The Soviet people trust the Party and follow the Party, fully aware of it being the only force capable of combining and directing the creative energies of millions of people in building the new society.

The three years that have passed since the 22nd Congress of the CPSU have borne out convincingly the correctness of one of the most important conclusions of the Program: the role of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, the importance of its organizational and educational work, and the need for greater Party leadership in all sections of economic and cultural development are further enhanced in the period of full-scale communist construction.

This is a natural historical development reflecting real processes in the life of our society. It is determined by the unusual magnitude and complexity of the tasks of communist construction, the tremendous growth of the creative initiative of the masses and the enlistment of fresh millions of people in administering the state, the steady development of socialist democracy, the growing role of Marxist-Leninist science in the life of society, and the tasks of communist education.

Soviet people see from their own experience that the Party and its Central Committee always adhere to the Leninist general line elaborated at the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses and in the Program of the CPSU. This line expresses the will of the Party and the entire people and embodies their collective reason and wisdom. The October Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU demonsrtated again the indestructible ideological and organizationl unity of our Party and the cohesion of its ranks.

In its activities and internal life the Party strictly abides by the Program and Rules of the CPSU. It specially sees to it that the Leninist principles of leadership are undeviatingly applied and the Leninist standards of Party life strictly observed.

The principle of collective leadership is the most important of them. It is the greatest political treasure of our Party. The Party has confirmed the vital significance of this principle in its Program and Rules, it is doing everything so that the principle of collective leadership be sacredly observed at all levels—from primary organizations to the Central Committee.

It is on this basis that the activity and initiative of all Communists are steadily developed, the responsibility of leaders to the Party rank and file is enhanced, the links with the working people are strengthened, criticism and self-criticism are promoted and efficient leadership in economic and cultural construction and in all spheres of social life ensured.

The personality cult which belittles the role of the Party and the masses and fetters the development of ideological life and the constructive activity of the working people, is incompatible with Leninist principles. Having resolutely condemned, at the 20th Congress, the cult of Stalin's personality, the Party launched extensive work to restore the Leninist standards of Party life. The Program and the Rules of the Party envisage a number of measures against the excessive concentration of power in the hands of individual workers and against their escaping control by the collective. These measures include: systematic renewal of the composition of all elective Party organs; undeviating application of the principle of electivity and accountability in Party organizations; enhancement of the role of Party meetings, conferences, congresses, plenary meetings of Party committees and other collective bodies; broad development of forms of work by volunteer helpers, and utmost promotion of criticism and self-criticism.

The carrying out of these measures is a guarantee of a consistent implementation of the Leninist principle of collective leadership, wide influx of fresh forces into leading Party organs, and proper combination of old and young cadres. The Party sees in the further development of inner-Party democracy a prime condition ensuring greater activity of Communists and enhancement of their responsibility for achieving lofty communist ideals. The Party demands of each Communist that in his entire behavior on the job, in social and personal life he be exemplary in the effort to assert communist relations and standards of communist morality.

Equipped with the Marxist-Leninist teaching, closely linked with the masses, the Party is able to impart to the building of communism an organized, planned and scientifically-substantiated character. It resolutely opposes subjectivism and spontaneity, hare-brained schemes, a predilection for administration by mere order, and boasting; it condemns hasty conclusions and actions divorced from life and is uprooting arm-chair bureaucratic methods of leadership.

The Party of the great Lenin has deep faith in the mighty creative

forces of the people and in their inexhaustible revolutionary energy. It sees in the people the decisive force for building the new society. In all its activities the Party relies on the people, on their reason and experience, it extends and deepens its bonds with the masses and constantly keeps its fingers on the pulse of life.

★ ★ ★

The Party subordinates all its activities, all its energies to the main thing—undeviating pursuit of the Leninist general line. The Program of the CPSU illumines, like a torch, the road to the future. Millions of working people throughout the world, find in our Program and in the titanic work of the Party and the people to carry it out, a source of inspiration and support in their revolutionary struggle. They are inspired by the words of the CPSU Program.

"Communism accomplishes the historic mission of delivering all men from social inequality, from every form of oppression and exploitation, from the horrors of war, and proclaims PEACE, LABOR, FREEDOM, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY and HAPPINESS for all peoples of the earth.

PLENARY MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

REPORT* BY G. MARCHAIS, MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU AND SECRETARY OF THE CC

There is no need to remind the Central Committee of the decisions the Political Bureau took following the announcement of changes in the leadership of the CPSU and USSR Government.

While considering the continued consistent pursuance of the political line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses of the CPSU to be the most important thing, the Political Bureau nevertheless wished to obtain fuller information and the necessary explanations regarding the conditions and methods of effecting these changes.

It therefore decided to request a meeting with the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Such were the circumstances in which our delegation left for Moscow, arriving there on October 24.

Discussions were held with a delegation appointed by the Presidium of the CC, CPSU and consisting of Comrades L. Brezhnev, First Secretary of the CC; N. Podgorny, member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CC; M. Suslov, member of the Presidium and Secretary of the CC, and B. Ponomaryov, Secretary of the CC.

Comrade Brezhnev gave us the floor, and I made a statement on behalf of our Political Bureau.

Georges Marchais acquainted the members of the CC with this statement, which can be summed up as follows:

Allow me to thank you, on behalf of the Political Bureau of the FCP, for your prompt and favorable reply to our request for a meeting. As a matter of fact, considering the invariably fraternal relations and bonds of friendship and solidarity existing between our parties, we had no doubts regarding your reply.

Allow me to explain the reasons for our demarche.

It conforms to the invariable position of our Party. Indeed, when problems or even misunderstandings arise between our parties we prefer to meet and discuss them frankly with you rather than begin with public criticism. We consider this to be the correct method and intend to keep to it in the future.

As you well understand, the changes you have just effected in

*Abridged from l'Humanité, November 9, 1964.

the leadership of the Party and the Soviet Government have posed some questions which we would like to be answered.

Needless to say, these measures are entirely within the competence of the CPSU. At the last meeting of the CC, FCP our General Secretary, Comrade Waldeck Rochet, stressed that nobody could question the independence and autonomy of the parties, which shape their policy in accordance with the concrete conditions of their countries, although we consider it imperative that there should be unity of thought and action among the different Communist parties as regards their chief objectives and the fundamental aspects of their tactics.

If one admits the necessity of and insists on the autonomy for one's own party, one must also recognize the autonomy of all the fraternal parties. Such is our stand. But we cannot be indifferent to decisions taken by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

As a matter of fact, this does not depend on our wishes alone. As the statement of our Political Bureau says, "considering the outstanding international role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its fully independent decisions concerning Party and state leadership assume exceptionally great importance for the Communists and people of the entire world."

We should not conceal from you the fact that your recent decisions have had deep-going repercussions among us. They have profoundly agitated the Communists and public opinion generally.

These measures have caused the leadership of our Party, the Party as a whole and the vast majority of our people to ask a number of questions: What happened in the USSR? Why were these measures carried out so rapidly? Will they lead to changes in the political line of the CPSU, specifically as regards its foreign policy?

This concern and these questions are quite understandable. As I have just stressed, the Soviet Union plays an outstanding role in the international arena. Its policy of peaceful coexistence, of strengthening world peace and friendship among the nations, is widely welcomed in our country. In addition, it should be borne in mind that Comrade Khrushchov enjoyed great prestige in our country, both among the Communists and among a considerable part of our population in general, thanks, in particular, to the role he played, together with the CPSU Central Committee, in shaping and carrying out a foreign policy which was widely understood and endorsed. His trip to France enhanced this prestige, which no criticism has been able to depreciate to this day.

Such are the questions that have arisen. They are understandable questions, and we must be able to answer them.

In our opinion, it is necessary to ascertain with you whether or not the decisions in question will lead to changes in your stand

on the main political goals which we have in common. True, you have already given an initial reply, and we have taken note of this with satisfaction.

Nevertheless, we believe that our discussion should bring about useful clarity.

Besides, there are other questions of great importance to us which we think should be discussed.

It appears from the documents published by you that Comrade Khrushchov's resignation for reasons of age and health is connected with serious criticism of his methods of work and leadership. We can tell you frankly that some of the criticisms did not come as a surprise to us. Indeed, the Political Bureau of our Party had on several occasions felt a certain anxiety in this connection. For instance, we could not understand why Comrade Khrushchov should have himself presented both reports to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU and why he spoke on all questions, whether they concerned industry, agriculture, or art. We feel that such methods could not contribute to the exercise of collective leadership.

That is why, I repeat, we are not surprised that these questions have been raised now. And we understand the Central Committee of the CPSU when it reaffirms its determination to be on guard against a return to methods endangering the democratic life of the Party and the principle of collective leadership.

We understand this especially well because we ourselves are not slackening efforts for the full blossoming of proletarian democracy based on democratic centralism in the life of our Party and to ensure strict observance of the principle of collective leadership at all levels.

However, we would like to have fuller information about the character and seriousness of the errors with which Comrade Khrushchov is reproached.

There is also the question of the methods by which these changes have been brought about.

The bourgeois press and the government-run radio and television are speculating on the changes that have taken place in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In this way they seek to undermine the prestige of the CPSU and its leadership, alleging that there is no genuine democracy in the CPSU and the Soviet state.

It is indisputable, of course, that, as you have said, the decisions adopted by the CC, CPSU and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet are wholly within their competence. But we would nevertheless like to have more exhaustive information on this score.

Such, dear comrades, are the questions which our Political Bureau has instructed us to discuss with you.

★ ★ ★

How did the Soviet comrades react to the demarche of the FCP and how did they receive its delegation?

They proceeded from a position of principle identical with ours, namely, that all the Communist and Workers' parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union included, are autonomous. Consequently, they added, the decision in question was entirely within their own jurisdiction. The essential thing for the fraternal parties is the assurance that there will be no change in policy.

Our Soviet comrades declared: "We are glad that you have come to have a frank and friendly talk with us. We deeply respect the French Communist Party and its activities on the international arena."

And they added: "We appreciate the serious attitude of the French Communist Party. We shall tell you frankly about our problems, and we are confident that these talks will strengthen our friendly contacts and solidarity based on community of positions."

It was an animated discussion permeated by a spirit of mutual understanding, fraternity and friendship.

Why did the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union elect Comrade Brezhnev its Secretary while the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet elected Comrade Kosygin Chairman of the Council of Ministers?

Implementing the correct policy of the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses, the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet people had achieved signal successes in building communism and pursuing a foreign policy of peace, the Soviet comrades told us.

Considerable economic progress was made in these years. Science scored numerous victories benefiting the whole world.

The life of the people improved. The Soviet state grew stronger and mightier. The Soviet people became politically more active. The Soviet Union's international prestige was enhanced.

But the successes would have been even bigger had not shortcomings developed in the work of the Party leadership. In this respect Comrade Khrushchov bears the responsibility, which was discussed with him, our comrades told us.

In discussing this question, they went on to say, they were invariably guided by two considerations:

1. The Presidium and the Central Committee proceeded from the fact that the political line of the Party, charted by the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses and expressed in the CPSU Program, was correct, unchanged and inviolable, both in domestic and foreign policy. This political line constitutes the basis of our victories.

2. We all remember Comrade Khrushchov's positive contribution to the elaboration and implementation by the Central Committee of this political line, including his contribution to combating the Stalin personality cult.

What were the abnormalities in the conditions of work and leadership which we were told of by the delegation of the CPSU?

Comrade Khrushchov began to ignore certain Leninist principles in the leading Party bodies. For instance, he tended to take on his own important decisions falling under the jurisdiction of the Party leadership, to disregard the opinion of his comrades, to impose his personal decisions. He did not facilitate discussion in the leading bodies, did not tolerate criticism, ascribed the successes to himself and sought to shift the responsibility for mistakes and shortcomings onto the shoulders of his comrades. He did not always use his important position with due prudence and began to lose his sense of modesty.

Several facts were cited to us to prove this. For instance, the practice of inviting hundreds of non-members to take part in plenary meetings of the Central Committee greatly hampered the work of the elected members. Quite recently, without any parliamentary discussion, Comrade Khrushchov made an unexpected speech on economic problems. Ignoring elected leaders he entrusted ever more responsible missions to people from his personal entourage.

Following this the CPSU delegation explained to us how these malpractices affected the policy of the Soviet Union.

From what we were told it appears that Comrade Khrushchov's methods of work and leadership had negative consequences first and foremost in some areas of internal policy. Without underestimating the results achieved in agriculture, it is necessary to correct the shortcomings resulting from these methods so as to attain the objectives set in the program adopted by the 22nd Congress.

Numerous examples were cited to us, and we can sum up the view of the Soviet comrades as follows: in agricultural policy sufficient attention was not paid to the wide diversity of natural conditions in the different regions of the Soviet Union. It lacked consistency, and in some cases this created an atmosphere of uncertainty. Comrade Khrushchov went so far as to ignore the opinions of agricultural executives, who were greatly hampered in their work by his decisions.

Finally, we were told that so far it was hard to explain why there was a tendency to belittle the role of local Party organizations in agriculture, whereas the number administrative organs was increasing.

The comrades outlined the position in agriculture as follows: since climatic conditions were favorable this year, the harvest will be good. State purchases of grain from the collective farms will be bigger than in the previous years. But efforts will have to be made to remove the above-mentioned shortcomings.

Soviet industry and Soviet science have scored signal successes,

as is evidenced by the space flights. They are developing rapidly and opening up inspiring prospects for the successful realization of the stupendous tasks of communist construction.

Nevertheless, inconsistent decisions sometimes resulted in the setting up of superfluous organs.

As regards the Soviet Union's foreign policy and problems pertaining to the international Communist movement, the comrades firmly held that in this area, with the exception of some hasty steps, the line as well as its practical implementation had been correct and justified.

Consequently, Comrade Khrushchov's harmful methods of work and leadership led, in practice, to negative consequences chiefly in the domestic sphere and especially in agriculture.

DECISIONS OF THE PRESIDIUM AND THE CC OF THE CPSU

Several comrades saw Comrade Khrushchov and told him that the conditions of the work of the Presidium had to be discussed.

Under his chairmanship the Presidium discussed the question for two days, the members stating their views and presenting their criticism with dignity and respect for N. Khrushchov and with the sense of responsibility expected of Presidium members.

As a result of the discussion Comrade Khrushchov conceded that the main points on which he was criticized were correct. Pleading the state of his health and his advanced age, he said he could not carry out his tasks any longer and handed in his resignation.

A Plenary meeting of the Central Committee, which alone could take the final decision, was then convened. Comrade Khrushchov participated in its work from beginning to end. He addressed a letter to the full and alternative members of the CC Presidium and the members of the Central Auditing Commission requesting to be relieved of his duties as Party Secretary, member of the CC Presidium and Chairman of the Council of Ministers for reasons of age and health. He assured the Central Committee that he would devote the rest of his life and his energies to work, to the Party, to the Soviet people, to their well-being, to the building of communism.

After discussing all the problems that had arisen the Central Committee unanimously decided to grant N. Khrushchov's request and elected Comrade Brezhnev First Secretary of the CC, CPSU.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet also discussed N. Khrushchov's request. It granted it and elected Comrade Kosygin Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The comrades from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union told us that the subsequent discussions in the Party organizations had shown that the Party organizations and the Soviet people unanimously approved these decisions, for they could not have been unaware of the negative consequences of the mistakes committed

in the recent period. This approval is an expression of the will of the Party and the Soviet people to carry out the decisions of the 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses.

THE ISSUES INVOLVED MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

It is not a matter of approving or disapproving the decision just adopted by the CPSU. But considering the outstanding role the CPSU plays in the international arena, the decisions it takes independently, and the explanations it gives are of tremendous importance for the Communists and the peoples of the whole world.

In their activities in the Communist movement the French Communists have always been guided by the principle of solidarity with the Soviet Union. They have always considered it essential to know and understand the life of the world's first socialist state and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union standing in the vanguard of the world Communist movement.

This solidarity is not blind but based on conscious accord and profound conviction. We supported the epoch-making decisions and conclusions of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU and combated those who tried to ignore them as well as those who tended to regard the Stalin personality cult as inherent in the socialist system. The line of the 20th and 22nd congresses was a valuable contribution to the cause of all the Communists. And now, for the same reasons, the explanations which the comrades from the CPSU have given us were indispensable.

Furthermore, whereas the capitalist press in France and other capitalist countries tried to use the CPSU decisions against the Soviet Union itself, the questions our people asked themselves, testified, on the contrary, to the prestige enjoyed among the general public by the Soviet Union thanks to its active and consistent policy of peace and to the broad prospects which the program of communist construction is opening to mankind.

In the interests of the struggle for our common aims our Party is duty bound to answer these questions. The working class and the vanguard forces are capable of understanding the problems that have arisen.

According to the information the Soviet comrades gave our delegation, their decisions were taken in conformity with democratic principles and the Rules of the Party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union gives a comprehensive appraisal of Khrushchov's activities, objectively assessing his merits and demerits. This is borne out by the fact that he remains a member of the Central Committee.

The important thing is that after having tried to help Comrade Khrushchov to overcome his shortcomings when this became necessary, the CPSU was able to put an end without any difficulty to

methods and practices which did not conform to the spirit of the 20th and 22nd congresses. Consequently, the spirit and the decisions of these two congresses are inviolable, and no one is permitted any longer to depart from democratic rules in the life of the Party and the state.

The comrades said to us: "Some people say that the measures taken by us may hamper the realization of the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses. Quite the reverse—we want Leninist democracy to be fully observed in practice."

It is precisely in this spirit that they criticize the still existing shortcomings with a view of eliminating them. For instance, they are against any restriction of the role of local Party organizations; against the shortcomings in collective leadership; against the still existing boasting instead of an objective analysis of the successes achieved, taking into consideration the shortcomings for the purpose of eliminating them; against excessive concentration of power in the hands of certain leaders, and against any tendency to exaggerate their merits—without, however, underestimating the role of leaders.

FOR STRENGTHENING PEACE, FOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The Soviet leaders have reaffirmed their basic line:

1. They stand for the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems; for unflagging struggle to strengthen peace, for international détente, for friendship and cooperation among nations. Their position on the German question, the question of Southeast Asia and other international problems remains unchanged.

2. They stand for an end to the arms race, for general and complete disarmament. Their appraisal of the Moscow partial test-ban treaty also remains unchanged.

3. They will continue to support the national-liberation movement.

4. They will do everything to strengthen contacts and improve relations with the countries of the socialist camp.

5. They will do everything to strengthen fraternal bonds with the Marxist-Leninist Communist parties.

Consequently, this is a confirmation of our common policy which we shall actively and undeviatingly pursue, because it accords with the interests of world peace, the interests of our two peoples and our two countries.

FOR THE UNITY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The Soviet delegation reaffirmed the determination of the CPSU to fight together with us for the unity of the world Communist movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow conferences of 1957 and 1960. The proposals for a new international conference, includ-

ing the reconvening of the 26-party drafting committee on December 15, remain in force.

Rejecting the insinuation that the CPSU seeks an ideological compromise with CPC leaders, the Soviet leaders said that they had noted certain signs of new possibilities opening up for discussions with a view to ironing out the differences. Already during our stay in Moscow the possibility that a Chinese delegation would attend the November 7 celebrations in Moscow became apparent.

The French Communist Party will fully appreciate all measures and initiatives which could help to overcome the differences and promote the unity of the world Communist movement. It has been our unchanging line to preserve unity and friendship with the Communist Party and the people of China. We have associated ourselves with many moves designed to create a more favorable climate for the settlement of issues. We have always declared that our Party will spare no effort to contribute to the unity of the world Communist movement, the guarantee of victory in the struggle against imperialism, for peace and peaceful coexistence, democracy and socialism. In doing so we have borne in mind, of course, that a conciliatory attitude towards the Leftist and nationalistic line of the Chinese leaders could endanger the world Communist movement, the Chinese people themselves, our Party and its policy of broad unity necessary for the struggle against the one-man rule.

Such was the spirit of Comrade Waldeck Rochet's report to our 17th Congress. We shall firmly abide by this line, as has been reaffirmed by the last meeting of our CC.

We are glad that both our parties have restated their common intention to continue preparations for an international conference to reaffirm the principles of the Declaration and Statement of 1957 and 1960, analyze the changes that have taken place since then, and draw conclusions common for the whole movement. This presupposes a struggle on two fronts: against dogmatism, which is the main danger today, and against Right-wing opportunism, which constantly makes itself felt.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion we wish to note that the decision of our Political Bureau to send a delegation to Moscow was a useful and positive step.

As usual, the enemies of the working people are trying to utilize the changes that have taken place in the USSR to discredit the cause for which we are fighting: socialism, communism. They are out to undermine the prestige, the authority of the CPSU.

We shall not allow ourselves to be intimidated by their campaign. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is leading the Soviet people to an inspiring goal—communism. The Soviet Union is de-

monstrating to the working people of the whole world the superiority of socialism over capitalism by the rate of its economic development, by its successes in science and technology, by the constant rise in the well-being of the people, by the development of democracy.

We for our part will work ever harder for working-class unity, for unity of action between the Communists and Socialists, for rallying all the working-class and democratic forces to free our country from the one-man regime and advance towards a new democracy, which is indispensable if our country too is to take the road of socialism and communism.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

Put Monopoly Under Control

A New Economic Policy for Canada

By TIM BUCK

This new 78-page booklet spells out in detail the Communist Party's economic policy for Canada. It deals with jobs, economic growth, Canadian independence, curbing of the monopolies and placing them under public control or nationalization; and the bringing of the benefits of automation to the people.

75 CENTS

Automation and Labor

By WILLLIAM KASHTAN

The meaning of automation for the labor movement, its effects on collective bargaining, the structure of the trade union movement and the need for a new labor policy are dealt with in this pamphlet.

15 CENTS

Now Available from

PROGRESS BOOKS / 44 STAFFORD ST. / TORONTO 3

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

PRICE TEN CENTS

INFORMATION

bulletin

28

Included in this Issue

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AND THE COMMUNISTS' FIGHT FOR A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY
L. Longo

LOYALTY TO LENINIST ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES

DEFEND AND EXTEND DEMOCRACY
E. Tuominen

FILE COPY

Issued by
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS

information bulletin - 28

contents

ON ENHANCING THE LEADING ROLE OF THE PARTY 5

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF JORDAN 10

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE
HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY 18

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AND THE COMMUNISTS' FIGHT FOR A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY
L. Longo 20

DEFEND AND EXTEND DEMOCRACY
Report by E. Tuominen 34

LOYALTY TO LENINIST ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES
Pravda Editorial 41

ECONOMIC PROGRAM OF SWEDISH COMMUNISTS
K. H. Hermansson 47

Published by

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 STAFFORD STREET, TORONTO 3, ONTARIO, CANADA

for WORLD MARXIST REVIEW PUBLISHERS, Prague.

PRINTED IN CANADA
December 30, 1964

ON ENHANCING THE LEADING ROLE OF THE PARTY

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING, MEXICAN COMMUNIST PARTY

I. In connection with the growing discontent of the working class and the people in general and the beginning of a new stage in the Mexican working-class, democratic and Communist movements whose initial successes open up great prospects for organizing mass struggles and proceeding to loftier objectives, the CC of the Mexican Communist Party has thoroughly analyzed its work in guiding the Party with a view to improving this work thus giving the struggle of the masses an effective guidance which would set concrete tasks conforming to the demands of the situation, impart conscious purpose to spontaneous actions, and lead the masses to victory.

The Central Committee has heard, discussed and unanimously approved the Presidium's report on the tasks arising from the need to enhance the leading role of the Party.

The Central Committee notes that the events in Puebla have vividly demonstrated the growing militancy of the masses and the increased responsibility of the Party as the conscientious vanguard of the working class and all the exploited people.

The mass actions in Puebla were a powerful blow at those who intended to intensify the policy of repressions against the working people, a policy which the ruling classes have pursued over the recent years. On the other hand, these actions testify to the defeat of the venal ruling cliques set up by the bourgeoisie to contain the working-class and popular movements. They are also a concrete expression of the militant unity of the masses, of a united front which has been formed at grass-roots level and which facilitates the launching of joint nation-wide actions of the workers, peasants and other sections of the people.

2. The experience of the recent working-class and popular struggles shows that no matter what level the spontaneous struggle of the masses may reach and what successes it may score, all gains will be sooner or later nullified by the ruling classes if there is no correct leadership and ideological guidance, which the Communist Party alone can provide.

This experience makes it imperative for the Party fully to carry out its role. Topmost among the Party's tasks in the effort to turn the spontaneous actions of the masses into a conscientious struggle for a social revolution, is to resist the imposition of bourgeois lea-

dership on the working class and to ensure the latter's organizational, political and ideological independence. Without this the working class will not be able to head the struggle of all the working people, the democratic and national-liberation movements, the struggle against imperialism, the vestiges of feudalism and the power of monopoly capital, for democratization.

Hence the need to bring socialist consciousness into the working-class movement, to link up this movement with scientific socialism.

To propagate our ideology among the fighting masses, to eradicate bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influence on the proletariat and other strata, to bring to completion the ideological struggle within the mass movement itself, to expose those intent on subordinating the workers and other exploited groups and classes to bourgeois leadership and interests—only in this way is it possible to ensure the success of the mass actions and make every victory of the workers or the people in general a step towards conscious revolutionary action, towards the fulfilment of the democratic tasks of today, and towards the revolutionary transformation of society.

Proletarian ideology triumphs in struggle, it is assimilated by the masses in the course of revolutionary activity. The Communists, exponents of working-class ideology, prove in action the correctness and validity of their ideas and methods of struggle.

In heading the struggle of the working people and putting forward the political, economic and social tasks to be carried out by the masses the Communists proceed from class positions and guide themselves by the Marxist-Leninist teaching. This enables them to win over the toiling exploited masses for the ideas of scientific communism and prove to them the need for a radical solution of the problems facing them, for the destruction of the last exploiting system.

All this leads to the undermining of bourgeois leadership of the mass movement.

3. In view of these urgent tasks the Party should pay special attention to ideological questions, to raising the political alertness of the Communists themselves and of Party leaders in the first place.

Party leaders are duty bound to master Marxist-Leninist theory, to work hard in order to assimilate creatively the principles formulated by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and by the international Communist movement.

Improving the Marxist-Leninist grounding of every Communist must become the concern of the entire Party.

In connection with this the Central Committee resolves:

a) to work out a uniform study plan for the Party members which should include principally the documents of the Fourteenth Party Congress and the fundamentals of Marxism;

b) to work out a uniform study plan for the Party committee members of the states and regions, to be supervised by the Nation-

al Party Education Commission, for the chief purpose of helping them master the fundamental theoretical and political principles underlying the Party's present tasks;

c) to improve the work of the National Party School and preserve its present orientation on the study of the ideological and political foundations of the Party Program. As soon as possible a course of instruction must be given in this school to the members of the Central Committee, the Party committees of the states and regions, and Party members working in mass organizations.

The plenary meeting stressed the duty of every Central Committee member to enhance his theoretical knowledge. The plenary meeting resolved to organize collective studies, at a series of meetings, of the various problems of our national reality and the history of our Party. Four such meetings will be organized in 1965 by the Presidium of the Central Committee.

Secondly, it is necessary to intensify the popularization of our ideas, our political views and our program among the workers. Although written propaganda should be the main form, serious attention should also be paid to the organization of study groups and meetings to explain our policy and our ideas.

In this connection the Central Committee has decided to strengthen and develop its propaganda media. Beginning with January *La Voz de Mexico* is to appear weekly, while *Nueva Epoca* is to become a quarterly magazine.

The responsibility for these tasks rests with all Party members. Every Communist should unfailingly fulfil his financial and political duties. The newspaper and the magazine, while being a means of orienting, educating and organizing the masses, should at the same time reflect their struggles, and this calls for the cooperation of all Communists.

Of great importance is the large-scale circulation of Marxist-Leninist publications which generalize the experience of the world Communist movement and help develop a scientfic world outlook. This work must be started immediately.

Thirdly, combating non-proletarian concepts should figure prominently in the ideological activities of the Party. The Communists should become convinced of this ideology in open struggle against any concepts alien to the working class. Misrepresentation by the bourgeoisie of our social reality and the prospects of its development, the bourgeois propaganda of class peace and of the inevitability of capitalist domination, exploitation and destruction of man by man must be given an argumented and resolute rebuff. It is necessary to lay bare the class roots of all the political manifestations of this bourgeois ideology.

Our propaganda organs will carry out this top-priority task proceeding from the need for the ideological consolidation of the working class and its Party. All Party leaders are duty bound to fulfill

their concrete tasks within the context of the struggle for these objectives. All Party organizations should explain to the workers, peasants and all people the essence of this struggle.

4. Success in the realization of the tasks, which the working class and the masses in general are ready to tackle, largely depends on the quality of leadership.

Our Party has worked ever since its inception to train Party cadres possessing the ability and personal qualities needed to lead the revolutionary movement in our country and enjoying unimpeachable prestige and the confidence of the workers and all toilers.

The arbitrary acts committed in 1940 during the personality cult period and the abnormal conditions in which our Party developed in the next twenty years hampered the formation of such a nucleus of Party cadres. The Thirteenth Congress of our Party and subsequent development made it possible to tackle the highly important task of strengthening the leading core of the Party. Today the conditions for this are even more favorable. The formation of the leading core of the Party cannot be allowed to proceed spontaneously. It is the duty of the Central Committee to draw fully upon past experience and rule out a repetition of mistakes harmful to the Party.

The leading core should consist of people absolutely reliable ideologically and politically and be at one in the assessment of theoretical problems and in the pursuit of Party policy.

Party leaders should not only be loyal to our cause, well-grounded theoretically and linked with the masses. They should also display a spirit of comradeship and mutual assistance. Vanity and self-complacency, oversensitiveness to criticism, arrogance and irresponsibility and lack of fraternal consideration for others are impermissible in relations between Party leaders and the rank and file. The Party is a union of equals, and its leaders should not allow in their behaviour any manifestations of superiority and conceit characteristic of the personality cult.

5. Party leadership cannot attain the standard required today without the active participation of Party cadres, of local and provincial organizations. No Party leader or Party organ can be freed from control and criticism by Communists. Now that our Party is tackling the highly important tasks pointed out in this resolution and outlined at the CC meeting stimulation of inner-Party democracy assumes primary importance. Improvement of our tactical line and the methods of leadership of the Party and the masses demands the cooperation of all Partly members without exception.

Of primary importance in this respect is encouragement of criticism and self-criticism from below, effective check-up on the work done, and accountability of the leaders to the rank-and-file. Meetings of Party organizations or activists and Party congresses and

conferences should be imbued with a spirit of comradely teamwork No obstacles to Party members making critical remarks or submitting constructive proposals should be tolerated.

At the same time it is necessary to enhance Party discipline and strengthen the Party spirit which demands that the common interests of our movement should be placed before individual interests, and also to deepen the understanding of the centralized character of Party leadership, of the need for the unconditional subordination of lower Party bodies to higher bodies, and of the minority to the majority. Any manifestation of subjectivism incompatible with the Party spirit should be vigorously condemned.

The tasks facing our Party demand enlisting the cooperation of many new comrades in guiding the Party. Cadres who have matured in struggle, practical activities and mass actions should be promoted without hesitation or prejudice.

A correct combination of these elements will enable us to promote vigorous Party activity and at the same time establish the strictest discipline in our ranks and take all necessary measures to ensure the security of the Party, its organizations and leaders. In this period of growth precautions should be taken against the infiltration of our local organizations and leading organs by enemy agents, the police and spies.

Strict observance of our internal rules, testing in action, check-up on the work done, and thorough knowledge of the cadres are reliable methods of combating provocations and espionage.

6. The 3rd plenary meeting of the MCP Central Committee resolved to apply every effort to bring about a considerable improvement in Party guidance, to strengthen the Party leadership at the national and local levels.

The Central Committee calls upon all Communists to join selflessly and enthusiastically in the struggle of the masses, to head the movements in defense of democratic rights and freedoms and better living conditions that are springing up practically all over the country. With boundless faith in the people, in their revolutionary spirit and determination to fight the Central Committee calls for building the independent and militant unity of the working class, the peasants, all working people and democratic forces.

Workers of all lands, unite!

Mexico, November 11, 1964

RESOLUTIONS* OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF JORDAN

In the first week of October 1964 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Jordan held a plenary meeting which was attended by the full and alternate members of the CC, heads of leading Party bodies, and a number of other Party cadres. The meeting discussed the general political situation in Jordan and the Arab world, the situation in the world Communist movement, and the Party's political and organizational tasks in various fields, and unanimously adopted a number of political and organizational resolutions, some of which are printed below.

RESOLUTION ON THE SITUATION IN JORDAN

The plenary meeting has noted with satisfaction the positive changes in Jordan's policy since the signing by the Jordanian government of the Moscow nuclear test-ban treaty.

Jordan took an active part in the first Arab Summit Conference held early in 1964; resumed normal friendly relations with the biggest fraternal country, the United Arab Republic; established diplomatic relations with the biggest friend of the Arabs, the USSR, and a number of other socialist countries; recognized the fraternal Yemeni Arab Republic; contributed to the efforts aimed at normalizing relations and promoting solidarity among the fraternal Arab states; took part in the Second Arab Summit Conference and the Conference of Non-Aligned States; supported the revival of the Palestinian entity and the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and took part in the United Arab Command to repel the imperialist-Israeli aggression.

These positive steps, and the role played by King Hussein personally in their realization, met with the support of the Jordanian people and all their national patriotic forces opposed to imperialism; they were also supported by the forces of liberation and progress in the Arab countries and the world.

The forces of imperialism and Zionism and the enemies of progress in Jordan and the Arab world were disturbed by these steps, and saw in them a danger to their interests, positions and influence. They started, therefore, intriguing, using open and secret pressure, maneuvering and plotting against this positive trend in Jordanian policy, putting obstacles in its way and creating difficulties in order to change or at least hamper it.

---

*At Takkaddum, October, 1964.

These hostile forces are utilizing the serious shortcomings still existing in the policy of the Jordanian authorities, such as the refusal to free political prisoners, the policy of terror and suppression conducted by the Security Department against the anti-imperialist forces, the worsening of the economic situation in the country, and the preservation of imperialist influence due to infiltration by foreign capital and to shackling aid from imperialist states.

These and other serious shortcomings create fertile soil for the continued subversive activities of the imperialist and ultra-reactionary circles. At the same time, the continued reserved and cautious attitude towards the decisively anti-imperialist, anti-Zionist, patriotic and progressive forces sincerely supporting the emancipatory and progressive trend in Jordan and the other Arab countries, does not serve the cause of Jordan's progress and the consolidation of its solidarity with the fraternal Arab peoples and their liberated states.

Expressing the wish of the Communists and all progressive patriots in Jordan for the continuation of this positive liberation trend in Jordanian policy in the interest of the Jordanian people and their aims of liberation, stability and progress, the plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ calls upon the higher Jordanian authorities to examine the situation and take the necessary measures to fill the existing gaps, relying on the masses and all patriotic and progressive forces, as well as on the support and solidarity of the fraternal Arab countries and the friendly states. Foremost among the measures required are:

1. A general amnesty for all political prisoners, exiles and persecuted persons, without discrimination; democratic and trade union freedoms for all patriotic and progressive forces supporting the liberation trend; freedom of the press.

2. Resolute measures to develop the economy, set up a state sector, build industrial establishments, explore for oil, potash, phosphate, copper, etc., and extract and market these with the help of technical experience and material assistance from the fraternal and friendly states. The experience of many developing countries, including a number of fraternal Arab states, has proved that the state sector is indispensable for developing the national economy and bringing it up to a level obviating the need for foreign aid.

It is necessary also to take into consideration the social developments taking place in the fraternal Arab countries; to take effective measures against unemployment and the high cost of living; to work for raising the living standards of the masses, ensuring social, medical and cultural services to the workers, artisans,

small employees and all sections of the people, and enabling them to exercise their rights and freedoms; to help the peasants with loans and modern agricultural machinery; to organize the marketing of agricultural produce, to build irrigation systems; to effect a land reform so as to raise the living, health and cultural standards in the Jordanian countryside, and curb the monopolists and usurers and put an end to their control over foodstuffs and prime necessities.

It is also necessary to combat infiltration by imperialist capital which plunders the country's resources and consolidates the positions of neocolonialism. The need for resolutely combating neocolonialism was urged by the summit conferences of the Arab and African states and non-aligned countries.

3. Purging the state organs of imperialist elements and those hostile to the progressive trend, particularly in the army, the intelligence service and the police, since leaving them in these vital centers constitutes a danger to the liberation trend and to the citizens' freedom and opens the way to imperialist pressure and plots against the country's independence and security.

4. In the interest of mutual defense and united Arab action against the joint aggression of imperialism and the Israeli rulers, it is necessary to arm the Jordanian army with modern weapons from fraternal and friendly states, to unify the weapons and training of the Arab armies, and to increase the fighting ability of the Jordanian army.

5. In order to be able to stand firmly in the face of the pressure of the imperialists and the rulers of Israel, it is necessary to promote boundless solidarity with all free Arab countries, particularly with the biggest fraternal country, the UAR, and to coordinate foreign, defense and cultural policies with it; the conclusion of bilateral coordination agreements can be an embodiment of this. It is also necessary to strengthen friendly relations and cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist states, and to make maximum use of their unselfish aid for developing the national economy and consolidating the country's independence and defense.

Undoubtedly, the accession of a strong, firm government to power would accelerate the realization of this correct course.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ stresses again that the CPJ has supported, and will continue to support, every patriotic and progressive measure by the Jordanian government; and that the CPJ sincerely wishes to cooperate with all bodies, organizations, groups and individuals who want national independence, resist imperialism, and stand for the promotion of solidarity and cooperation with the UAR, Algeria and all other free Arab states.

The CPJ calls upon them to unite their efforts to strengthen the anti-imperialist, liberation trend and go forward to the realization of our people's aspirations for peace, liberation, democracy, and economic and social progress.

RESOLUTION ON THE SITUATION IN THE ARAB WORLD

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ has examined the general situation in the Arab countries and noted the important changes which have happened and are happening in the Arab world, and the radical change in the balance of power in favor of the liberation movement of the Arab peoples. These changes promote social progress and the struggle for the abolition of colonialism in its old and new forms, against the imperialist bases and concessions, for the liberation of the areas in the Arab East still under imperialist domination and occupation.

In the two biggest Arab countries, the UAR and the Algerian Republic, the revolution has gone beyond the bounds of political emancipation from imperialism and entered a new stage of its development, that of attaining complete economic independence and of effecting radical social changes which have put both these Arab countries on the road of non-capitalist development leading to socialism. The profound economic and social changes which have taken and are taking place in the UAR and Algeria have within a short space of time led to considerable successes thanks to the role increasingly played by the working people and the truly revolutionary forces in the realization, development and defense of these changes. Among the most important factors contributing to this are the freedoms and rights which the workers, peasants, progressive intellectuals and other forces sincerely struggling for socialism have begun to enjoy, and the cohesion of all progressive forces and their unity behind their revolutionary organizations and progressive national governments.

No doubt, the developments and deep changes taking place in the UAR and the Algerian Republic are an example of the profound impact of the socialist world system and the theory of scientific socialism, of the disinterested generous aid given by the USSR and other socialist countries, on the economic and social processes in the newly independent countries and on the course of their development.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ expresses high appreciation of the policy of the UAR aimed at strengthening Arab solidarity against imperialist and Zionist plots and claims.

This was clearly revealed in the initiative the UAR and President Nasser personally took to convene the first Arab Summit Conference, and in the prominent positive role and effective activity of the UAR at the sessions of the first and second Arab

summit conferences, which was reflected in important resolutions and measures against the imperialist-Israeli aggression in connection with the plans for diverting the waters of the Jordan river, and in the support for the revival of the entity of the Palestinian Arab people, for their rights and self-determination, and for the return of the refugees to their homeland, Palestine.

The CC, CPJ expresses the appreciation of all the Communists and progressive people in Jordan of the big role played by the UAR in supporting peoples fighting for the liquidation of colonial regimes, and especially of the political, material and military assistance which it has extended and continues to extend to the Yemeni revolution and the young Yemeni Arab Republic in its hard battle against the sinister forces of imperialism and reaction.

The UAR is also giving support and assistance to the fighting peoples of Aden, the protectorates in the south of Arabia, Oman, and other occupied areas of the Arabian gulf, to the peoples of Libya, Aden, Cyprus and other countries in their struggle for the liquidation of British and American military bases, and to the struggle of the peoples of Africa and other continents against imperialism, oppression and racial discrimination.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ highly estimates the line taken by the UAR in its general foreign policy and international relations. This policy is opposed to imperialism, its blocs, alliances, bases, plots, interventions and aggression; it is a policy for peace, relaxation of international tension, peaceful settlement of international disputes, the denuclearization of the Mediterranean area and Africa, general and complete disarmament, the liquidation of the remnants of the old colonial system, and for fighting neocolonialism. This policy of the UAR is clearly manifested in its extensive support of the national-liberation movements in Asia and Africa, in its prominent role in the Arab and African summit conferences, the conferences of non-aligned states and in other international conferences and meetings. It is manifested in its active and effective contribution both to the initiating and preparing of these conferences and to the resolutions adopted by them in the interest of peace, peaceful coexistence, the national-liberation movement, against colonialism in its old and new forms, and against persecutions and racial discrimination. As a result of this Cairo has become an important center pooling together the activities of the Arab, African and Asian states which have overthrown the yoke of imperialism and which aspire to building their new life in peace. This has promoted the international prestige of the UAR and given it a place of prominence among the states of the world.

The CC, CPJ and all our Party note with satisfaction that the UAR continues to strengthen and develop its political, economic and cultural relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist

countries. This is evident in the growing economic, trade and cultural contacts between the UAR and the Soviet Union and in the community of their views on a number of international problems.

One of the most vivid manifestations of the consolidation of friendship and cooperation between the UAR and the Soviet Union was the historic visit made by the Soivet government delegation to take part in celebrating the completion of the first stage of the gigantic Aswan High Dam being built with the assistance of the Soviet Union. The exceptionally warm and enthusiastic welcome given to the Soviet guests was an expression of the feelings of friendship, respect and gratitude entertained by the people of the UAR, their government and all the Arab peoples for the people of the Soviet Union.

Expressing the opinion of all the Communists and other progressive forces of Jordan, the plenary meeting fully approved the constitutional measures taken by the UAR government to abolish the state of emergency and release all political prisoners, and, in particular, the abandonment of anti-democratic and anti-communist practices and the granting to Communists and democrats of an opportunity to contribute to the further development of their country, its economic and social progress.

The plenary meeting highly praised the achievements of the victorious Algerian revolution under the leadership of Ahmed Ben Bella. This revolution, which continues to develop, is aimed at reorganizing society on a new basis; it advances rapidly along the road of socialist changes. In the external sphere, it is fighting against imperialism, in defense of world peace, for stronger solidarity with the UAR and all the other free Arab states, and for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The achievements of the two Arab revolutions, in the UAR and in Algeria, the close solidarity of the two states and their policy based on the defense of peace, opposition to imperialism, and on the strengthening of cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union, exert an ever increasing influence on all the Arab countries and on many African and Asian states. All this has advanced the two fraternal countries, the UAR and the Algerian Republic, to the forefront among the Arab states; they have bcome a center of attraction for the movement for Arab freedom and progress, a base for genuine and solid Arab unity.

The cause of Arab unity is becoming more and more linked with the new developments taking place in the Arab world, and above all with the profound progressive changes, political, economic and social, in the UAR and in the Algerian Republic which have enriched the progressive content of the movement for Arab unity and turned it into a movement for national and social emancipation.

The plenary meeting stresses anew the full support and contribution of the Communists of Jordan to the movement for Arab unity, which has today not only a liberation and democratic content, but also a social content.

The profound economic and social changes occurring in the United Arab Republic and the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, and their choice of a path leading to socialism deeply distress the emperialist, Zionist and all reactionary forces. They arouse the black malice of these forces, which continue their intrigues, plots and attacks in order to obstruct these changes. The best guarantee of the further development of these achievements, and their protection from the intrigues and conspiracies of the imperialists, feudalists, capitalists and all reactionaries, is furnished by the granting of greater freedom to the workers, peasants and all the revolutionary forces of the people, by reliance on them, by their active participation in effecting these changes, by stronger contacts and greater cooperation between the two fraternal Arab republics at various governmental levels and at the levels of political, cultural and popular organizations, by the promotion of cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and by the extension of bonds of solidarity and friendship with all the socialist and other progressive forces in the Arab countries and in the whole world.

The plenary meeting of the CC. CPJ approves and supports the coordination agreement between the UAR and the Iraqi Republic, and the nationalization measures taken by the Iraqi government. The realization and extension of these measures calls for the active participation of the workers and peasants and all other truly revolutionary forces in Iraq; the liquidation of the vestiges and painful heritage of the abominable fascist Baath regime; the release of imprisoned Communists, democrats and other progressives; peaceful and just settlement of the Kurdish problem, unity of action of all the socialist and progressive forces in fraternal Iraq against imperialism, feudalism and reaction.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ supports the reforms recently undertaken in the Tunisian Republic, especially the confiscation of the estates of French colonialists and the distribution of the land among the Tunisian peasants.

The plenary meeting stresses anew that the Jordanian Communists, like all patriots and the masses of the Jordanian people, support the Yemeni Arab Republic in its valiant struggle against imperialist and reactionary intervention and aggression and the vestiges of the moribund regime of the imams, and for a better life for the fraternal Yemeni people.

The plenary meeting also declares the support of our Party and people for the revolutionary struggle of the Arab peoples in the

Arab South, Aden and Oman against imperialism, against its bases and occupation forces, and for liberation and progress.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ denounces the persecutions, suppression of liberties and arrests practised by the Saudi Arabian, Libyan, Moroccan and Syrian authorities against patriotic and progressive elements and trade unionists, and demands the revocation of the death sentences passed against patriots in Morocco, the release of political prisoners in Libya, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and Syria, and the granting of democratic liberties to the peoples of these countries.

The plenary meeting emphasizes the importance and necessity of strengthening Arab solidariy at all levels—among the peoples, government bodies, trade unions, political, labor, social and professional organizations—in the fight against imperialism in its various forms, for the liquidation of imperialist influence and bases in Arab countries, for thwarting the aggressive plans and expansionist ambitions of the rulers of Israel, for peace, liberation, democracy and social progress.

The supreme interests of the Arab nation, of its liberation movement and social progress and the interests of its unity require the cooperation of all the patriotic and progressive forces within every Arab country and the cooperation and unification of the efforts of all the progressive and socialist forces, groups and movements in the Arab world, regardless of former differences and mutual mistakes.

The plenary meeting of the CC, CPJ expresses the unshakable confidence of all the Communists and progressives in Jordan that liberation, social progress and Arab unity will be achieved despite the machinations and intrigues of the imperialists and their agents, thanks to the solidarity of the peoples, their stubborn struggle, and support from the world forces of peace liberation and socialism.

RESOLUTION ON THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The plenary meeting of the CC of the Communist Party of Jordan stresses anew the full support of our Party for the idea of holding an international conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties in order to discuss in a collective manner the experience of the world revolutionary movement in recent years, to remove the differences that have arisen in the international Communist movement, and to consolidate the ranks of the movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and the propositions jointly worked out by the Communist and Workers' parties and contained in the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960.

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE, HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST WORKERS' PARTY

At a meeting held on October 23, the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party considered the change of leadership in the Communist Party and government of the Soviet Union and the repercussions it had both at home and abroad. Having heard an account of the CC, CPSU plenary meeting held on October 14 and having endorsed the statements made earlier by our Party on this score, the Central Committee summed up its attitude as follows:

The Central Committee of the HSWP, on the basis of the available information, recognizes that Comrade Khrushchov, who has considerable services to his credit in exposing the personality cult alien to socialism, in elaborating the epoch-making line of the 20th and 22nd congresses of the CPSU, and in the struggle for peace and international security, could no longer cope with the tasks developing on him in the high posts he occupied. In his methods of leadership, he regrettably made mistakes which, owing to his advanced age and declining health, tended to increase.

The Central Committee of the HSWP, in common with all progressive forces of the world, attaches great importance to the fact that the CPSU Central Committee has emphatically declared that its policy continues to be founded on the decisions of the 20th and 22nd congresses and the 1957 and 1960 Statements of the Communist and Workers' parties, that it will carry on the work to fulfil the program of communist construction and to ensure the unity of the international revolutionary working-class movement, peace and peaceful coexistence.

The Central Committee of the HSWP reaffirms its complete confidence in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It hails Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Comrade A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, whom we know as tried and tested fighters for the cause of communism and peace, as men who took part in elaborating and who are exponents of the political line of the 20th Congress.

It is the deep conviction of the HSWP Central Committee that the unbreakable friendship of the Hungarian and Soviet peoples and the close cooperation between their two parties and govern-

*Nepszabadsag, October 25, 1964.

ments will be further consolidated. The identity of views of our parties and the friendship of our peoples rest on the firm foundation of principle. We will never cease to consider the attitude to the Soviet Union — the first socialist state — as one of the main criteria of internationalism.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party undeviatingly carries on its policy — a policy of peaceful coexistence, peace and social progress — in the spirit of the 20th Congress and the documents of the 1957 and 1960 meetings. Our Party continues its persistent work to implement the decisions of the Eighth Congress, further to extend socialist democracy and to build the unity of our socialist nation. We shall spare no effort in the struggle to achieve fresh successes in economy and culture, and to complete the building of socialism.

THE MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS AND THE COMMUNISTS' FIGHT FOR A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY*

L. Longo

GENERAL SECRETARY, ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

1. The political situation bears the imprint of deep-seated dissension both in the Christian Democratic Party and between that party and its partners in the government coalition. It is a highly unstable situation which adds to the tensions arising from unresolved social problems, the threat to wages and employment, and other problems, big and small, which are awaiting solution.

2. In the three years since its inception the Center-Left has gradually lost its spirit and its ability to retain the initiative. It began with blind faith that the economic "miracle" was here to stay and that a policy of modest reform would secure it the support of both the popular masses and the monopoly groups. The end of the "miracle" and the onset of economic difficulties showed that superficial intervention is not enough to do away with the deep-seated disproportions in Italy's economy. What is needed is an economic policy based on strictly democratic and anti-monopoly programming.

There are still many obstacles, prejudices and preconceived notions to be overcome. We criticize the Christian Democratic Party not because they rely on Catholic support but because they seek to capitalize on mass support won on religious grounds in order to pursue a conservative social policy running counter to the interests and aspirations of the masses. It is our aim to help to free the Christian Democrat rank and file from the tutelage of the conservative forces and to make our contribution towards a positive solution of the problems with which Italian society has been confronted for years. Only concerted actions within the Christian Democratic Party and outside it release it from the grip of the conservative social forces and enable it to pursue a policy corresponding to the aspirations of its broad mass following.

3. It has been alleged that we are contradicting ourselves when we seek agreement with the Catholics while remaining loyal to Marxism. We have also been charged with disorientating people,

---

*Report to the C.C., ICP. Abridged translation from **Unita**, October 8, 1964.

helping, in both theory and practice, to confuse Catholicism with Communism. This in no way accords with the truth. We do not consider rejection of their ideological concepts by either side to be a condition for agreement between the Catholics and the Communists.

Freedom presupposes free discussion and comparison of diverse concepts and positions. Consequently, both Marxism and Catholicism, just as all other outlooks and philosophies, should engage in free discussion and comparison of positions on the basis of mutual respect and abstention from exerting pressures of any kind.

The sincerity of our position vis-a-vis religion stems from the fact that this position is a component of our overall struggle for socialism. We stand for a society relying on the support of the most diverse political and ideological forces, including religious forces, capable of giving effect to genuine freedom and democracy by abolishing the exploitation of man by man. We by no means believe that the building of a socialist society as such leads to the disappearance of religious sentiment. We concede that religion has deep and complex roots in the minds of men and that, like all super-structural phenomena, it has its own measure of autonomy in relation to the basis. We believe that the strength of any ideology and, consequently, of any religion depends primarily on its ability to explain things and offer solutions to the problems which history constantly poses before man.

In this respect we believe that Marxism-Leninism is vastly superior to any other metaphysical or philosophical concept and, hence, to all forms of religious thinking. On the other hand, we are convinced that at the present stage in history the religious conscience cannot but come into conflict with the exploitation and the suppression of man which are inherent in the capitalist society at the highest level of its development, and hence is bound to become receptive to socialist ideas.

Catholicism, the ideological foundations of which contain elements of humanism, would suffer a serious setback if in supporting the present social set-up it completely ignored the objective historical need to build a new society free from exploitation and capitalist oppression.

In the light of this we ask the Catholics: is it not possible and necessary for us to seek agreement, to search for forms of cooperation which would enable us to work together to build a new society without war, exploitation and ignorance.

We believe that many Catholics sincerely want social regeneration and progress. Hence we do not limit ourselves merely to advancing a program of immediate joint actions with the Catholics. We also offer to enter into a broader dialogue concerning the socialist perspective. We are prepared to discuss this perspective

without prejudice or dogmatism, sincerely believing that forces representing other ideologies can contribute to the building and organization of the new society.

4. Underscoring the need for a discussion with the Catholics does not mean relegating our traditional policy of unity with all socialist forces to the background. Both are essential for rapprochement, contact and cooperation among all the Left forces. The problem of relations between all these forces based on mutual respect and cooperation is imperatively posed by life itself, by the evolution of the Christian Democrats towards reaction and the collapse of the Center-Left. Crisis has gripped the Christian Democrats and the forces that harboured illusions concerning the nature and potentialities of the Center-Left have been thrown into confusion. When the Socialist leaders agreed to the conditions for cooperation in the government which the Christian Democrats dictated to them, they did a disservice to themselves, to the Left Catholics and Christian Democrats, and to the working-class movement as a whole. The price they paid for collaboration in the government was a split in their own party, the emergence in their ranks of a new opposition, a break-up of their party's autonomist majority. And they compelled the Left Christian Democrat groups and trends to follow the same pattern. This shows that a genuine policy of regeneration and progress is impossible without the unity and autonomy of all the working-class and democratic forces, without a new relationship being established between the Communists and the Socialists and a new dialectical link being forged on this basis between all the Left forces.

Experience shows that the Socialists alone, isolated from the broad popular movement, cannot stand up to the conservatives and the moderates who are always ready to make concessions to the Right. Unless the broad working-class and popular masses following our Party play their militant part it is impossible to pursue any serious policy of reform and to enable these masses to make their contribution. It is necessary to put an end to all discrimination, to all forms of anti-communism, among the Left forces. This is the big lesson taught by the political history of recent years. In other words, it is imperative to stop breaking up and scattering the Left forces. We have always criticized splits and voiced our regret when such have occurred. But these splits still continue, causing grave harm to the working-class movement and impeding the advance towards socialism. The existence of different socialist groupings and the contradictions and differences between them cannot be ignored. But neither can we ignore that which they have in common: one or another

measure of concern for the interests of the working classes, the desire to safeguard peace and to effect changes of a socialist nature in the society we live in. We know that the biggest differences between the various socialist trends concern the methods and time of resolving these issues. The question is this: Is it not possible to find, the differences notwithstanding, common grounds for actions aimed at defeating the united front of forces irreconcilably opposed to the working classes, peaceful coexistence and socialism? Is it not possible, while continuing the discussion and comparison of views, to establish between all the socialist forces such relationships, such an inner dialectics, as would place the emphasis on that which unites them all in the face of the united front of employers and conservatives? The experience of the past years has shown that if the relations between parties representing socialist trends are governed by that which divides them and not by what they have in common, this can only work against their common interests and common aspirations, weakening each of the parties in question. Only the conservative social forces and the reactionaries have gained by it. It is imperative for the entire Italian working-class and socialist movement, for the Left parties which wish to overcome their present weakness, to build new relationships between the various socialist trends. We do not of course assume that the differences, divisions and sentiments which hardened in the course of so many years can be overcome overnight. We in no way propose giving effect to forms of cooperation and unity the need for which is not yet appreciated by the masses.

We merely propose discussing these questions among the masses and in the groups concerned. This should be an open-minded discussion aimed primarily at halting the process of division and isolation of socialist trends, and stimulating a contrary process of mutual understanding, closer relations and cooperation among them within the framework of broad popular and democratic unity.

We are aware of the difficulties involved. But there is no other way of leading Italy out of its present state of stagnation and decline. And this must be done primarily by the working class and other sections of the working people. It is a task for the fulfilment of which each party bears the responsibility before its membership, before the working class and democratic movement and the country as a whole. We consider this task to be the main immediate task of our Party.

5. The question of building new relationships between the Left forces, between the Communists and the Socialists, which we pose today is a question quite distinct from that of establishing

a united party of the working class. It is a matter of finding in the different socialist trends, regardless of the diversity of their orientations, that which can bring them closer together and lead to political cooperation; whereas building a united working-class party involves overcoming the deep-going differences which still separate these groups. Although they are interconnected, these two questions should not be confused with one another. Neither should the conditions necessary for raising one be confused with those necessary for raising the other, the solution of one should not be made dependent on the conditions being ripe for the solution of the other.

Yet Comrade Nenni does precisely this when he rejects our arguments in favor of agreement between the Communists and the Socialists on the grounds that there are deep-seated ideological differences between us.

In discussing the question of a united working-class party we must bear in mind that the old patterns have become obsolete and that the search for new forms of unity must be conducted on a different plane. In his report to the Central Committee in December 1963, Comrade Togliatti declared that in the complex conditions of political and social differentiation found in a developed capitalist society with democratic traditions socialism becomes the orientation not only of the vanguard of the working class but also of broad sections of the working masses and the middle sections of the intelligentsia. Hence the emergence of diverse parties advocating or accepting the socialist perspective. Connected with this is the question of the possibility of several political parties existing even after the proletariat has become the ruling class; we believe that there is such a possibility. On the other hand, the monopoly stage of capitalism objectively strengthens the unity of the exploiters and links the struggle for immediate demands more closely with the problems of governmental power and the state.

Hence two types of problems arise: on the one hand, those connected with the expansion and development of the movement in a multiplicity of organizational forms, and on the other hand, the problems of unification of goals and thinking.

Promotion of a unitarian movement for a program of regeneration corresponding to the urgent requirements of Italian society is a prerequisite for conducting a concrete discussion on the question of a united party. Our Socialist comrades make a gross mistake when they take our quests in this direction to be a sign of agreement with their criticism and revision of Marxism, with their interpretation of the process of regeneration ushered in by the 20th Congress of the CPSU as signifying rejection of the

Leninist heritage and a return to the Social Democratic posture.

Proceeding from this mistake, the Socialists and Social Democrats accuse us of vacillation and duplicity since we do not support their reformist concept of the working-class party and since we seek to advance revolutionary thought instead of renouncing it, to advance the struggle to a higher level instead of giving it up.

The revolutionary strategy of the working class cannot ignore the fact that the enemy it has to fight is becoming more and more international in nature. Indeed, the need for proletarian internationalism is today underscored more emphatically than ever by the latest developments in world imperialism, which by no means is on the way to disintegration, as Comrade De Martino thinks.

Consequently, the solution should be sought not in weakening or undermining internationalism, but in strengthening and developing it on a plane equal to the new level of the struggle and on the basis of independent initiative in this struggle. Needless to say, it is still too early to define the form the united party of the working class should take. But what is obvious is the need for a party making for the political synthesis of social forces and class-conscious Marxist guidance of historical, political and social processes in which the main role is played by the broad masses of working people. It is a question of fighting for the creation not merely of a united party but of a party adequate to the requirements of the struggle at the present stage of history. The process of building such a united working-class party is a broad, far from easy process compounded of quests, contacts, contradictions and partial cooperation.

This process will make headway only if our Party brings these problems to the attention of the broad masses, to the workers; if it raises them at every factory and at every educational establishment, calls for cooperation among all forces advocating socialism and consistently supports unitarian initiatives.

6. The failure of the Center-Left shows us that unless there is a real break with the forces of the Right, whatever the camouflage they assume, unless new relations are established with the Communists and the dialectical link thus created within the Left forces, as well as between the Left and the Christian Democratic and republican institutions and to pursue an effective policy of reform and progress. We once again repeat what we have said so many times before—that we have no intention of raising the question of our participation in the government at the present time; we merely wish to declare that any discrimination against the Left and anti-communism in any form impede the pursuance of a genuinely popular policy.

The working people and broad sections of the intellectuals who expected the Center-Left to carry out a policy of regeneration have been deeply disappointed. On the other hand, past experience shows that Socialists can influence government policy even while remaining in the opposition if they take heed of the popular aspirations and give leadership to the struggle of the masses. Let us recall some of the most striking facts.

The present electoral law was forced on the Christian Democrats and their government by the opposition after the notorious "swindle law" had suffered a fiasco. Tramboni's experiment was foiled by the joint actions of the Left opposition in parliament and in the country as a whole. Our Socialist comrades claim that the only alternative to the present Center-Left majority is a Right majority. This is not true; the Christian Democrats would find it difficult to go over wholly to a frankly reactionary policy.

Moreover, it is quite obvious that there is no ready-made new majority to take the place of the present. A new majority can be built up only through struggle. Today the democratic forces in Italy are strong and numerous enough, provided they stand united, to exert a decisive influence on the march of events and create their own government majority.

The issue now is one of uniting all these forces. We and our Socialist comrades can do a great deal to bring about this unity. We have often sharply criticized the Socialists for not seeing the need for unity and often even working to prevent it. Our criticism has always been an expression not only of our concern and hopes but also of the anxiety felt by a considerable section of the working class, of public opinion generally and of the Socialist Party itself.

Needless to say, there are many differences and contradictions between us and our Socialist comrades, but they are not so deep as to justify the systematic rejection of our proposals for agreement and political cooperation. At any rate the differences are less than the gulf that should separate the Socialists from the Christian Democrats. We do not reject in principle the possibility of cooperation with the Christian Democrats. We criticize our Socialist comrades for agreeing to restrictive terms of cooperation. A policy of cooperation between the Socialist Party and the Christian Democrats which ignores the need for unity between all working-class and democratic forces, which rejects agreement and cooperation with the Communist Party, can only ensure, as experience has shown, the preponderance of the forces working to preserve the existing social system.

7. These are the central issues we pose in the election campaign. We shall show that the causes for the changes in the

Christian Democrat orientation are to be found in changes in the economic situation and outlook. So long as the economic "miracle" lasted, the Right-wing in the leadership of the Christian Democratic Party and in the Center-Left government were content to limit themselves to "cautious experiments." When the economic indices dropped the Christian Democratic Right went over to the offensive in order to compel the government coalition to adopt a policy of stabilization advantageous to the monopolies.

In effect we are dealing here not only with a retreat from positions previously gained, not only a drop in employment and an attempt on the part of the employers to launch a drive against the working classes in order to defeat their wage claims, but also with an attempt on the part of some big industrial groupings to find a way out of depression and stagnation through continued monopoly concentration and higher productivity; these groups are once again out to ensure themselves high differential profits as a source of capital accumulation for self-financing investments.

If this process is to continue it can only increase the disproportion between the various branches of the economy to the detriment of the branches most important for the organic development of the Italian economy, and hence to the detriment of the overall production level. This means a deepening of the contradiction between drift in the choice of industrial complexes to be developed and the need to raise the overall level of production with a view to ensuring maximum competitive capability on the international markets.

The new phase of moderate development which the Italian economy is apparently headed for is likely to lead to a growth of permanent unemployment and in general impede the trade union struggles of the workers. To the attempt to limit technico-economic reorganization to the big monopolies we must counterpose a qualitative reconstruction of the economy which, although pivoted on the more advanced sectors of industry, would guarantee in all sectors a higher productivity and a more rapid rate of growth.

In view of the present stagnation and retrogression, it is imperative to promote the growth and modernization of the production, of the means of production, concentrating the bulk of the investments in this sector with a view to ensuring a higher productivity. For this purpose more attention should be paid to research and training. Radical reforms should be effected in the countryside. The modernization of agriculture should be laregly based on its own accumulations. This will be possible only if the peasant owns the land he tills, if he cultivates it with the help of diverse forms of association, and if he is given economic and technical aid guaranteeing high

productivity and profits. Radical steps should be taken to prevent the peasants' accumulations from being siphoned out of agriculture, from being swallowed up by seculators' profit and the land rent. Economic progress in the Southern districts in harmony with the development of the country as a whole should be ensured through agricultural reform and measures promoting parallel development of industry and agriculture.

These aims can be achieved only within the framework of democratic programming supported by the working class and all other popular forces and ensuring the predominance of the national interests over the private monopoly and corporation interests.

8. Consequently, we must continue the discussion on programming and consummate it with a political solution differing from the present. We must make it clear that the programming we are working for does not presuppose nationalizing all means of production although the possibility that in some cases this may become necessary cannot be excluded.

The issue today is not the building of socialism. The demand of the day is to place democratically expressed interests above the blind laws of the market. We demand programming that would not abolish the market but would subordinate it to the common interest, programming under which the market, profit and private appropriation of profit would retain their functions but which would rule out any regulation of wages which the ruling classes could use to distort the very meaning of programming and to make it an instrument for tightening the screws on the working class. Hence, trade union autonomy and free play of wages are indispensable conditions under democratic programming. Moreover, we regard trade union autonomy as the prime condition for achieving the aims of programming, for ensuring that the programming will be neither technocratic nor bureaucratic but based on the predominance of the common popular interests over monopoly interests.

Therefore it is the working class that should play the leading role in democratic programming. This points to the need to convene the third conference of Communists employed at the factories following factory meetings which would prepare the ground for such a conference as well as for our participation in unitarian conferences on programming. Such conferences would make it possible to make better use of the new situations developing at many enterprises, thereby directly facilitating the workers' struggle. Conferences at different levels would make it possible to take up questions extending beyond the bounds of separate factories.

These conferences should initiate a political dialogue with other

forces, a dialogue conducted not only at the top. We reject the measures proposed by the Center-Left government to deal with economic fluctuations. But in doing so we are not merely taking a negative position and advancing a number of isolated demands. Our No is a positive call for the adoption of a different economic and political line, a line which should be worked out on the basis of concrete problems, taking into account the demands advanced by the workers in their struggle for job security, collective bargaining, the right to work, higher pensions and a national social security system.

While demanding reforms that would enable agriculture to meet the growing demand for farm produce, we stress the problem of a market capable of ensuring industrial growth. Expanding the market is not merely a matter of increasing consumption generally. Expanding the market by means of democratic programming means promoting the new areas of consumption which are now being sacrificed to the interests of the monopolies.

We therefore lay the stress on not only the social but also the economic significance of the working people's struggle for better living conditions. We also underscore the general political significance of the fight for wages inasmuch as the aim of this struggle is to overcome the historically conditioned limits of the Italian market today and put an end to its anarchic orientation.

9. We know that democratic programming can be realized only if Italy rids itself of the legacy of international commitments limiting its freedom of action. During the past several months we have seen what onerous demands have been put to the Moro government by representatives of various international bodies of which Italy is a member with the object of imposing their line of action in dealing with economic fluctuations, of preventing any move towards structural reforms, and opposing any democratic programming as allegedly contrary to international agreements. Most alarming is the theory beginning to be propounded in the various bodies of the European Community, and especially in Bonn and Paris, that no economic or political crisis affecting any Common Market country can be solved on a national scale inasmuch as the interests of all other member-countries are involved. This means that in the future Brussels, Bonn and Paris will seek even more insistently and openly to dictate the course of economic and political development in Italy.

This is clearly fraught with danger to our independence, our freedom of choice, our democracy. Hence the need to put forward a democratic alternative for Europe to which Comrade Togliatti attached so much importance in his Memorandum. The question here is not only of the European Parliament in Strassbourg with

its non-existent or all but non-existent powers, or of the scandalous discrimination against members of parliament from the Italian Communist Party, the Italian Socialist Party and now from the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity. The implications are far wider. What is in question is the bloc of class and political forces in Western Europe, their tactics, their strategy, their unity and their present dissension.

It is imperative to fight for a new Italian foreign policy which in the present economic situation would help Italian industry expand trade, establish new business contacts and make our country an active factor of European and world security.

The so-called Atlantic loyalty, especially as understood by the more reactionary trends in Italy, has become meaningless in the present situation. This loyalty is becoming an anachronism tying Italy's hands with commitments no longer observed by anyone and bonds which only damage our economy, independence and national sovereignty.

These are facts from which the proper conclusions should be drawn. Coexistence on the international plane can and must put an end to all the obstacles which have impeded progress in the last 15-20 years. We should bring this home to our people through our activities and initiative. We should approach this question as seriously as we approach the dialogue with or the struggle against other political forces, as we approach all the concrete problems confronting us. One of the cardinal factors to be borne in mind is the absence of an independent foreign policy clearly oriented on detente. It is essential that Italy's foreign policy should be a forward-looking policy and cease to be a vehicle of concepts which are becoming more and more outdated as time goes on.

10. We are now in an extremely complex and difficult economic and political situation on both the national and the international plane. There are many ominous symptoms which are alarming all political movements. There is concern over the economic prospects and over the political situation in Italy and in the world. The election campaign we are entering affords an opportunity to elucidate profoundly all these issues and to ask the electorate to pass judgement on them.*

At the same time we have no intention of evading concrete local problems, the choice that must be made in issues affecting each community, each province and each region. We do not intend to place the general problems above the local, but seek to underscore the organic link between national policy and the local elec-

---

*In the local elections held on November 22-23, 6,600,000 votes, or 26 per cent of the total (2 per cent more than in the previous election), were cast for Communist candidates.—Ed.

tions. Only by urging the people to give new momentum to changes in national policy can we make every local and provincial council, every autonomous local subdivision, a complex of positive forces capable of breaking the stranglehold of conservatism in the higher governmental bodies and to press from below for a new course towards renewal. It is not merely a matter of listing the necessary reforms and measures in the various elections programs but of pinpointing the principal issues now being discussed in every community and every province. In all our local campaigns we pose the problems of housing, schools, medical aid, transport, town planning and scientific and professional research in the concrete context of the respective localities.

We are raising the issue of taxes, which should not weigh down on the working people and curtail consumption but should be levied on monopoly profits, ground rent and speculators' income. We reject the concept that municipal councils should be administrative bodies pure and simple. We regard the municipal, provincial and regional councils as seats of democracy and political life, as strongholds of all the autonomous elements of civic life. Hence we urge the voters to intervene so as to sweep away all that remains of the old, obsolete and essentially authoritarian system.

These elections place our Party in the center of a broad democratic comparison of ideas subjecting the paramount problems of local and national significance to scrutiny. We want to make our election campaign broad and concrete so as to help all the socialist and democratic forces which have been disillusioned by their experience of the Center-Left to regain faith in themselves. We want in this election campaign to stimulate a new upswing in the democratic and unitarian activities of the masses. Because of this we shall discuss our orientation and our proposals with all the social groups and democratic sections concerned. We shall seek to harness the energies of the masses not merely for propaganda purposes but to give organized form to the political aspirations of the masses which will then find expression at the polls and after the voting. We shall work to unite all forces for vigorous effort. We shall explore every possibility for agreement and comparison of ideas with all social and political forces which together with us can give strong leadership in the local authorities—strong by virtue of the support of the masses and their resolute striving towards regeneration.

It is not only a question of cementing alliances in localities where Left administration already exist. There are large areas where Christian Democrat-led majorities or Center-Left majorities are experiencing a deep-going crisis. Indicative in this respect is

the experience of Milan and Genoa. It is essential in these areas to carry our political and propaganda initiative to the logical conclusion not only in order to restore the alliance of socialist and other Left forces, but especially in order to overcome the resistance to agreement with us. The dialogue with the Catholics, especially at this time of crisis for the leading conservative Christian Democrat group, must necessarily be one of the main components of our election policy. Our uncompromising criticism of and resolute opposition to the Christian Democrat attempt to retain their monopoly of power with the help of Center-Left alliances do not, needless to say, detract from our constant quest for points of contact and cooperation with those Christian Democrats who accept a platform of social and democratic progress.

The slogan of winning a unitarian popular majority in the local, provincial and regional administrations remains valid in the overall context of struggle for a democratic majority in the leadership of the state. We propose to build still closer relations with the Italian Socialist Party and the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, eschewing intolerance in every shape and form, and to support them before, during and after the elections. But agreement and cooperation along these lines should be understood not as a quest for formal alliance between the parties but as a quest for a program and a policy on the basis of which it would be possible to achieve agreement and unity among broad sections of democrats, independents and non-party people. In the light of this we propose that in communities with less than 5,000 people only lists with strong democratic majorities should be put forward. In bigger communities and in the provinces our lists should likewise clearly express our desire for unity. We should bring together in these lists both the forces which during these past years and months have been working together with us and those whom we have been urging to join forces with us.

11. The contact with the people which we shall establish during the election campaign should help to heighten the influence of the Communist Party, strengthen it and broaden its activities. But we shall not be satisfied with an increased vote alone. We want most of these votes to be consolidated as a constant force playing its part in the struggle for socialism. We want hundreds of thousands of the men and women who will vote for our program to join the ranks of our Party. The Party and the Communist Youth Federation are carrying on their work this year from stonger organizational and political positions. Relying on these strong positions we should expand our propaganda work, our work to win over individuals and organizations. We must convince thousands of working people, and be convinced ourselves,

that unless we have a big, well organized, active and united Party no policy, even the most correct policy, can triumph.

Our entire perspective of democratic and peaceful advance towards ever stronger positions for the working people in the governmental bodies and far-reaching reorganization of the economic and political system presupposes the existence of a revolutionary mass party. We realize that for the working man, woman and young person the decision to join our Party is not an easy decision to take. Party membership involves sacrifices and responsibilities. It should not be forgotten, however, that the working people in capitalist society have been reduced to mere objects of exploitation, that to all practical purposes they enjoy no real freedom. But all of them—men, women, young people—cease to be helpless pawns when they join the party of the working class, the Communist Party, the party guided by revolutionary theory; they become fighters and builders of the new society, they become the masters of their own life, of their own destiny.

We therefore urge all comrades to fulfil their duty and reregister as member of the Party or the Communist Youth Federation, to set to work to enlist others, even those who, for one or another reason, have drifted away from the Party or lost contact with it but whom Togliatti's death has impelled to realize that they should return to the Party in order to carry forward his cause. The broad wave of sympathy and solidarity which was displayed for us when Togliatti died and which attends each of our initiatives, each action we organize, places a new responsibility on us.

We must ask each comrade, each sympathizer and every working man to exert in this election campaign greater political, ideological, organizational and propaganda effort than ever to carry the call to vote for our ticket to every home, every community and every working man.

The people of Italy should clearly and resolutely voice at the polls their condemnation of the present government policy and the attempts to shift the burden of the economic crisis on the shoulders of the working people, and to create through a new powerful shift to the Left the political conditions that would guarantee the full functioning of all democratic institutions and the active and conscious participation of the people in deciding all the urgent problems confronting the country in the sphere of defense of peace and freedom.

DEFEND AND EXTEND DEMOCRACY

Report* by E. Tuominen

MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF FINLAND TO PLENARY MEETING.

Defense and extension of democracy is becoming an ever more pressing problem in the world Communist and working-class movement. This can be explained by two mutually opposed trends. On the one hand, state-monopoly capital in the developed capitalist countries is penetrating ever deeper into all spheres of the life of society, with the resulting restrictions of democracy. On the other hand, the growing influence of the socialist countries, the success of the peaceful-coexistence policy and the vigorous extension and regeneration of democracy in the Soviet Union have created a situation in which peaceful transition to socialism is no longer a dream but a real possibility for some countries.

As is noted in the CPF program Finland is one of these countries. As the need to defend democracy grows, questions of extending it have begun to figure ever more prominently in the everyday political work of the Communist parties.

The most acute of these problems is that of the economic power of monopoly capital, the basis of its political influence in the capitalist countries.

The Finnish bourgeoisie denies that the monopolies and their economic organizations participate in governing our state.

Let us take a look at the facts.

Actual power belongs to twenty families; this was thoroughly discussed back in 1960 by the 12th CPF Congress where numerous facts were cited testifying to the power of a handful of financiers whose banks and industrial capital enable them to control the various aspects of social life.

Not wishing to repeat myself here, I shall refer to the opinion of a man whose authority is recognized by the bourgeoisie itself. He is Mikko Tamminen, professor of economics. Speaking before members of the Finnish Businessmen's Union in 1954 he touched upon the question of restoring the freedom of competition, viewing this question in terms of the entire capitalist system and

*Abridged from **Kansan Uutiset**, October 23 and 24, 1964.

citing numerous examples from leading capitalist countries, the United States included. He stated the following: "The marketing system now prevailing in most Western countries is . . . imperfect and boils down to competition between the monopolies."

As we see, Professor Tamminen admitted the existence of inter-monopoly competition. We know well the repeated contentions of the Right-wing circles, especially those behind the Coalition Party, such as Rihtniemi, an Employers' Association leader, to the effect that freedom of enterprise and competition flourishes in Finland and that the right to private property is sacred. It would be interesting to see what Professor Tamminen thinks on this score.

THE END OF FREE COMPETITION

The professor put on record that development in the United States has led to competition between a chosen few and that "the system of marketing is monopolistic rather than anything else." About Finland, a small country, Tamminen said: "It should be noted also that Finland by no means falls out of this general trend. Last year's (1963) economic survey shows that, judging by number of workers or by annual turnover, more than 60 per cent of our industry is in the hands of big owners, while the share of small owners in wholesale trade is infinitesimal." Referring to the causes of this, he declared: "I, for my part . . . belong to those who consider that competition tends to destroy itself."

We Marxists also consider that monopolies destroy free competition and replace it with inter-monopoly competition. Tamminen stated further: "At first competition can be very keen, but as the weaker perish and only the stronger survive, the number of 'contestants' dwindles to a point where competition assumes a monopoly character."

We Marxists hold the same view. While not denying the presence of competition, we maintain that it is monopoly competition. "The biggest social harm done by inter-monopoly competition," Tamminen said, "is social wastefulness born of the 'one-sidedness' of production and unutilized capacities, and also excessive advertising." We Marxists note the same phenomena in Finnish society as well.

MONOPOLIES DESTROY FREE ENTERPRISE

The large number of small businessmen and especially shopkeepers is often pointed out as proof of the existence of free enterprise and competition in our country. We Marxists disagree with this view. For instance, we do not regard the small shopkeepers as independent. Tamminen has this to say on this score: "As Professor Vilho Annala has pointed out, the spread of this

system (fixed prices) changes the character of retail trade; this is not free enterprise any longer, but middlemanship for which the producers have to pay." The Rightists and the bourgeoisie keep talking about free enterprise. Not long ago Rihtniemi, M.P., claimed that free enterprise did exist in Finland and branded us Communists as enemies of free enterprise and private property. To quote from Professor Tamminen again: "They talk a lot about free enterprise now, but one can't help thinking that what is actually meant is not only freedom from regulating measures by the state, but also freedom to conclude agreements which restrict competition." Tamminen is absolutely right in this respect as well.

Indeed, free enterprise is the freedom of big monopoly to subordinate the weaker and conclude agreements restricting competion. Consequently, Finnish society is a society with different and closely interwoven forms of interdependence, as sociologists would put it.

It is also interesting to note that Professor Tamminen comes out in defense of other Marxist propositions advanced by us, specifically the proposition that the capitalist system tends to develop into monopoly capitalism and state-monopoly capitalism. He agrees also with our estimate of the role of economic organizations.

It remains to be added that under state-monopoly capitalism to separate economics from politics is equivalent to unscientific denial of facts.

Spokesmen of the Coalition Party and the monopolies assert that the freedom of enterprise and competition, like private ownership, is the basis of political freedom. In the previous paragraphs we quoted a bourgeois scientist to show that the freedom of enterprise and competition has actually ceased to exist.

Now about the right to private property.

WHO OWNS OUR NATIONAL WEALTH?

The answer is: five per cent of the Finnish people own approximately 90 per cent of the national wealth of the country. Thus, the overwhelming majority of the people are deprived of the right to private property, which has become a privilige of the capitalists, of big monopolies.

The disappearance of the freedom of competition and enterprise under capitalism invariably leads to a reduction in the number of small businessmen and an increase in the number of big capitalists. The bitterest enemy of the right to private property, as well as of political and economic freedom, is monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism, which is born within the capitalist system itself.

BIG CAPITAL RESTRICTS POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

Big capital in Finland has always regarded parliament as something dangerous. Ever since our country became independent it has contemplated a reform of the Diet. Back in 1918 Ehrnrooth, then chairman of the Woodworking Industry Union, prepared a memorandum on this question proposing that the Diet be strengthened through electing representatives of influential privileged circles in circumvention of the ordinary electoral system. The aim was to bring the positions of monopoly capital in parliament into conformity with its economic might.

By bringing various pressures to bear upon parliamentary elections big capital seeks to secure a composition of the Diet suiting it. Back in the first years of independence special organizations and committees were set up during election campaigns to select those from among the candidates of the bourgeois parties who could best represent the monopolies in the Diet. Similar work is conducted now as well.

Attempts to change the composition of the Diet through an electoral reform have never been abandoned. In 1922 a corresponding draft law was submitted by the Tulenheimo committee. In the period of the Lapua movement open demands were made for a change in the electoral system to guarantee the representation of the privileged circles and the officialdom. The question was also raised of introducing the majority system. After the war a proposal on this was submitted by the People's Party. Not long ago the same proposal was made by Fleant, director of the Bank of Finland. All this shows the attitude of big capital and the parties subservient to it with regard to the Diet, to parliamentary democracy.

The monopolies interfere in the affairs of the state also in other, camouflaged ways. They endeavor to place their yes-men in high posts and in the government. Such attempts are made whenever a new government is being formed. Besides, they have their men in the various committees which draft and submit proposals and even pass decisions on important state matters.

Thus big capital influence in a more or less open form legislation and the preparation of various measures by the government and other state organs. It also influences the substance of many important decisions.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN THE GRIP OF BIG PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

The recently published reports on the activities of communal organs are eloquent testimony to the nature of the relations between these bodies and private corporations, economic ones in-

cluded, and to their own economic activity. The committee which studied this question found that the powers of communal organs were being steadily whittled down. The very interesting factual material published by the committee convincingly bears out our contention that the communal organs are being pressured by the big corporations.

Specifically, the committee stated the following:

"The communal organs sell, at low prices, plots of land at their disposal to different enterprises or lease them, sometimes even free of charge. This has become a widespread practice. In addition, they provide technical and other assistance on easy terms or gratuitously."

This is a characteristic trait of state-monopoly capitalism. At first the communal organs rarely granted easy terms of private individuals, but later this became the rule. The committee notes further on: "Accustomed to getting easy terms from the communal organs the businessmen demand all kinds of privileges for themselves. Experience shows that the businessmen's demands are becoming all the more insistent the more readily the communal organs grant these privileges."

The committee cites facts showing to what outrageous extremes things go. Here are some of them:

"About 70 rural and 15 urban local councils have stated that they give away land free of charge or for a symbolic payment. . .

"Private business is assisted not only by the provisions of land for construction, but also in many other ways." Municipal organs carry out all public works, supply water and electric power free of charge or at a discount, build railway lines for private enterprises or participate in this construction financially, and provide the necessary land. In addition, on eleven occasions communal councils acted as guarantors of loans extended to capitalists, and several loans were floated out of the municipal funds.

To what length the subordination of communal councils to the interests of big corporations can go is illustrated by two concrete instances mentioned in the committee's report.

"One council, having granted to an industrial establishment the use of a waterfall and 15 hectares of land for a camping site and guaranteed its loans to a sum of 50 million old marks, was compelled to assume the obligation that a representative of this enterprise would be elected to the municipal board. . .

"Another council, eager to attract a big industrial establishment to the area, provided it with a plot of land worth 25 million old marks and financed the building of a railway branch-line, which cost 65 million old marks."

These examples suffice to illustrate the way our communal

organs are used under state-monopoly capitalism. They not only provide big businessmen with privileges and guarantees. When still drawing up their plans the latter reckon on the assistance of the communal organs, i.e., the money of the taxpayers—workers, other employees, and peasants.

This is a "subsidy" paid to big corporations. To it should be added the means officially allocated by the state. They prefer to keep silent about this "subsidy," although it equals the subsidies paid to the whole of the peasantry.

On the other hand, the economic activity of the communal organs themselves is in every way restricted. Besides, these organs tend to engage in profit-making schemes alone.

The above shows that the question of the powers of local authorities is of exceptional importance, and concerns, without doubt, broad strata of the people. In this matter the Communists should strive for cooperation with the Social Democratic Party and the Agrarian Union. It is necessary to expand the sphere of economic activity of the communal organs, and possibly, their cooperation with one another and with the state.

RESTRICTIONS OF DEMOCRACY IN COMMUNAL ORGANS

With the progressive industrialization of the economy and automation of production, the "expert" figures ever more prominently in the activities of the communal organs, while elected representatives are ignored. As the number of officials increases the apparatus of communal organs loses its democratic character.

The view that proportional representation is obsolete and unsuitable for the modern society with a developing industry is widespread among big businessmen and top-ranking officials and cultivated in bourgeois and Social Democratic quarters.

The CPF considers that the powers of councillors should be extended, not curtailed, and that the activity of the experts should be controlled by councillors and used in the interests of democracy. What we want is a socialist society, not the rule by technocrats.

NATIONALIZATION

The Thirteenth Congress of our Party included the demand for nationalization in its decisions. This question assumed a particularly acute character in connection with the case of the Stromberg joint-stock company.

The desire to protect big Finnish concerns against foreign capital led to employee-employer cooperation. Specifically, the demand was voiced that Stromberg remain a Finnish company and that it even be nationalized. Nationalization was also urged by workers in

a number of other instances. But on the whole this demand has not been emphatic enough in recent years.

Nationalization is indispensable for the success of the struggle for democracy. Only when the state takes over big industrial enterprises will it be possible to put an end to the profoundly undemocratic influence of monopoly on the state and on social life as a whole.

It should be noted that although many industrial establishments and big corporations are already state-run, their activities in no way differ from those of private concerns. They are affiliated with organizations of the monopolists and cartels and with the Employers' Association, and are guided in their activities by the latter's decisions which often run counter to official policy.

These phenomena, characteristic of state-monopoly capitalism, should not, however, lead to the conclusion that nationalization is not in the interests of the working people and democracy. The question of the activities of these enterprises and of control over them is part of the question of nationalization. For this reason the 13th Congress of the CPF demanded wider powers for the workers, including control over the activities of state enterprises. The congress also demanded that state corporations should have nothing in common with the monopolies.

Clearly, nationalization within the framework of the bourgeois state cannot bring about the same results as in a socialist state.

There is no doubt, however, that nationalization vigorously supported by the masses will deliver a crushing blow at monopoly capital, curb its power and weaken its anti-democratic influence.

LOYALTY TO LENINIST ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES

Pravda yesterday published a communique on the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which took place on November 16, 1964, and the decisions it adopted. The Central Committee meeting examined the question of merging of the industrial and rural Party organizations in the Regions and Territories, and also organizational matters.

The decision of the Central Committee meeting "On the Merging of Industrial and Rural Regional and Territorial Party Organizations" says in particular:

"To enhance the guiding role of the Party and its local bodies in communist construction, to accomplish more successfully the tasks of economic and cultural development of every Region, Territory and Republic it is necessary to revert to the territorial and production principle in the structure of Party organizations and their leading bodies, the principle incorporated as a very important component part in the CPSU Rules, adopted by the 22nd Party Congress."

The meeting decided to restore in Regions and Territories, where Party organizations were divided into the industrial and the rural, single regional and territorial Party organizations uniting all Communists of a given region or territory indiscriminately whether they are employed in industry or in agricultural production. A single territorial or regional Party Committee will be elected by every territorial or regional Party organization.

It has been also found necessary to reorganize the Party Committees of the Agricultural Production Departments into district Party Committees, vesting them with the leadership of all Party organizations, including those of industrial enterprises and construction sites in the area of the given district. In this connection, industrial-production (zonal) Party Committees will be abolished.

The decisions of the Central Committee meeting will undoubtedly meet the approval and support of the entire Party, of the entire Soviet people. They have been prompted by the experience of life, by the interests of communist construction. Underlying them is the unswerving loyalty of our Party to the tested Leninist principles of Party and state guidance, and the deep concern for the enhancement of the Party's guiding role in communist construction.

Our country owes all its successes to the heroic effort of the Soviet people and the tremendous organizational and educational

work of the Communist Party, to the faithful pursuance of the Leninist general line of the Party, elaborated through collective discussion at its 20th, 21st and 22nd congresses and embodied in the CPSU Program.

The people see in the Leninist Party their militant vanguard which is armed with revolutionary Marxist-Leninist theory, closely linked with the masses and provides correct guidance of the entire work of building communism. The strength of our Party lies in the fact that it exists for the people and sees the meaning of its activities in serving the people, that it expresses by its policy the vital interests of the people, the vital requirements of the development of Soviet society. The Party clearly visualizes its final great goal, shows the people the scientifically-grounded ways of advance towards this goal, ignites in the masses gigantic constructive energy, and directs their energies towards the solution of the grand tasks facing them.

The time that has passed since the 22nd Congress has fully confirmed the viability of one of the most important conclusions of the CPSU Program: the period of full-scale communist construction will be marked by a further enhancement of the role and importance of the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, the growth of the creative activity of the masses. Enhancement of the role of the Party is an objective historical law which derives from the actuality of building a communist society and is conditioned, by the greatness and complexity of the tasks to be accomplished.

In organizational matters, in its attitude to forms of organization, methods of work, as well as in questions of theory, our Party remains loyal to Marxism-Leninism which in its essence is a profoundly constructive and revolutionary science, a science that does not tolerate stagnation of thought, dogmatism and conservatism. It has never regarded, nor does it regard now, that the established forms of organization and methods of work will be suitable for all the stages of the revolutionary process. Forms of organization and methods of work are determined by the specific features of the concrete historical situation, concrete political, economic and ideological tasks to be resolved at the given period.

But the indispensable and essential condition for any reorganization is the inviolability of the Leninist principles and norms of Party and state life. A truly creative search for new and better organizational forms has nothing in common with endless reorganizations. Lenin called the penchant for reorganizations that have not been thought out, carefully weighed and tested in practice, a big scourge. He stressed, at the same time, that the crux of the matter lay in people, in the selection and appointment

of the right people, and in control over work done, and not in institutions, reorganizations or new decrees.

Whenever the objective necessity required, the Party improved and will continue to improve its organizational work. However, changes in the established forms and methods of organizational work depend on political and economic necessity, on practical expediency. Changes should be introduced only when developments have shown that the old forms have spent themselves and are unsuited to the new conditions. A strictly scientific approach is, then, essential. When this scientific approach is replaced by a subjective approach, rainbow chasing, and arbitrary and hasty decisions, failures and mistakes are bound to crop up.

The 20th CPSU Congress, which was so vastly instrumental in developing the creative activity and initiative of the Communists and all the people, initiated the process of re-establishing the genuine Leninist standards of our Party's life. A milestone in realizing the decisions of the 20th CPSU Congress was the plenary meeting which the Party Central Committee held last October. Its decisions, which have received the approval and support of the entire Party and the entire people are a fresh indication of the Central Committee's concern for the successful implementation of the Party's general line and the undeviating observance of the Leninist norms of Party life and the principle of collective leadership. Again demonstrated was our Party's monolithic unity and the Soviet people's close solidarity with it.

Also imbued with loyalty to Lenin's behests are the decisions taken by the latest Central Committee meeting which resolved to merge the industrial and rural regional and territorial Party organizations.

As is known, Party organizations were repatterned two years ago along the so-called production principle, as the upshot of which the overwhelming majority of territorial and regional Party organizations were split into two—the industrial and the rural, with executives created for each. Organized in place of the rural Party district committees were the Party committees of the Agricultural Production Departments, and also the industrial-production organizations were subsequently repatterned along similar lines.

Developments showed this reorganization to be untimely and inexpedient, as it was carried out without due and proper preparation, with unjustifiable haste, without taking stock of all its consequences.

The reorganization violated the principles of the organizational structure of the Party defined in the CPSU Rules adopted by the 22nd Congress. Our Party, as is stated in its Rules, is organized on a territorial-and-production principle. This makes it possible for

the Party committee concerned better to see the prospects of the development of the Territory, Region or District as a whole, more rationally to allocate and use cadres. The territory or region is a single living organism with industry, agriculture and spheres that service them closely interrelated. They cannot be torn apart, cannot be divided without causing damage to the whole.

The Party organizations have worked for two years under that reorganization. What does their experience show? The members of the industrial and rural Party committees and their staffs have displayed a great sense of responsibility in tackling the tasks entrusted them by the Party, they have done a great deal to improve the efficiency of industry and to develop agriculture. More specialists in industry and agriculture have been promoted as Party leaders.

But at the same time division of Party organizations into industrial and rural has produced many difficulties and complications. The reorganization came in conflict with realities. Life has shown that it is practically impossible to draw a sharp line of distinction between the sphere of activity of the industrial and rural Party organizations.

Replacement of the territorial-and-production principle in the structure of the Party organizations by the so-called production principle actually led to mixing up the functions, powers and responsibilities of the Party, government and economic bodies, it impelled the Party committees towards replacing the economic organs. As a result of the reorganization, the District, which is the basic administrative and economic unit, was partitioned as far as the Party and the state activities were concerned.

The machinery or administration, in regions and territories, instead of becoming simpler and cheaper, has in the past two years become greatly inflated, and district government has been noticeably weakened. Work with the personnel has become more difficult and the possibilities of industrial communities helping the rural communities have diminished. Finally, the difficulties and drawbacks caused by the division of the Party, government, trade union and Komsomol organs into industrial and rural ones have seriously affected the servicing of the population, creating many inconveniencies for the people.

Thus division of the regional and territorial organizations, replacement of the Party regional committees by the Party committees of the Agricultural Production Departments and the setting up of industrial-production Party committees did not yield the expected results. Moreover, in a number of important areas of economic endeavor the reorganization led to the weakening of the influence exerted by the Party bodies in production activities.

That is why the Central Committee, having carefully weighed the

situation and taken into account the opinion of local government workers, Communists and all the working people, arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to restore the territorial-and-production principle as regards the structure of the Party organizations and their leading bodies.

The Central Committee meeting approved the proposals worked out by the Presidium of the Central Committee on the procedure to be followed in uniting the industrial and rural Party organizations. Party conferences will be held this December in all the Territories and Regions where single Territorial and Regional Party committees are to be restored. Until the single Party organs are elected at these conferences, the now existing industrial and rural regional and territorial Party committees will continue their work and bear full responsibility for the state of affairs in their respective Party organizations. Similar measures will be taken to restore single government bodies.

Coming back to the organizational principles contained in the CPSU Rules, the Party is profoundly convinced that the forms of organization ensuing therefrom have not exhausted themselves and are in full conformity with the modern conditions and tasks. This does not at all mean that there is no need to continue to improve them on a healthy and tested basis. The Party and its Central Committee consider it their duty to take the necessary measures for the improvement of the national economic management, doing this discreetly, without undue bustle and haste.

The interests of our cause demand the strict observation of Leninist standards of Party and state life, the principle of collective leadership, the all-round improvement in the style and methods of work, the further development on this basis of the creative initiative and activity of Communists, and of all the working people. It is important to arm Party organizations and their leading bodies with all that is valuable in the experience amassed by the Party organizations and their leading bodies both earlier as well as in the past two years.

The Party will in the future as well strive to ensure that all Party organizations thoroughly study production, economics, technology and advanced experience, that they take decisions on practical tasks with a knowledge of the matter under discussion, rationally use all the internal reserves, increasing the output of goods, improving their quality and cutting production costs.

Fanfare, and window-dressing, paper work and endless unnecessary meetings, petty tutelage over economic bodies and incompetent interference in their activities coupled with commandism should be resolutely uprooted in Party guidance. The emphasis should be on work with the executive personnel, their selection and ideological education, effective control over fulfilment of assignments, and

concrete organizational and educational activities among the masses.

The decisions of the CC meeting bespeak the strength of our Party, its Leninist approach in analyzing activities, the positive and negative aspects in practical work in giving guidance to economic and cultural development. By improving organizational forms, the style and methods of work, by heeding the voice of the people and by timely and correct solution of urgent problems the Party still further enhances its leading and guiding role in all spheres of public life, ensures the successful realization of the great and intricate tasks of communist construction.

ECONOMIC PROGRAM OF SWEDISH COMMUNISTS*

K. H. Hermansson

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SWEDEN

The Party organization of Upsala submitted a proposal to the CPS Congress, held in January 1964, in which it pointed out that the concentration of economic might in Sweden was most pronounced in banking and insurance and that public control, realized through the conversion of the banks and insurance companies into public property, would be an important step towards socialism. It was suggested, in view of this, that the question of the socialization of the banks and insurance companies be regarded as an essential aspect of Communist activity.

The policy statement adopted by the Ninteenth CPS Congress in 1961 read, in part:

"The following must be taken over from monopoly capital and made public property:

"natural wealth: mineral deposits, hydropower resources and forests;

"big commercial banks;

"insurance companies;

"chemical, building materials, mining, metallurgical, engineering and wood-processing industry enterprises;

"ancestral and other estates."

Thus, the proposal of the Upsala Communists falls in with this policy statement. This does not mean, however, that the question of the nationalization of banks and insurance companies should be made the top-priority question for the CPS at the present moment.

Demands for state control or nationalization should be presented in keeping with the social conditions in which a Communist Party operates and subordinated to the general political line of the party.

To analyze the fundamental features of production relations in present-day Sweden is not a problem for us Communists. Our difficulty lies in organizing propaganda and large-scale actions to prove to the people that Sweden is a country of monopoly capital where economically dominant big capital with its high concentration, monopolies and the inter-linking of banking and industrial interests wields the decisive power. Monopoly capital owns almost all the

---

*Abridged from **Var tid**, No. 1, 1964.

natural wealth and means of production of our country, and it is on the self-seeking policy of the monopolists, who are concerned solely with profit-making, that the means of subsistence and conditions of life of the millions depend.

Most broad-minded Social Democrats and a certain part of the membership of the bourgeois parties, the Party of the Center in the first place, seem to agree with this. It is the question of political power in Swedish society, of relations between the various classes and the state that is a more difficult question on which Communists and Socialists differ most.

Widespread in the bourgeois parties and even in the ruling Social Democrat Party is the opinion or "theory" that political power in our country belongs to the Social Democrats, based on the fact that they have been almost uninterruptedly in government since 1932 and on the proportion of seats in the Riksdag. However, other and much more important circumstances are ignored.

According to our theory, the state is an organ of class domination. The class in power utilizes the machinery of state in its own interests and for retaining its power. At present the big capitalists are, without doubt, the economically predominant class in our country. This means that they command the machinery of state and utilize it for their own ends.

We were able to put on record back in 1943 that Swedish capitalism was evincing a trend to turn into state-monopoly capitalism. After a number of extraordinary laws were adopted the monopolists began to use the bourgeois state apparatus with its civil and military organs of power for regulating the economy. The links between the state apparatus and monopoly capital were becoming even closer.

In the postwar years these trends, particularly pronounced in wartime, have abated somewhat but have not disappeared altogether. It would be quite correct to operate with categories of state-monopoly capitalism when analyzing the situation in Sweden in order to stress the strong influence of big capital on state power under the existing correlation of forces, but one should avoid any schematism, for a concrete analysis of the existing relations is invariably of decisive importance.

Along with criticizing the Social Democrats' theory that ours is already an "affluent society" or "welfare state," we should take a very careful stock of the conditions and political opportunities arising due to the strong positions of the working-class mosvement.

We must fully utilize all possibilities for influencing official policy and the activities and character of the entire state apparatus through workers' and other mass organizations, through parliament and public opinion, by open mass actions, i.e., various forms of class struggle. At the same time we should explain that our state remains, on the whole, bourgeois and that big capital shapes the

country's policy with the help of various means.

The policy of the Social Democrat government is aimed, in fact, at administering capitalist society without cardinally changing the relations of production or the correlation of forces. This policy is facilitated by the favorable conditions in which Swedish capitalism has been developing in the postwar years, marked by a rapid growth of production and foreign trade. This has until now made it possible to effect substantial social reforms without waiting for the contradictions between labor and capital to develop into open conflict. This has beeen a very favorable time for the policy of reformism.

The influence of the state on the economy has grown markedly in the last decades. In the current fiscal year the state sector accounts for at least 24 per cent of the gross national product. The share of the state and the communes in capital investments has reached 40 per cent. This development is not peculiar to our country alone. It is to be observed in all the developed capitalist countries. where it is having a stabilizing effect on the economy. Big capital does not resist this. The Social Democrat regime ensures it an untroubled existence and high and stable profits. Economic and social development proceeds more peacefully today than was the case under bourgeois governments, when Social Democracy and the trade union movement were in the opposition.

Many representatives of Swedish big capital have drawn political conclusions from this favorable development. They have adapted themselves to Social Democratic rule and stopped seeking the support of the Right and People's parties. This has affected the policy of these parties and resulted in important changes on the political scene. The changed attitude of big capital to the prospect of the continued existence of a labor government has been reflected in ideological discussions as well.

The establishment of more state-run enterprises, regulation of economic development by the state, increasing the share of the state in the national income, economic planning—all these forms of the growing influence of the state on economic life may be either progressive or reactionary in nature. In Hitler's Germany economic development was to a very large degree directed by the state. State power in France, headed by de Gaulle, plans economic development on a much bigger scale than the Swedish state headed by a Social Democratic government. Of decisive significance, of course, is the class content of state influence, the question which classes and social groups are favored by the policy of the state.

In assessing problems pertaining to the state's economic activity and regulation the Communist Party should proceed from the concrete situation in the country. We consider that in the present conditions the growing economic role of the state, the establish-

ment of new state enterprises and economic planning can be utilized by the working people as a weapon in the struggle against the power of big capital.

The opinion is often expressed abroad that the economic activity of the state, the state enterprises are playing a very important role in Sweden after thirty years of Social Democrat rule. But this is an illusion. Actually, the state sector is very small in Sweden, much smaller than in many other capitalist countries.

Last year the Finance Ministry issued a report on the enterprises managed by the state or belonging to state joint-stock companies ("state enterprises"). According to this report, only 204,000 people worked at state enterprises; 137,000 of them were employed in the postal, telegraph and telephone services and the state railways.

Thus, state enterprises account for not more than 5 per cent of the 4 million people employed in the national economy. Between 1960 and 1962 the number of workers at these enterprises dropped by 4,000. From 1950 till 1962 capital investments in the public sector, depreciation excluded, grew by a mere 60 per cent, whereas in the other sectors they registered a 90 per cent increase. In the past two years expenditures on new construction work and new purchases within the state group of enterprises decreased by 20 million kronor; in the other sectors, they went up by 1,355 million kronor, or 5 per cent. The Finance Ministery comments that "the state sector seems to have entered a period of stagnation." This is an understatement. In reality, the group of state enterprises is regressing and its share in total manpower and output is diminishing.

In Sweden, where Prime Minister Erlander says a socialist policy is being pursued, only 5 per cent of all enterprises are state-owned. Moreover, about 95 per cent of this state property was created by brougeois governments and only 5 per cent in the period of Social Democratic rule. This means that in the course of thirty years Sweden's Social Democratic governments have turned only 0.25 per cent of the enterprises into state property. Not a very impressive achievement for the party which considers itself to be one of the strongest Social Democratic parties in the world!

We sharply criticize the Social Democratic Party for having bungled this important task. Its indifferent and sometimes even negative attitude to state ownership and to state enterprises has been hampering social development in our country. Big capital and the bourgeois parties alone can thank it for this policy.

The 20th Congress of the CPS considers that we have every reason to raise the question of state ownership and state industry in a more resolute way than we have done until now. The Program of Action adopted by the congress says:

"The establishment of state enterprises and proper geographical

distribution of industry will ensure planned development of the economically underdeveloped regions of the country. The communes should be granted broader powers in industrial and other economic activity.

"It is necessary to make state-owned enterprises more effective economically and to expand them; to increase the share of the state in the national economy; to turn as soon as possible the big insurance concerns, trade in oil products and the manufacture of and sale of medicines, into public or cooperative property."

The demands for state ownership stated in our Program of Action are deliberately limited to some branches of the economy. Like the program as a whole, they show what is really possible to accomplish in the nearest future. This does not mean, however, that other questions pertaining to state ownership cannot be raised on a local or nationwide scale when the possibilities arise for this.

In every instance the demand for state ownership is concretely substantiated.

The insurance business is dominated by a certain number of big concerns. Besides, there are very many small, local societies. The concentration and centralization of capital in the insurance field has been very rapid in recent years. Today 92.5 per cent of the total sum of insurance premiums and 95.4 per cent of the incomes of all Swedish insurance societies fall to the share of the twenty biggest concerns. Five concerns account for approximately 60 per cent of all insurance premiums and 70 per cent of the total income. Some concerns are very closely connected with one another and with big commercial banks. All this is a component part of the general process of concentration and centralization of capital leading to the build-up of big capital. The insurance societies have colossal sums at their disposal amounting to 20,000 million kronor. The utilization of these means is limited by certain ordinances and to a certain degree public-controlled but the policy holders actually have no possibility of influencing the way their means are employed. The high degree of concentration, the power of big capital over the insurance companies, and the high uncontrollable incomes—this in itself is reason enough for the nationalization of the big insurance concerns. Then it will be possible to institute a more rational order; social security will become less costly, and at the same time the policy holders will be enabled to exercise greater influence on the way their money is utilized.

Folksmam, one of the country's biggest insurance companies, is run on a cooperative basis. We do not demand its nationalization. (Our program speaks of "national, public or cooperative property"). In this connection I would like to point to that part of the Program Statement which reads:

"The state will take into its hands and manage such vital branches as the railways, hydropower resources, metallurgical plants, etc.

But the process of social transformation will retain as its essential feature, development of such socially useful forms of enterprise as will ensure to all citizens equal opportunities for owning and managing enterprises and disposing of the part of the values created not designated for the needs of the society as a whole or for the development of production. By nationalizing the basic industries and promoting socially useful forms of enterprise socialism will provide the right to own property to the whole people. Therefore, socialist relations of production are the opposite of the bureaucratic centralism of monopoly capitalism, which dominates in most branches of the economy today."

The Communist Party does not intend to fight for complete state ownership and control in the economy. There are many other forms of socially useful economic activity which should be developed: the activity of the communes, production cooperatives, housebuilding cooperatives, consumers' cooperatives, and so on. We highly value the various forms of Swedish cooperatives and consider that both during the transition to socialism and after the establishment of socialist social relations the cooperative movement can and must play an even bigger role than today.

As far as trade in oil products is concerned, we may refer both to the Post-war Program of the Working-class Movement* and to the study of the oil problem made in 1945. Big foreign trusts have established full control over most of the oil import and the distributive system. The power of the trusts has been further strengthened of late following the construction of the country's first oil refinery. Nationalization of trade in oil products would have such important results as more rational and cheaper distribution, elimination of the additional expenditures caused by monopoly prices, guaranteed and better working and living conditions for factory and office workers, and stronger foundations for our neutrailty thanks to the consolidation of independence.

The question of the pharmaceutical industry has advanced to the foreground primarily because of the neurosedyn tragedy. Many people are wondering whether the private ownership of the drug industry with its drive for profits did not lead to a slackening of control, which in turn resulted in numerous cases of death or illness. Sharp criticism has also been levelled at other faults of this industry, such as high advertising expenditures, monopoly prices, an irrational and costly distribution system, and others. There are many reasons for society to assume control over and responsibility for the production and distribution of medicines—as is the case with the public health system as a whole.

The above-indicated trend of development of state-owned enter-

---

*This program was worked out jointly by the trade unions and the Social Democratic Party in 1944.—Ed.

prises makes it imperative that they should be enlarged and made more efficient. In Italy, for instance, the state-run industry is growing much faster than the rest of the economy owing to extensive modernization and expansion. Within a few years the state steel industry has outstripped its privately-owned counterpart. The share of the state in the output of electricity and chemical goods is also growing. In Sweden, the development of state-run enterprises is hampered by the absence of centralized guidance which makes investment difficult, complicates the order of financing, and so on. This question was touched upon by the Hoksberk Party organization, which proposed that a study be made of forms of coordinating state-managed production. The proposal was made in connection with the discussion in the official circles of the question of setting up a special state agency to manage all state enterprises. A system of several such agencies might prove to be more effective. The proposal of this Party organization was supported by the congress.

There is also the problem of establishing new state enterprises as a means of promoting the development of the regions where stagnation or regress has been observed. An example best known and most successful in this respect is the construction of an iron and steel plant in Norrbotten province for the purpose of catering to the needs of the local population and offsetting big capital's drive to monopolize all metal production. The Communists are unanimous that this line should be pursued on a nationwide scale.

It still remains, however, to clear up the question of geographical distribution of enterprises, in which the construction of new state-run industrial establishments should play an important part. What is the essence of the matter?

Development of capitalism is logically accompanied by industrialization and growth of the urban population and the labor force in the non-agricultural branches.

We have had very considerable migrations of the population inside the country and laso between Sweden and other countries. Many people have emigrated to the United States. The process of migration continues. Another 100,000 peasant households are expected to disappear in the current decade. Migration will also continue from forest regions and villages first to small inhabited localities, from there to bigger ones and so on, with gradual concentration in the areas of big cities.

No party can check this process; indeed, it would be unwise to try to do this. We cannot resist the operation of economic laws of development, and the people would not understand us were we to urge them to cling to the old, to rest content with lower incomes and worse housing conditions. Sentiment and feelings of local patriotism should not be allowed to prevail.

However, like the working people of all our country, those living

in regions with a declining population have the right to demand that the capitalists' chase after profits cease to be decisive in determining the lot of all parts of the country and big groups of the population.

Our economy should develop in accordance with a democratic plan based on the economic needs of society and ruling out considerations of capitalist profit as the decisive factor.

We approve, on the whole, the proposals of the state committee for the geographic distribution of enterprises, but we regard them as insufficient. Solution of these problems demands a firmer pursuit of the policy of geographic distribution and much more effective social planning.

Incidentally, the problems of geographic distribution concern not only the non-industrialized regions of the country, but big cities as well: there are questions of improving city transport and housing conditions, combating air and water pollution—creating, in general, conditions worthy of man. Problems of a different nature are also arising. The big cities do not attract industry any longer. On the contrary, they are losing industrial enterprises and workers. Between 1946 and 1961, 86 enterprises employing 12,000 workers were moved out of Greater Stockholm. The 87 new enterprises that have appeared there have a total of only 6,000 wage and salary workers. The same trend is to be observed in Goteborg and its environs.

It is not in the interests of society that our cities should lose their industrial aspect, with the resulting scattering of our working class. The setting up of new interprises in big urban areas with the simultaneous removal of some institutions and commercial establishments from there is a line of development which should be given serious attention when planning on a nation-wide scale.

In the field of economic planning as a whole the Social Democratic government is guilty of grave omissions. It has failed to solve satisfactorily even those problems of planning which do not go beyond the framework of state-monopoly capitalism. To a still lesser degree has it succeeded in working out clear objectives and methods of economic planning for the good of the people. It is talking about "contour planning" and a "mixed economy" as not only transitional forms, but also the ultimate ideals of its policy. However, criticism from within Social Democracy itself and particularly from the trade union center shows that the government has not achieved even these limited goals.

"Contour planning" and "mixed economy" presuppose that big capital will continue to have the decisive say in the vital questions of investment, new construction, the closing down of enterprises, etc. Private capital will enjoy, as before, the freedom of governing economic development. In such conditions a planned economy and

big-scale economic planning are unthinkable.

The contradictions between the people and big capital are the central factor in the life of present-day Sweden, where the factory and office workers, the intelligentsia and individual owners engaged in agriculture, commerce, handicrafts and industry are in one camp and the powerful financial aligarchy which dominates the economy and exploits the riches and the manpower of the nation, in the other. These contradictions are broader and deeper than the basic contradiction between labor and capital, and just as inevitable and acute. Indeed, they underlie all political issues, from the struggle for a shorter working week to the questions of the sale of plots of land and the effort to free women from their double slavery. They are also manifested in the field of international relations—the problems of markets, the export of Swedish capital the establishment of foreign concerns in our country.

As distinct from Social Democracy, which prefers to rule together with big capital, we consider that Sweden has long been ripe for government policy against big capital and its domination. The time has come for the socialist harvest which was spoken about in connection with the Postwar Program of the Working-Class Movement but which has never been started.

The remaining six years of this decade should see the breaching by the working class of the dominant positions of big capital in vital fields. This has to be done if Sweden's policy is to measure up to the great tasks posed in our increasingly dynamic time. The present government's policy is simply unable to cope with the problems of the sixties, for it is antiquated and lacks consistency and perspective.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party adopted a program outlining the basic elements of this six-year onslaught on big capital. The main thing is that this program envisages the solution of all problems with due regard for the main demands of the people.

Of great importance is the question of guaranteed employment. The overwhelming majority of our people today are wage earners —factory and office workers, technical specialists, workers in education. They sell their labor power to the state, the commune, the joint-stock company, the individual capitalist. They possess no means of production of their own and are not guaranteed the right to work. In the private sector they constantly stand the risk of losing their livelihood.

This is a highly important problem requiring a political solution. In conditions of a prolonged favorable economic situation, when jobs are easy to find (since the capitalists compete for manpower, whose growth lags behind the growth of the requirements of capital,) this is not a top-priority question for most wage and salary earners, but it demands attention in view of the conditions which

have developed in our country in recent years for such categories as seasonal building workers, workers dismissed as a result of closures, lumbermen, and so on. The sweeping changes in the economic life which are to be expected in the near future in connection with automation and other forms of capitalist nationalization, the aggravation of relations on the world market, the stepping up of the so-called structural economic readjustment, and new economic crisis, add urgency to this problem.

There exists an absurd situation when groups of finance capital, anonymous share-holders and executive directors enjoy the exclusive right to decide all questions at enterprises merely because they represent joint-stock capital. The decisive role in the operation of any enterprise is played by the labor of its employees. A greater part of the capital on which the enterprise operates is created by this labor and not invested by the share-holders. The existing order of decision-making in industry in no way corresponds to the actual contribution of the working people to production and is in glaring contradiction with the ideals of democracy.

The history of the Swedish working-class movement has been keynoted by the struggle for people's power, for democracy. This struggle has been waged against the remnants of feudalism and absolutism, against the timber barons, against banks and finance magnates. The solution of the problems of our time s h o u l d be fought for in the same way. Democracy should be extended to economic life as well. The trend of development and the volume of production should be determined by the people and not by the fifteen families which constitute the backbone of big capital in Sweden.

The entire program proposed by the Communists with a view to commencing the destruction of the rule of big capital in the vital fields wil lead to an extension of the power of the people, of democracy. The people and the organs elected by them should enjoy greater rights than big capital.

No matter what our opponents say, there is no contradiction between our striving to extend democracy and our socialist goals. Socialism means the full blossoming or democracy. Full democracy is unthinkable if the decisive aspects of the life of society, particularly production, are wholly subordinated to the interests of the rich.

We are marching along the road of democracy and have no intention of swerving from it. We consider it a perfectly natural right and duty of popular democracy to defend itself against the enemies, if the latter try to interfere with the realization of the decisions of organs elected by the people.

We reject with scorn the allegation that the Communist Party of Sweden is not a democratic party. This is an invention of the heirs

to those reactionaries who in their time called even the Liberal Carl Staaff and the Social Democrat Hjalmar Branting traitors to the country.

Nobody has any grounds for accusing our Communist Party of pursuing an anti-national or anti-democratic policy. It is we who have every reason to level this accusation at other parties.

What we can reproach ourselves for is that we do not make a sufficiently thorough analysis of Swedish society, in which our movement has its roots, in which we are waging our struggles, and in which our future lies. We can reproach ourselves for drawing insufficiently on the rich heritage of the pioneers of the socialist movement — Axel Danielsson and others, for not always stressing clearly enough the significance of our historical conditions and the militant traditions of the Swedish people, particularly the significance of mass organizations and municipal self-government for the process of social transformation, for the building of socialism.

We are far from ignoring the rich experience of the successful struggle of the working class of other countries for socialism, but the forms and methods of this struggle, waged in different conditions, cannot be binding on us. Just as the forms of the bourgeois revolutions and of the emergence of capitalism differed from country to country, so the proletarian revolution and the victory of socialism will demonstrate a great variety of forms. We are contributing to the struggle of the international working class by finding the most successful ways of breaking the power of big capital and building socialism in the specific conditions of our country.

Success in the struggle against the domination of big capital and for the extension of people's power requires active work in all fields of political life with the use of all means of the struggle of the working class. In the Riksdag a majority should be won which would resolutely effect the necessary legislation. Our country should have a government which will rule against the interests of big capital. This calls for a high degree of and organization on the part of the factory and office workers, of all the groups of the population being ruined by big capital.

The struggle against the power of the fifteen families cannot be abstract. It should be concentrated around the vital interests of our citizens. In addition to insisting on guaranteed employment, democracy at enterprises, and promotion of state-owned industry, our Party's Program of Action contains the following demands which we consider most essential:

— a 40-hour working week; equal wages and job opportunities for men and women; a rise in the real wages more in step with the growth of production;

— state aid to families covering most of the cost of bringing up children;

— solution of the housing problem, and

— improvement of the public health system and medical services in accordance with the separate programs adopted by the congress.

We consider that a greater share of the national income should be spent on education and scientific research in order to ensure more rapid progress. Education should be so financed as to give equal opportunities to all.

The Program of Action provides for extending the authority of public bodies and enhancing the influence of the masses.

In our opinion, the means necesary for implementing the policy of radical reforms can be obtained through broadening economic planning, placing science and technology at the service of a progressive policy, increasing the influence of the state on the economy, and imposing bigger taxes on the incomes of companies and large estates. The large sums that can be released by cutting the unproductive expenditures on armaments should be used both for implementing reforms inside the country and for substantially increasing aid to the underdeveloped countries.

The realization of the six-year plan of struggle against big capital should have, as an indispensable political prerequisite, the building up of a majority in the people and in the Riksdag which will support this plan. Of exceptional importance is the task of convincing our fellow-workers and friends in the Social Democratic Party of the need to set up a single democratic front to combat the power of the fifteen families and the political forces defending them.

It is also essential for the working class to win supporters and allies in the other classes and strata: professionals, peasants, persons engaged in the various branches of the economy—all those who are interested in a policy of radical reforms and in extending people's power. The working-class parties should be able to secure the support of a greater part of the people in order to be able to carry out their policy and achieve their ideals.

Particularly important is the winning over of the two biggest groups of the population—the youth and the women, whose political activity has been growing of late.

The emancipation of women in our country has made considerable headway in recent years. Although it is far from being complete, women have been displaying a new consciousness, reflected in serious demands presented to society. The process owing to which the women are being increasingly drawn into the economic sphere will continue. On many occasions it involves having to do hard work and complicates personal life, but at the same time it lends power to their actions, which are bound to lead to the establishment of the equality of women. The spontaneous radicalism of modern women should be used more effectively.

The condition and sentiments of the youth are more difficult to fit into a single formula. That they have long since broken with the

old positions is clear, but they have not charted their new path yet. The young people of today are critically-minded, ambitious and ready for sacrifice. But their ideals are vague, often inconsistent, and lack a definite perspective.

The socialist working-class movement bears a vast responsibility in this respect. We should speak about the ideals of democracy and socialism in such a way as to capture the imagination of the youth and appeal to their urge for heroic deeds.

A world without wars, without weapons and soldiers, with open borders, without racial discrimination and class oppression, a world of people working freely and concertedly for the common weal, knowing no degrading relations of slavery and exploitation, living without kings and prejudices—how can this fail to fascinate the modern youth?

These are the ideals of socialism and communism which our Party upholds—perhaps not always vigorously enough and sometimes even not quite consistently. But these ideals exist, and they illumine our road.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

Featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems in the fields of economics and political science, history, culture, natural science and philosophy; records and reminiscences from the history of the labor and farm movements; discussion of the burning issues of our time—peace, independence, democratic liberties, changing social structures, the transition to Socialism and Communism.

•

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00

(3 YEARS - $5.00)

SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.

Canada

Put Monopoly Under Control

A New Economic Policy for Canada

By TIM BUCK

This new 78-page booklet spells out in detail the Communist Party's economic policy for Canada. It deals with jobs, economic growth, Canadian independence, curbing of the monopolies and placing them under public control or nationalization; and the bringing of the benefits of automation to the people.

75 CENTS

Automation and Labor

By WILLLIAM KASHTAN

The meaning of automation for the labor movement, its effects on collective bargaining, the structure of the trade union movement and the need for a new labor policy are dealt with in this pamphlet.

15 CENTS

Now Available from

PROGRESS BOOKS / 44 STAFFORD ST. / TORONTO 3

world marxist review

problems of peace and socialism

Each month a rich selection of material is carried relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. An invaluable asset in today's swift-moving world. Edited in Prague, it has correspondents on all continents, is published in 33 countries in 25 languages and is read in 137 countries. Leading Communists the world over contribute to its pages. The North American edition is published by:

progress books
44 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3

subscriptions are $5 for 18 issues;
$3.50 for 12 issues.
single copies are 35 cents.

PRICE TEN CENTS