

# PEKING REVIEW

37

September 13, 1963

北  
京  
周  
報

## The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership Of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves

Comment on the Open Letter of the Central  
Committee of the C.P.S.U.

By the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* and *Hongqi*

## The Indonesian Revolution and the Immediate Tasks of the Communist Party of Indonesia

A political report by Comrade D.N. Aidit (p. 26).

## Reply to Khrushchov

Resolution of the Central Committee of the  
Communist Party of Brazil (p. 39).

A WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE NEWS AND VIEWS

# Special Gift Offer

To Overseas Subscribers of

## PEKING REVIEW

(Valid Until February 1, 1964)

To every subscriber of PEKING REVIEW  
for 1964

**A DESK CALENDAR OF 1964** ornamented with  
24 superb reproductions of Chinese paintings

and

**A NOTEBOOK** with handy reference material  
on China



To everyone who wins 1-2 new subscribers to PEKING  
REVIEW at one time –

A beautiful Chinese scroll picture

SPRING by Wang Ke-yi

• in full colours (96 × 36.5 cm.)

To everyone who wins 3 or more new subscribers at  
one time –

A handsome notebook (17.5 × 12.5 cm.)

in addition to the scroll



Send your orders or enquiries to **GUOZI SHUDIAN**, P.O. Box 399, Peking, China

or to our distributors in your country. Free samples on request.

---

### Annual Subscription Rates:

Europe, U.S.A., Canada, Australia, New Zealand: Br. Stg. £1-0-0, US\$4.00

Asia: £0-14-0

Africa: £0-7-0

# PEKING REVIEW

北京周報

(BEIJING ZHOUBAO)

A WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHINESE  
NEWS AND VIEWS

September 13, 1963 Vol. VI No. 37

## CONTENTS

THE WEEK	3
ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS	
The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves —The Editorial Departments of <i>Renmin Ribao</i> and <i>Hongqi</i>	6
Korean People's Great Day —Our Correspondent	24
The Indonesian Revolution and the Immediate Tasks of the Communist Party of Indonesia —D.N. Aidit	26
Outstanding Contributions of the Communist Party of Indonesia —Peng Chen	36
Some Questions of the Indonesian Revolution and the Communist Party of Indonesia —D.N. Aidit	37
Reply to Khrushchov —Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil	39
We Have Friends and Comrades All Over the World	44
Mounting Barrage of Slanders	46
POETRY	47

Published every Friday by PEKING REVIEW  
Pai Wan Chuang, Peking (37), China  
Cable Address: Peking 6170

Post Office Registration No. 2-922  
Printed in the People's Republic of China

# THE WEEK

Among the major events of the week:

- Korean visit of Chairman Liu Shao-chi announced.
- The Chinese press published on September 6 an article by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* and *Hongqi*, entitled "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves," commenting on the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.
- The 15th anniversary of the founding of the Korean Democratic People's Republic was warmly celebrated in China.

- Over 10,000 people welcomed D.N. Aidit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party, and the Party delegation he led. The Indonesian Party leader was conferred the honorary membership of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

- Chinese Government's proposal for a conference of government heads of all countries to discuss complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is receiving still more support.

Among those who replied to Premier Chou En-lai last week were: Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia who expressed support in principle, Foreign Minister John Karefa-Smart of Sierra Leone, and Ne Win, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Revolutionary Government of the Union of Burma who supported the proposal.

- More provocations against China were reported last week:
  - In Moscow, a group of Soviet citizens staged an organized, anti-China demonstration in front of the Chinese Embassy.
  - In Prague, the Czechoslovak Government unreasonably demanded the recall of a staff member of the Chinese Embassy and a Chinese student.

- The Chinese press last week published in full or in excerpts:
  - an article in the Korean magazine *Keunroja* refuting revisionist exaggeration of the role of nuclear weapons and pointing out that the decisive force of the revolution is the masses of the people.

- an editorial of the *People's Voice*, organ of the New Zealand Communist Party, which refutes the lie that China wants to start a nuclear war.

- a resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil entitled "Reply to Khrushchov," and an article from *A Classe Operaria*, organ of the C.P. of Brazil, by Jose Duarte, under the heading of "The Great Idea of Marxism-Leninism Will Certainly Triumph on Our Continent."

## Chairman Liu to Visit Korea

Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the People's Republic of China and Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, will pay a friendship visit to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in mid-September. He was invited for the visit by Choi Yong Kun, President of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's

Republic of Korea and Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers' Party.

## Chairman Mao Tse-tung Meets New Zealand C.P. Leader

Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, met and had a cordial talk on September 9 with M. Williams, Chairman of the National



Chairman Mao Tse-tung meeting Chairman M. Williams

Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand.

Comrade Williams arrived in Peking on September 6 on a visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

### Comrade Aidit — Honorary Member of Chinese Academy

The delegation of the Indonesian Communist Party, led by Chairman of its Central Committee D.N. Aidit, left Peking for Korea on September 7. During their short stay in Peking, Chairman Aidit and his party received a most warm and fraternal welcome from the Chinese people and leaders of the Chinese Communist Party. Besides a very full schedule of talks and meetings, they visited a factory and a people's commune on the outskirts of the city.

Peking held a mass rally at the Great Hall of the People in honour of the Indonesian comrades. Among the 10,000 people who attended were: Chou En-lai, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China; Teng Hsiao-ping, General Secretary of the Party's Central Committee; Peng Chen, Member of the Political Bureau and Member of the Secretariat of the Party's Central Committee and First Secretary of the Peking Municipal Committee of the Party.

After Comrade Peng Chen opened the rally with a speech of welcome (see p.36), Comrade Aidit gave a report on "Some Questions of the Indonesian Revolution and the Communist Party of Indonesia." (For excerpts of his report, see p.37.)

At a ceremony in Peking on September 5, the Chinese Academy of Sciences made Comrade Aidit an Honorary Member of the Academy. Among those present were Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, Teng Hsiao-ping and other leaders of the Chinese Communist Party; M.H. Lukman, Deputy Speaker of the Indonesian Co-operation Parliament and First Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party, and the delegation of the Indonesian Co-operation Parliament he led.

In his address at the meeting, President of the Academy Kuo Mo-jo said that it was the first time the Chinese Academy of Sciences had ever conferred the title of Honorary Member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences on an outstanding foreign personage. "While engaged in arduous revolutionary activities in the cause of the Indonesian revolution," he said, "Comrade Aidit has devoted himself tirelessly to the study of revolutionary theory and has written many works on the Indonesian revolution, the international communist movement and

other topics. The great significance of Comrade Aidit's theoretical activity lies in his creative application and development of Marxism-Leninism in the conditions existing in Indonesia, and his great contribution to 'Indonesianizing' Marxism-Leninism, thus enriching the theoretical treasury of Marxism-Leninism. Comrade Aidit has defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism, and opposed both revisionism — which runs counter to the fundamental principles of Marxism — and dogmatism which departs from the practice of one's own country."

Paying tribute to Comrade Aidit's contributions to Marxist-Leninist theory, President Kuo Mo-jo said that Chinese scientific workers would do their best to learn from him and that they looked on his works as a sharp weapon for studying the current questions of the revolution and opposing revisionism.

Amidst warm applause, Kuo Mo-jo presented the certificate of honorary membership in the Chinese Academy of Sciences to Comrade Aidit.

In his speech thanking the Academy for the honour bestowed on him, Comrade Aidit said: "In conferring on me the title of Honorary Member, the Chinese Academy of Sciences is honouring all the leaders and members of the Indonesian Communist Party and the working people of Indonesia." He assured all members of the Chinese Academy of Sciences that he and his Indonesian colleagues would continue to work tirelessly for an all-round integration of the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Indonesian revolution. He concluded his speech with the cheers: "Marxism-Leninism is invincible!" and "Marxism-Leninism will surely triumph throughout the world!"

### Welcome for Kenyan Friends

Peking held a meeting on September 5 to welcome the visiting delegation of the Kenyan African National Union led by John David Kali. Sponsored by the Chinese Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity and two other people's organizations, the meeting was attended by 1,500 people.

In his speech, Liu Chang-sheng, President of the Chinese-African People's Friendship Association, paid tribute to the heroic struggle waged by the Kenyan people against colonial

enslavement and for independence and freedom.

Liu Chang-sheng reaffirmed the resolute support of the Chinese people for the African people's revolutionary struggle against old and new colonialism and for national independence.

John David Kali, Member of the House of Representatives and Chief Whip of the Government Party in Kenya's House of Representatives, in his speech, expressed his satisfaction with the great success of the goodwill mission and described that success as "a good beginning for the good things to follow." "We shall endeavour to maintain our established good relationship with your country and we hope and trust that you will do the same," he said.

"Africa today is like a big elephant who has been sleeping for many years and on whose body some people have built their huts. As he starts waking up he will topple them all and throw over anyone in them," he declared.

The 20-member delegation of the Kenyan African National Union arrived in Peking on September 2. Its members were received by Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Chairman Chu Teh of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Premier Chen Yi on separate occasions.

### **National Cotton Conference**

Cotton was the subject of discussion at a national conference recently convened by the State Council. Conference participants—cadres from cotton-producing counties, specialists, outstanding cotton growers and members of agro-technical stations—took stock of the cotton situation and forecast that a 20 to 30 per cent increase over last year's output in cotton would be gained this year.

Premier Chou En-lai addressed the conference. He urged all concerned to strengthen leadership in cotton production and called on functionaries, experts and members of people's communes to pool their efforts and work together for a higher cotton output.

Latest reports from the nation's cotton-growing areas are encouraging. The people's communes this year sowed 10 million *mu* more to cotton than last year. Though heavy sum-

mer rains damaged the crops in some parts of north China's Hopei and Honan Provinces, the cotton fields are doing very well in the high-yielding provinces along the Yangtse River—Chekiang, Kiangsu, Kiangsi, Hupeh and Hunan—and a higher output than last year's is expected confidently here. Shensi and Shansi in north China, Sinkiang in the northwest, and a number of other provinces also report better crops than in 1962.

The conference adopted two proposals: one on measures to increase per-*mu* yields this year and another on measures to improve the techniques of cotton growing to ensure a still better crop next year.

### **Socialist Armies' Basketball Championship**

With the last of a number of exciting matches played, the 1963 basketball championship among the army teams of the socialist countries ended on the evening of September 3 in Peking. The teams of the Soviet Union, China and Bulgaria came first, second and third respectively, followed in order of placing by Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Korea, Hungary, Viet Nam, Albania and Mongolia.

"It's a success," was the way Lieutenant-General Liu Chih-chien, Vice-Director of the General Political Department of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, characterized the championship in his speech for the closing ceremony at the end of play that evening in the Peking Workers' Gymnasium. "It has enhanced mutual understanding and friendship between the army teams." He expressed the hope that the players would convey this friendship to their peoples and armies so that it would help the common struggle against imperialist aggression, for the defence of world peace and socialist construction.

### **Bulgarian Anniversary**

On the eve of the 19th anniversary of the socialist revolution of Bulgaria, Chinese Communist Party and state leaders sent a message of greetings to the Bulgarian Communist Party and state leaders.

In Peking, on September 9, Bulgarian Ambassador to China Kristu Stoichev gave a reception to celebrate the occasion. Vice-Premiers Chen Yi and Lu Ting-yi were among the guests. At the reception, Ambassador Kristu

Stoichev and Vice-Premier Chen Yi exchanged toasts to the friendship between the Bulgarian and Chinese peoples and to the solidarity of the people of the whole world and to world peace.

### **Anti-China Provocation in Moscow**

On September 2, at 13:00 hours local time, more than a score of Soviet men and women staged an organized, provocative anti-China demonstration before the Chinese Embassy in Moscow.

Marching arm in arm past the Embassy on Friendship Street, they chanted: "We do not want to die!" "We do not want war!" "Shame on China!" "Shame on the Chinese!" and "Shame! Shame! Shame!" Some of them shook their fists at the Embassy.

Having passed the Embassy these provocateurs then turned back and coming up to the gate of the consular department of the Embassy glared at the Chinese staff on duty. They truculently raised a number of questions worded to distort the correct policy of the Chinese Government, such as "Do you want war or peace?" "Why doesn't China sign the Moscow treaty?" "Do you know with whom you are siding?" and "Why does the Chinese Government announce its opposition to reaching any agreement or making any compromise with the United States?"

They said they were students of Moscow University's physics department. It was 13:30 hours when they left the embassy gate.

Normally a single Soviet policeman stands by the gate of the Chinese Embassy. Recently the number has been increased to two, and when this incident took place, three Soviet policemen were present. They stood and witnessed this serious anti-China provocation.

At 17:30 hours that same day, the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union made a verbal representation to the Soviet Foreign Ministry pointing out that this unprecedented and seriously provocative incident undermines the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples and vitiates relations between the two countries. Stating that it was most regrettable that it should have happened, the Chinese Embassy demanded that the Soviet Foreign Ministry deal seriously with this inci-

*(Continued on p. 43.)*

# The Origin and Development of the Differences Between the Leadership Of the C.P.S.U. and Ourselves

— Comment on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

by the Editorial Departments of "Renmin Ribao" and "Hongqi"

---

## ANNOUNCEMENT

On July 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published an open letter to Party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union.

In a statement on July 19 a spokesman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China declared:

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. is an appraisal of our letter of June 14. The Central Committee of the C.P.C. considers that the contents of the open letter do not accord with the facts, and we cannot agree with the views it expresses. At the appropriate time, the Central Committee of the C.P.C. will clarify matters and give its comments.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. was published in full on July 20 in the *Renmin Ribao* and other national papers and in all provincial and municipal papers throughout China. It was also broadcast in full by Chinese radio stations.

In the Soviet national papers, the open letter was followed by nearly 300 articles attacking China. The *Renmin Ribao* has published extracts from a number of these articles.

Starting today, the Editorial Departments of the *Renmin Ribao* and the journal *Hongqi* are publishing a succession of articles commenting on the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao*  
Editorial Department of *Hongqi*

September 6, 1963

---

IT is more than a month since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published its open letter of July 14 to Party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union. This open letter, and the steps taken by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. since its publication, have pushed Sino-Soviet relations to the brink of a split and have carried the differences in the international communist movement to a new stage of unprecedented gravity.

Now Moscow, Washington, New Delhi and Belgrade are joined in a love feast and the Soviet press is running an endless assortment of fantastic stories and theories at-

tacking China. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. has allied itself with U.S. imperialism, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique against socialist China and against all Marxist-Leninist parties, in open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, in brazen repudiation of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and in flagrant violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance.

The present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve a whole series of important questions of principle. In its letter of June 14 to the Central Com-

mittee of the C.P.S.U., the Central Committee of the C.P.C. systematically and comprehensively discussed the essence of these differences. It pointed out that, in the last analysis, the present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve the questions of whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, whether or not to accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, whether or not there is need for revolution, whether or not imperialism is to be opposed, and whether or not the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement is desired.

How have the differences in the international communist movement and between the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and ourselves arisen? And how have they grown to their present serious dimensions? Everybody is concerned about these questions.

In our article "Whence the Differences?" (*Renmin Ribao* editorial, February 27, 1963), we dealt with the origin and growth of the differences in the international communist movement in general outline. We deliberately refrained from giving certain facts concerning this question, and particularly certain important facts involving the leadership of the C.P.S.U., and left the leadership of the C.P.S.U. some leeway, though we were ready to provide a fuller picture and to thrash out the rights and wrongs when necessary. Now that the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. has told many lies about the origin and development of the differences and completely distorted the facts, it has become necessary for us to set forth certain facts in order to explain the matter in greater detail.

In its open letter, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. dares not state the truth to its Party members and the masses of the people. Instead of being open and above-board and respecting the facts as Marxist-Leninists should, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. resorts to the customary practice of bourgeois politicians, distorting the facts and confusing truth and falsehood in its determined attempt to shift the blame for the emergence and growth of the differences on to the Chinese Communist Party.

Lenin once said, "Honesty in politics is the result of strength, and hypocrisy—the result of weakness." Honesty and respect for the facts mark the attitude of Marxist-Leninists. Only those who have degenerated politically depend on telling lies for a living.

The facts are most eloquent. Facts are the best witness. Let us look at the facts.

### **The Differences Began With the 20th Congress Of the C.P.S.U.**

There is a saying, "It takes more than one cold day for the river to freeze three feet deep." The present differences in the international communist movement did not, of course, begin just today.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. spreads the notion that the differences in the international communist movement were started by the three articles which we published in April 1960 under the title of *Long Live Leninism!* This is a big lie.

What is the truth?

The truth is that the whole series of differences of principle in the international communist movement began more than seven years ago.

To be specific, it began with the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. in 1956.

The 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. was the first step along the road of revisionism taken by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. From the 20th Congress to the present, the revisionist line of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has gone through the process of emergence, formation, growth and systematization. And by a gradual process, too, people have come to understand more and more deeply the revisionist line of the C.P.S.U. leadership.

From the very outset we held that a number of views advanced at the 20th Congress concerning the contemporary international struggle and the international communist movement were wrong, were violations of Marxism-Leninism. In particular, the complete negation of Stalin on the pretext of "combating the personality cult" and the thesis of peaceful transition to socialism by "the parliamentary road" are gross errors of principle.

The criticism of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. was wrong both in principle and in method.

Stalin's life was that of a great Marxist-Leninist, a great proletarian revolutionary. For thirty years after Lenin's death, Stalin was the foremost leader of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government, as well as the recognized leader of the international communist movement and the standard-bearer of the world revolution. During his lifetime, Stalin made some serious mistakes, but compared to his great and meritorious deeds his mistakes are only secondary.

Stalin rendered great services to the development of the Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In the article "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" published in April 1956, we said:

**After Lenin's death Stalin creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism as the chief leader of the Party and the state. Stalin expressed the will and aspirations of the people, and proved himself an outstanding Marxist-Leninist fighter in the struggle in defence of the legacy of Leninism against its enemies—the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and other bourgeois agents. Stalin won the support of the Soviet people and played an important role in history primarily because, together with the other leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, he defended Lenin's line on the industrialization of the Soviet Union and the collectivization of agriculture. By pursuing this line, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union brought about the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union and created the conditions for the victory of the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler; these victories of the Soviet people accorded with the interests of the working class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore natural that the name of Stalin was greatly honoured throughout the world.**

It was necessary to criticize Stalin's mistakes. But in his secret report to the 20th Congress, Comrade Khrushchov completely negated Stalin, and in doing so defamed

the dictatorship of the proletariat, defamed the socialist system, the great C.P.S.U., the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. Far from using a revolutionary proletarian party's method of criticism and self-criticism for the purpose of making an earnest and serious analysis and summation of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he treated Stalin as an enemy and shifted the blame for all mistakes on to Stalin alone.

Khrushchov viciously and demagogically told a host of lies in his secret report, and threw around charges that Stalin had a "persecution mania," indulged in "brutal arbitrariness," took the path of "mass repressions and terror," "knew the country and agriculture only from films" and "planned operations on a globe," that Stalin's leadership "became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development," and so on and so forth. He completely obliterated the meritorious deeds of the Stalin who led the Soviet people in waging resolute struggle against all internal and external foes and achieving great results in socialist transformation and socialist construction, who led the Soviet people in defending and consolidating the first socialist country in the world and winning the glorious victory in the anti-fascist war, and who defended and developed Marxism-Leninism.

In completely negating Stalin at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., Khrushchov in effect negated the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism which Stalin defended and developed. It was at that congress that Khrushchov, in his summary report, began the repudiation of Marxism-Leninism on a number of questions of principle.

In his report to the 20th Congress, under the pretext that "radical changes" had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchov put forward the thesis of "peaceful transition." He said that the road of the October Revolution was "the only correct road in those historical conditions," but that as the situation had changed, it had become possible to effect the transition from capitalism to socialism "through the parliamentary road." In essence, this erroneous thesis is a clear revision of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state and revolution and a clear denial of the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution.

In his report, under the same pretext that "radical changes" had taken place in the world situation, Khrushchov also questioned the continued validity of Lenin's teachings on imperialism and on war and peace, and in fact tampered with Lenin's teachings.

Khrushchov pictured the U.S. Government and its head as people resisting the forces of war, and not as representatives of the imperialist forces of war. He said, ". . . the advocates of settling outstanding issues by means of war still hold strong positions there [in the United States]," and ". . . they continue to exert big pressure on the President and the Administration." He went on to say that the imperialists were beginning to admit that the positions-of-strength policy had failed and that "symptoms of a certain sobering up are appearing" among them. It was as much as saying that it was possible for the U.S. Government and its head not to represent the interests of U.S. monopolistic capital and

for them to abandon their policies of war and aggression and that they had become forces defending peace.

Khrushchov declared: "We want to be friends with the United States and to co-operate with it for peace and international security and also in the economic and cultural spheres." This wrong view later developed into the line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the settlement of world problems."

Distorting Lenin's correct principle of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, Khrushchov declared that peaceful coexistence was the "general line of the foreign policy" of the U.S.S.R. This amounted to excluding from the general line of foreign policy of the socialist countries their mutual assistance and co-operation as well as assistance by them to the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, or to subordinating all this to the policy of so-called "peaceful coexistence."

The questions raised by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. at the 20th Congress, and especially the questions of Stalin and of "peaceful transition," are by no means simply internal affairs of the C.P.S.U.; they are vital issues of common interest for all fraternal Parties. Without any prior consultation with the fraternal Parties, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. drew arbitrary conclusions; it forced the fraternal Parties to accept a *fait accompli* and, on the pretext of "combating the personality cult," crudely interfered in the internal affairs of fraternal Parties and countries and subverted their leaderships, thus pushing its policy of sectarianism and splittism in the international communist movement.

Subsequent developments show with increasing clarity that the revision and betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism by the leaders of the C.P.S.U. have grown out of the above errors.

The C.P.C. has always differed in principle in its view of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., and the leading comrades of the C.P.S.U. are well aware of this. Yet the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. asserts that the Communist Party of China previously gave the 20th Congress full support, that we "have made a 180-degree turn" in our evaluation of the 20th Congress, and that our position is full of "vacillations and waverings" and is "false."

It is impossible for the leadership of the C.P.S.U. to shut out the heavens with one palm. Let the facts speak for themselves.

On many occasions in internal discussions after the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., leading comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. solemnly criticized the errors of the C.P.S.U. leadership.

**In April 1956, less than two months after the 20th Congress, in conversations both with Comrade Mikoyan, Member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., and with the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung expressed our views on the question of Stalin. He emphasized that Stalin's "merits outweighed his faults" and that it was necessary to "make a concrete analysis" and "an all-round evaluation" of Stalin.**

**On October 23, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out,**



"Stalin deserves to be criticized, but we do not agree with the method of criticism, and there are some other matters we do not agree with."

On November 30, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung again pointed out that the basic policy and line during the period when Stalin was in power were correct and that methods that are used against enemies must not be used against one's comrades.

Both Comrade Liu Shao-chi in his conversation with leaders of the C.P.S.U. in October 1956, and Comrade Chou En-lai in his conversations on October 1, 1956, with the delegation of the C.P.S.U. to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.C. and on January 18, 1957, with leaders of the C.P.S.U., also expressed our views on the question of Stalin, and both criticized the errors of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. as consisting chiefly of "total lack of an overall analysis" of Stalin, "lack of self-criticism" and "failure to consult with the fraternal Parties in advance."

In internal discussions with comrades of the C.P.S.U., leading comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. also stated where we differed on the question of peaceful transition. Furthermore, in November 1957 the Central Committee of the C.P.C. presented the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. with a written "Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition," comprehensively and clearly explaining the viewpoint of the C.P.C.

In their many internal discussions with comrades of the C.P.S.U., leading comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. also systematically set forth our views on the international situation and the strategy of the international communist movement, with direct reference to the errors of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

These are plain facts. How can the leadership of the C.P.S.U. obliterate them by bare-faced lying?

Attempting to conceal these important facts, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. in its open letter quotes out of context public statements by Comrades Mao Tse-tung, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping to show that at one time the Chinese Communist Party completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. This is futile.

The fact is that at no time and in no place did the Chinese Communist Party completely affirm the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., agree with the complete negation of Stalin or endorse the view of peaceful transition to socialism through the "parliamentary road."

Not long after the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., on April 5, 1956, we published "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"; then, on December 29, 1956, we published "More on the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." While refuting the anti-communist slanders of the imperialists and reactionaries, these two articles made an all-round analysis of the life of Stalin, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, summed up the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and tactfully but unequivocally criticized the erroneous propositions of the 20th Congress. Is this not a widely known fact?

Since the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., the Chinese Communist Party has continued to display the portrait of Stalin along with those of the other great revolutionary leaders, Marx, Engels and Lenin. Is not this, too, a widely known fact?

It needs to be said, of course, that for the sake of unity against the enemy and out of consideration for the difficult position the leaders of the C.P.S.U. were then in, we refrained in those days from open criticism of the errors of the 20th Congress, because the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries were exploiting these errors and carrying on frenzied activities against the Soviet Union, against communism and against the people, and also because the leaders of the C.P.S.U. had not yet departed as far from Marxism-Leninism as they did later. We fervently hoped at the time that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. would put their errors right. Consequently, we invariably endeavoured to seek out positive aspects and on public occasions gave them whatever support was appropriate and necessary.

Even so, by stressing positive lessons and principles in their public speeches, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. explained our position with regard to the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. asserts that in his political report to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.C., Comrade Liu Shao-chi completely affirmed the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. But it was in this very report that Comrade Liu Shao-chi spoke on the lessons of the Chinese revolution and explained that the road of "peaceful transition" was wrong and impracticable.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. asserts that in his report to the Eighth Congress of the C.P.C. on the revision of the Party Constitution, Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping completely affirmed the "combat against the personality cult" conducted at the 20th Congress. But it was in this very report that Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping discussed at some length democratic centralism in the Party and the interrelationship between leaders and masses, explained the consistent and correct style of work of our Party, and thus in effect criticized the error of the 20th Congress concerning "combating the personality cult."

Is there anything wrong in the way we acted? Have we not done exactly what a Marxist-Leninist party ought to do by persevering in principle and upholding unity?

How can this consistently correct attitude of the Chinese Communist Party towards the 20th Congress be described as full of "vacillations and waverings," as "false" and as representing "a 180-degree turn"?

In making these charges against us in the open letter, perhaps the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. thought it could deny the criticisms we made because they were known only to a few leaders of the C.P.S.U., and that it could use falsehoods to deceive the broad masses of the membership of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet people. But does this not prove its own falseness?

### **The Serious Consequences of the 20th Congress Of the C.P.S.U.**

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. loudly proclaims the "wonderful" and "majestic results" of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

But history cannot be altered. People not suffering from too short a memory will recall that by its errors the

20th Congress produced not "wonderful" or "majestic results" but a discrediting of the Soviet Union, of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of socialism and communism, and gave an opportunity to the imperialists, the reactionaries and all the other enemies of communism, with extremely serious consequences for the international communist movement.

After the congress, swollen with arrogance the imperialists and reactionaries everywhere stirred up a worldwide tidal wave against the Soviet Union, against communism and against the people. The U.S. imperialists saw the all-out attack on Stalin by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. as something that was "never so suited to our purposes," they talked openly about using Khrushchov's secret report as a "weapon with which to destroy the prestige and influence of the communist movement" and they took the opportunity to advocate "peaceful transformation" in the Soviet Union.

The Titoites became most aggressive. Flaunting their reactionary slogan of "anti-Stalinism," they wildly attacked the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. They declared that the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. "created sufficient elements" for the "new course" which Yugoslavia had started and that "the question now is whether this course will win or the course of Stalinism will win again."

Those enemies of communism, the Trotskyites, who had been in desperate straits, feverishly resumed activity. In its *Manifesto to the Workers and Peoples of the Entire World* the so-called Fourth International said, "Today, when the Kremlin leaders are themselves admitting the crimes of Stalin, they implicitly recognize that the indefatigable struggle carried on . . . by the world Trotskyist movement against the degeneration of the workers' state, was fully justified."

The errors of the 20th Congress brought great ideological confusion in the international communist movement and caused it to be deluged with revisionist ideas. Along with the imperialists, the reactionaries and the Tito clique, renegades from communism in many countries attacked Marxism-Leninism and the international communist movement.

Most striking among the events which took place during this period were the incident in Soviet-Polish relations and the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary. The two events were different in character. But the leadership of the C.P.S.U. made grave errors in both. By moving up troops in an attempt to subdue the Polish comrades by armed force it committed the error of great-power chauvinism. And at the critical moment when the Hungarian counter-revolutionaries had occupied Budapest, for a time it intended to adopt a policy of capitulation and abandon socialist Hungary to counter-revolution.

These errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. inflated the arrogance of all the enemies of communism, created serious difficulties for many fraternal Parties and caused the international communist movement great damage.

In the face of this situation, the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Parties persevering in Marxism-Leninism firmly demanded repulsing the assaults of impe-

rialism and reaction and safeguarding the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We insisted on the taking of all necessary measures to smash the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary and firmly opposed the abandonment of socialist Hungary. We insisted that in the handling of problems between fraternal Parties and countries correct principles should be followed so as to strengthen the unity of the socialist camp, and we firmly opposed the erroneous methods of great-power chauvinism. At the same time, we made very great efforts to safeguard the prestige of the C.P.S.U.

At that time the leaders of the C.P.S.U. accepted our suggestion and on October 30, 1956, issued the Soviet Government's "Declaration on the Foundations of the Development and Further Strengthening of Friendship and Co-operation Between the Soviet Union and Other Socialist Countries," in which they examined some of their own past mistakes in handling their relations with fraternal countries. On November 1, the Chinese Government issued a statement expressing support for the Soviet Government's declaration.

All this we did in the interests of the international communist movement, and also in order to persuade the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to draw the proper lessons and correct their errors in good time and not slide farther away from Marxism-Leninism. But subsequent events showed that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. nursed rancour against us and regarded the C.P.C. and its perseverance in proletarian internationalism as the biggest obstacle to their wrong line.

### **The 1957 Moscow Meeting of Fraternal Parties**

The 1957 Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties took place in Moscow after the repulse of the heavy attacks of the imperialists and the reactionaries of various countries on the international communist movement.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. says that the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. played a "tremendous role" in defining the general line of the international communist movement. The facts show the very reverse. The erroneous views of the 20th Congress on many important questions of principle were rejected and corrected by the 1957 meeting of fraternal Parties.

The well-known Declaration of 1957, adopted by the Moscow Meeting, summed up the experience of the international communist movement, set forth the common fighting tasks of all the Communist Parties, affirmed the universal significance of the road of the October Revolution, outlined the common laws governing socialist revolution and socialist construction and laid down the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries. The common line of the international communist movement which was thus worked out at the meeting embodies the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and is opposed to the erroneous views deviating from Marxism-Leninism which were advanced by the 20th Congress. The principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries laid down in the Declaration are concrete expressions of the principle of proletarian internationalism and stand opposed to the

great-power chauvinism and sectarianism of the leadership of the C.P.S.U.

The delegation of the C.P.C., which was headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung, did a great deal of work during the meeting. On the one hand, it had full consultations with the leaders of the C.P.S.U., and where necessary and appropriate waged struggle against them, in order to help them correct their errors; on the other hand, it held repeated exchanges of views with the leaders of other fraternal Parties in order that a common document acceptable to all might be worked out.

At this meeting, the chief subject of controversy between us and the delegation of the C.P.S.U. was the transition from capitalism to socialism. In their original draft of the Declaration the leadership of the C.P.S.U. insisted on the inclusion of the erroneous views of the 20th Congress on peaceful transition. The original draft said not a word about non-peaceful transition, mentioning only peaceful transition; moreover, it described peaceful transition as "securing a majority in parliament and transforming parliament from an instrument of the bourgeois dictatorship into an instrument of a genuine people's state power." In fact, it substituted the "parliamentary road" advocated by the opportunists of the Second International for the road of the October Revolution and tampered with the basic Marxist-Leninist theory on the state and revolution.

The Chinese Communist Party resolutely opposed the wrong views contained in the draft declaration submitted by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. We expressed our views on the two successive drafts put forward by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and made a considerable number of major changes of principle which we presented as our own revised draft. Repeated discussions were then held between the delegations of the Chinese and Soviet Parties on the basis of our revised draft before the "Joint Draft Declaration by the C.P.S.U. and the C.P.C." was submitted to the delegations of the other fraternal Parties for their opinions.

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the C.P.C. and the other fraternal Parties, the meeting finally adopted the present version of the Declaration, which contains two major changes on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism compared with the first draft put forward by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. First, while indicating the possibility of peaceful transition, the Declaration also points to the road of non-peaceful transition and stresses that "Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily." Secondly, while speaking of securing "a firm majority in parliament," the Declaration emphasizes the need to "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."

Despite these changes, the formulation in the Declaration on the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism was still unsatisfactory. We finally conceded the point only out of consideration for the repeatedly expressed wish of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. that the formulation should show some connection with that of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

However, we presented the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. with an outline of our views on the question of peaceful transition in which the views of the C.P.C. were explained comprehensively and clearly. The outline emphasizes the following:

**In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition.**

**They [the proletariat and the Communist Party] must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so).**

**To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible . . . or undependable. . . (See Appendix I)**

As a result of the common efforts of the delegations of the C.P.C. and the other fraternal Parties, the 1957 Declaration also corrected the erroneous views which the C.P.S.U. leadership had put forward at the 20th Congress on such questions as imperialism and war and peace, and it added many important points on a number of questions of principle. The main additions were: the thesis that U.S. imperialism is the centre of world reaction and the sworn enemy of the people; the thesis that if imperialism should unleash a world war it would doom itself to destruction; the common laws governing the socialist revolution and the building of socialism; the principle of combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in different countries; the formulation on the importance of applying dialectical materialism in practical work; the thesis that the seizure of political power by the working class is the beginning of the revolution and not its end; the thesis that it will take a fairly long time to solve the question of who will win — capitalism or socialism; the thesis that the existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source; and so on.

At the same time, the delegation of the C.P.C. made some necessary compromises. In addition to the formulation on the question of peaceful transition, we did not agree with the reference to the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. and suggested changes. But out of consideration for the difficult position of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. at the time, we did not insist on the changes.

Who could have imagined that these concessions which we made out of consideration for the larger interest would later be used by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. as an excuse for aggravating differences and creating a split in the international communist movement?

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. constantly equates the resolution of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. with the Declaration of 1957 in

its attempt to substitute the wrong line of the 20th Congress for the common line of the international communist movement. We have pointed out long ago, and deem it necessary to reiterate now, that in accordance with the principle that all fraternal Parties are independent and equal, no one is entitled to demand of fraternal Parties that they accept the resolutions of the congress of one Party or for that matter anything else; and the resolutions of a Party congress, whatever the Party, cannot be regarded as the common line of the international communist movement and have no binding force on other fraternal Parties. Only Marxism-Leninism and the documents unanimously agreed upon constitute the common code binding us and all fraternal Parties.

### **The Growth of the Revisionism of the C.P.S.U. Leadership**

After the Moscow Meeting of 1957 with its unanimously agreed Declaration, we hoped that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. would follow the line laid down in the Declaration and correct its errors. We regret to say that contrary to the expectations we and all other Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties entertained, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. perpetrated increasingly serious violations of the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries, and departed farther and farther from the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The revisionism of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. grew. This development aggravated the differences in the international communist movement and carried them to a new stage.

In complete disregard of the common conclusion of the 1957 Declaration that U.S. imperialism is the enemy of all the people of the world, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. passionately sought collaboration with U.S. imperialism and the settlement of world problems by the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States. Particularly around the time of the Camp David Talks in September 1959, Khrushchov lauded Eisenhower to the skies, hailing him as a man who "enjoys the absolute confidence of his people" and who "also worries about ensuring peace just as we do." Moreover, comrades of the C.P.S.U. energetically advertised the so-called "spirit of Camp David," whose existence Eisenhower himself denied, alleging that it marked "a new era in international relations" and "a turning-point in history."

Completely disregarding the revolutionary line of the 1957 Declaration, in statements by Khrushchov and in the Soviet press the leaders of the C.P.S.U. vigorously advocated their revisionist line of "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition," praised the "wisdom" and "goodwill" of the imperialists, preached that "a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars" could be brought into being while the greater part of the globe was still ruled and controlled by imperialism, and that universal and complete disarmament could "open up literally a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America," etc., etc.

The C.P.S.U. published many books and articles in which it tampered with the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism, emasculated their revolutionary spirit and propagated its revisionist views on a whole series of

important problems of principle in the fields of philosophy, political economy, socialist and communist theory, history, literature and art.

The leadership of the C.P.S.U. actively endeavoured to impose its erroneous views on the international democratic organizations and to change their correct lines. An outstanding case in point was the behaviour of the Soviet comrades at the Peking session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions in June 1960.

Completely disregarding the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries which were laid down in the 1957 Declaration, the leaders of the C.P.S.U., eager to curry favour with U.S. imperialism, engaged in unbridled activities against China. They regarded the Chinese Communist Party and its adherence to Marxism-Leninism as an obstacle to their revisionist line. They thought they had solved their internal problems and had "stabilized" their own position and could therefore step up their policy of "being friendly to enemies and tough with friends."

In 1958 the leadership of the C.P.S.U. put forward unreasonable demands designed to bring China under Soviet military control. These unreasonable demands were rightly and firmly rejected by the Chinese Government. Not long afterwards, in June 1959, the Soviet Government unilaterally tore up the agreement on new technology for national defence concluded between China and the Soviet Union in October 1957, and refused to provide China with a sample of an atomic bomb and technical data concerning its manufacture.

Then, on the eve of Khrushchov's visit to the United States, ignoring China's repeated objections the leadership of the C.P.S.U. rushed out the TASS statement of September 9 on the Sino-Indian border incident, siding with the Indian reactionaries. In this way, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. brought the differences between China and the Soviet Union right into the open before the whole world.

The tearing up of the agreement on new technology for national defence by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and its issuance of the statement on the Sino-Indian border clash on the eve of Khrushchov's visit to the United States were ceremonial gifts to Eisenhower so as to curry favour with the U.S. imperialists and create the so-called "spirit of Camp David."

The leaders of the C.P.S.U. and Soviet publications also levelled many virulent attacks on the domestic and foreign policies of the Chinese Communist Party. These attacks were almost invariably led by Khrushchov in person. He insinuated that China's socialist construction was "skipping over a stage" and was "equalitarian communism" and that China's people's communes were "in essence reactionary." By innuendo he maligned China as warlike, guilty of "adventurism," and so on and so forth. Back from the Camp David Talks, he went so far as to try to sell China the U.S. plot of "two Chinas" and, at the state banquet celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, he read China a lecture against "testing by force the stability of the capitalist system."

The line of revisionism and splittism pursued by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. created serious confusion in

the ranks of the international communist movement. It seemed as though U.S. imperialism had ceased to be the most ferocious enemy of the people of the world. Eisenhower was welcomed by certain Communists as a "peace envoy." Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957 seemed to be outmoded.

In the circumstances, in order to defend Marxism-Leninism and the 1957 Declaration and clear up the ideological confusion in the international communist movement, the Communist Party of China published "Long Live Leninism!" and two other articles in April 1960. In our consistent stand of persevering in principle and upholding unity, we concentrated on explaining the revolutionary theses of the 1957 Declaration and the fundamental Marxist-Leninist theories on imperialism, war and peace, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The views in these three articles were totally different from the series of erroneous views being propagated by the leaders of the C.P.S.U. However, for the sake of the larger interest, we refrained from publicly criticizing the comrades of the C.P.S.U. and directed the spearhead of struggle against the imperialists and the Yugoslav revisionists.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. spends much energy distorting and attacking "Long Live Leninism!" and the two other articles, but is unable to support its attacks with any convincing arguments. We should like to put this question: In those circumstances, should we have kept silent on the wrong views and fatuous arguments which had become current? Did we not have the right, and indeed the duty, to come forward in defence of Marxism-Leninism and the Declaration of 1957?

### **The Surprise Assault on the C.P.C. by the Leadership of the C.P.S.U.**

A week after the publication of "Long Live Leninism!" and our two other articles, an American U-2 plane intruded into Soviet air space and the United States aborted the four-power summit conference. The "spirit of Camp David" completely vanished. Thus events entirely confirmed our views.

In the face of the arch enemy, it was imperative for the Communist Parties of China and the Soviet Union and the fraternal Parties of the whole world to eliminate their differences, strengthen their unity and wage a common struggle against the enemy. But that was not what happened. In the summer of 1960 there was a widening of the differences in the international communist movement, a large-scale campaign was launched against the C.P.C., and the leadership of the C.P.S.U. extended the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In early June 1960 the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. made the proposal that the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party to be held in Bucharest later in June should be taken as an opportunity for representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all the socialist countries to meet and exchange views on the international situation following the miscarriage of the four-power summit conference caused by the

United States. The Chinese Communist Party did not approve of this idea of a hasty meeting nor of the idea of a representative meeting of the Parties of the socialist countries alone. We made the positive proposal that there should be a meeting of representatives of all the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world and maintained that adequate preparations were necessary to make that meeting a success. Our proposal was agreed to by the C.P.S.U. The two Parties thereupon agreed that, in preparation for the international meeting, the representatives of the fraternal Parties attending the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party could provisionally exchange views on the date and place for the meeting, but not take any decision.

At Bucharest, to our amazement, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. went back on their word and unleashed a surprise assault on the Chinese Communist Party, turning the spearhead of struggle against us and not against U.S. imperialism.

The Bucharest meeting of representatives of fraternal Parties took place from June 24 to June 26. It is a plain lie for the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. to describe that meeting as "comradely assistance" to the Chinese Communist Party.

Indeed, on the eve of the meeting, the delegation of the C.P.S.U. headed by Khrushchov distributed among the representatives of some fraternal Parties, and read out to those of others, a Letter of Information dated June 21 from the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. to the Central Committee of the C.P.C. This Letter of Information groundlessly slandered and attacked the C.P.C. all along the line; it constituted a programme for the anti-China campaign which was launched by the leadership of the C.P.S.U.

In the meeting, Khrushchov took the lead in organizing a great converging onslaught on the Chinese Communist Party. In his speech, he wantonly vilified the Chinese Communist Party as "madmen," "wanting to unleash war," "picking up the banner of the imperialist monopoly capitalists," being "pure nationalist" on the Sino-Indian boundary question and employing "Trotskyite ways" against the C.P.S.U. Some of the fraternal Party representatives who obeyed Khrushchov and followed his lead also wantonly charged the C.P.C. with being "dogmatic," "Left adventurist," "pseudo-revolutionary," "sectarian," "worse than Yugoslavia," and so on and so forth.

The anti-China campaign launched by Khrushchov at this meeting also came as a surprise to many fraternal Parties. The representatives of a number of Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties took exception to the wrong action of the leadership of the C.P.S.U.

At this meeting, the delegation of the Albanian Party of Labour refused to obey the baton of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and firmly opposed their sectarian activities. Consequently the leaders of the C.P.S.U. regarded the Albanian Party of Labour as a thorn in their flesh. Whereupon they took increasingly drastic steps against the Albanian Party.

Can this dastardly attack on the C.P.C. launched by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. be called "comradely as-

sistance"? Of course not. It was a pre-arranged anti-China performance staged by the leadership of the C.P.S.U.: it was a serious and crude violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the 1957 Declaration; it was a large-scale attack on a Marxist-Leninist party by the revisionists, represented by the leaders of the C.P.S.U.

In the circumstances, the Communist Party of China waged a tit-for-tat struggle against the leadership of the C.P.S.U. in defence of the positions of Marxism-Leninism and the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the Declaration. For the sake of the larger interest, the delegation of the C.P.C. in Bucharest signed the Communiqué on the meeting, and at the same time, on June 26, 1960, distributed a written statement upon the instructions of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. In this statement, the delegation of the C.P.C. pointed out that Khrushchov's behaviour at the Bucharest meeting created an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. It solemnly declared:

**"There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchov on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism." "The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any one individual." "... our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous views which run counter to Marxism-Leninism." (See Appendix II.)**

The leaders of the C.P.S.U. did not reconcile themselves to their failure to subdue the Chinese Communist Party in Bucharest. Immediately after the Bucharest meeting, they brought more pressure to bear on China by taking a number of steps to extend the ideological differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to the sphere of state relations.

In July the Soviet Government suddenly unilaterally decided to recall all the Soviet experts in China within one month, thereby tearing up hundreds of agreements and contracts. The Soviet side unilaterally scrapped the agreement on the publication of the magazine *Druzhba* (Friendship) by China in the Soviet Union and of *Su Chung You Hao* (Soviet-Chinese Friendship) by the Soviet Union in China and their distribution on reciprocal terms; it took the unwarranted step of demanding the recall by the Chinese Government of a staff member of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union; and it provoked the troubles on the Sino-Soviet border.

Apparently the leaders of the C.P.S.U. imagined that once they waved their baton, gathered a group of hatchmen to make a converging assault, and applied immense political and economic pressures, they could force the Chinese Communist Party to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand and submit to their revisionist and great-power chauvinist behests. But the tempered and long-tested Chinese Communist Party and Chinese people could be neither vanquished nor subdued. Those who tried to subjugate us by engineering a converging assault and applying pressures completely miscalculated.

We shall leave the details of the way the leadership of the C.P.S.U. sabotaged Sino-Soviet relations for other

articles. Here we shall simply point out that on the subject of Sino-Soviet relations, the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. falsely charges China with extending the ideological differences to the sphere of state relations and with reducing trade between the two countries, while deliberately concealing the fact that the Soviet Government withdrew all its experts from China and unilaterally tore up hundreds of agreements and contracts, and that it was these unilateral Soviet actions which made Sino-Soviet trade shrink. For the leadership of the C.P.S.U. to deceive its members and the Soviet people in such a bare-faced way is truly sad.

### **The Struggle Between the Two Lines at the 1960 Meeting of Fraternal Parties**

In the latter half of 1960, a sharp struggle developed in the international communist movement around the meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. It was a struggle between the line of Marxism-Leninism and the line of revisionism and between the policy of persevering in principle and upholding unity and the policy of abandoning principle and creating splits.

It had become evident before the meeting that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was stubbornly persisting in its wrong stand and was endeavouring to impose its wrong line on the international communist movement.

The Chinese Communist Party was keenly aware of the gravity of the differences. In the interests of the international communist movement we made many efforts, hoping that the leadership of the C.P.S.U. would not proceed too far down the wrong path.

On September 10, 1960, the Central Committee of the C.P.C. replied to the June 21 Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. In its reply which set forth the facts and reasoned things out, the Central Committee of the C.P.C. systematically explained its views on a series of important questions of principle concerning the world situation and the international communist movement, refuted the attacks of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. on us, criticized its wrong views and put forward to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. five positive proposals for settling the differences and attaining unity (for the five proposals, see Appendix III).

The Central Committee of the C.P.C. subsequently sent a delegation to Moscow in September for talks with the delegation of the C.P.S.U. During these talks, the delegation of the C.P.C. pointed out that, while prettifying U.S. imperialism, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was actively vilifying China and extending the ideological differences between the two Parties to state relations, and was thus treating enemies as brothers and brothers as enemies. Again and again the delegation of the C.P.C. urged the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to change their wrong stand, return to the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries, and strengthen the unity between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and between the two countries in order to fight the common enemy. However, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. showed not the slightest intention of correcting their errors.

Thus a sharp struggle became inevitable. This struggle first unfolded in the Drafting Committee, attended by the representatives of 26 fraternal Parties, which prepared the documents for the meeting of fraternal Parties, and later grew to unprecedented acuteness at the meeting of the representatives of 81 fraternal Parties.

In the meetings of the Drafting Committee in Moscow during October, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. attempted to force through their own draft statement, which contained a whole string of erroneous views. As a result of principled struggle by the delegations of the C.P.C. and some other fraternal Parties, the Drafting Committee after heated debates made many important changes of principle in the draft statement put forward by the C.P.S.U. The committee reached agreement on most of the draft. However, in their determination to continue the debate, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. refused to arrive at agreement on several important points at issue in the draft and, moreover, on Khrushchov's return from New York, even scrapped the agreements which had already been reached on some questions.

The Meeting of the Representatives of the 81 Fraternal Parties was held in Moscow in November 1960. Ignoring the desire of the Chinese and many other delegations to eliminate the differences and strengthen unity, on the eve of the meeting the leadership of the C.P.S.U. distributed among the representatives of the fraternal Parties gathered in Moscow a letter of more than sixty thousand words, which attacked the Chinese Communist Party more savagely than ever, thus provoking still sharper controversy.

Such was the most unnatural atmosphere in which the Meeting of the Representatives of the 81 Fraternal Parties was held. By their base conduct, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. brought the meeting to the brink of rupture. But the meeting finally reached agreement and achieved positive results, because the delegations of the Chinese Communist Party and some other fraternal Parties stuck to principle, persevered in struggle and upheld unity, and because the majority of the delegations of the fraternal Parties demanded unity and were against a split.

In its open letter, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. declares that the delegation of the C.P.C. at this meeting "signed the Statement only when the danger arose of its full isolation." This is another lie.

What was the actual state of affairs?

It is true that, both before and during the meeting, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. engineered converging assaults on the Chinese Communist Party by a number of representatives of fraternal Parties, and relying on a so-called majority attempted to bring the delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist parties to their knees and compel them to accept its revisionist line and views. However, the attempts to impose things on others met with failure, both in the Drafting Committee of the 26 fraternal Parties and in the Meeting of the Representatives of the 81 Fraternal Parties.

The fact remains that many of the wrong theses they put forward in their draft statement were rejected. Here are some examples:

The wrong thesis of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. that peaceful coexistence and economic competition form the general line of the foreign policy of the socialist countries was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that the emergence of a new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is the result of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis that there is a growing possibility of peaceful transition was rejected.

Its wrong thesis about opposing the policy of "going it alone" on the part of the socialist countries, which in effect meant opposing the policy of their relying mainly on themselves in construction, was rejected.

Its wrong thesis concerning opposition to so-called "cliquish activities" and "factional activities" in the international communist movement was rejected. In effect this thesis meant demanding that fraternal Parties should obey its baton, liquidating the principles of independence and equality in relations among fraternal Parties, and replacing the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation by the practice of subduing the minority by the majority.

Its wrong thesis underestimating the serious danger of modern revisionism was rejected.

The fact remains that many correct views on important principles set forth by the delegations of the Chinese and other fraternal Parties were written into the Statement. The theses on the unaltered nature of imperialism; on U.S. imperialism as the enemy of the people of the whole world; on the formation of the most extensive united front against U.S. imperialism; on the national-liberation movement as a significant force in preventing world war; on the thoroughgoing completion by the newly independent countries of their national democratic revolutions; on support by the socialist countries and the international working-class movement for the national-liberation struggle; on the need for the working class and the masses in certain advanced capitalist countries under U.S. imperialist political, economic and military domination to direct their chief blows at U.S. imperialist domination and also at the monopoly capital and other reactionary forces at home which betray their national interests; on the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal Parties; against the revisionist emasculation of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism-Leninism; on the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia; and so on—all these theses are present in the Statement as a result of the acceptance of the views of the Chinese and some other delegations.

It is, of course, necessary to add that after the leaders of the C.P.S.U. agreed to drop their erroneous propositions and accepted the correct propositions of other Parties, the delegations of the C.P.C. and some other fraternal Parties also made certain concessions. For instance, we differed on the questions of the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. and of the forms of transition from capitalism to socialism, but out of consideration for the needs of the C.P.S.U. and certain other fraternal Parties we agreed to the inclusion of the same wording on these two questions as that used in the 1957 Declaration. But we made

it plain at the time to the leaders of the C.P.S.U. that this would be the last time we accommodated ourselves to such a formulation about the 20th Congress; we would never do so again.

From all the above it can be seen that the struggle between the two lines in the international communist movement dominated the 1960 Moscow Meeting from beginning to end. The errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. as revealed at this meeting had developed further. From the draft statement of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and their speeches during the meeting, it could be clearly seen that the main political content of the wrong line they were attempting to impose on the fraternal Parties consisted of the erroneous theories of "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition," while its organizational content consisted of erroneous, sectarian and splitting policies. It was a revisionist line in fundamental conflict with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The delegations of the Chinese and other Marxist-Leninist parties resolutely opposed it and firmly upheld the line of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The outcome of the struggle at this meeting was that the revisionist line and views of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. were in the main repudiated and that the Marxist-Leninist line gained a great victory. The revolutionary principles embodied in the Statement adopted at the meeting are powerful weapons in the hands of all fraternal Parties in the struggles against imperialism and for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; they are also powerful weapons in the hands of Marxist-Leninists throughout the world in combating modern revisionism.

At the meeting the fraternal Parties which upheld Marxism-Leninism earnestly criticized the erroneous views of the C.P.S.U. leadership and compelled it to accept many of their correct views; in doing so they changed the previous highly abnormal situation, in which not even the slightest criticism of the errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. was tolerated and its word was final. This was an event of great historical significance in the international communist movement.

The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. asserts in its open letter that the delegation of the C.P.C. was "completely isolated" at the meeting. This is merely an impudent attempt on the part of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. to represent its defeat as a victory.

The principles of mutual solidarity as well as independence and equality among fraternal Parties and of reaching unanimity through consultation were observed at the meeting and the mistaken attempt of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to use a majority to overrule the minority and to impose their views on other fraternal Parties was frustrated. The meeting demonstrated once again that in resolving differences among fraternal Parties it is most necessary for Marxist-Leninist parties to stick to principle, persevere in struggle and uphold unity.

### **The Revisionism of the C.P.S.U. Leadership Becomes Systematized**

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. asserts that "the C.P.C. leaders were only ma-

noeuving when they affixed their signatures to the Statement of 1960." Is that really a fact? No. On the contrary, it was the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and not we who were manoeuvring.

The facts have shown that at the 1960 meeting the leaders of the C.P.S.U. agreed to delete or change the erroneous propositions in their draft statement against their will and they were insincere in their acceptance of the correct propositions of fraternal Parties. They did not care two hoots about the document which was jointly agreed upon by the fraternal Parties. The ink was scarcely dry on their signature to the 1960 Statement before they began wrecking it. On December 1 Khrushchov signed the Statement on behalf of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and 24 hours later, violating what the fraternal Parties had agreed on, the same Khrushchov brazenly described Yugoslavia as a socialist country at the banquet for the delegations of the fraternal Parties.

After the meeting of the 81 fraternal Parties, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. became more and more blatant in wrecking the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement. On the one hand, they took as their friend U.S. imperialism which the Statement declares to be the enemy of the people of the world, advocating "U.S.-Soviet co-operation" and expressing the desire to work together with Kennedy to "set about building durable bridges of confidence, mutual understanding and friendship." On the other hand, they took some fraternal Parties and countries as their enemies and drastically worsened the Soviet Union's relations with Albania.

The 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. in October 1961 marked a new low in the C.P.S.U. leadership's efforts to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the socialist camp and the international communist movement. It marked the systematization of the revisionism which the leadership of the C.P.S.U. had developed step by step from the 20th Congress onward.

The leadership of the C.P.S.U. unleashed a great public attack on the Albanian Party of Labour at the 22nd Congress. In his speech Khrushchov went so far as openly to call for the overthrow of the Albanian leadership under Comrades Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu. Thus the leadership of the C.P.S.U. established the vicious precedent of a Party congress being used for public attacks on other fraternal Parties.

Another important thing the leadership of the C.P.S.U. did at the congress was the renewed concentrated onslaught on Stalin five years after the complete negation of him at the 20th Congress and eight years after his death.

In the final analysis, this was done in order to enable the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to throw the Declaration and the Statement overboard, oppose Marxism-Leninism and pursue a systematically revisionist line.

Their revisionism was expressed in concentrated form in the new Programme of the C.P.S.U. which that congress adopted.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. says that the line of the 22nd Congress was "approved at the meetings of representatives of the Communist Parties and reflected in the Declaration and Statement." Is it not very careless of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to make such a statement? How can they de-



scribe what happened in 1961 as having been "approved" or "reflected" at the meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960, or as far back as that in 1957?

But leaving such silly self-commendation aside for the moment, let us first see the kind of stuff the Programme adopted at the 22nd Congress is made of.

Even a cursory study of the Programme and the report on it made by Khrushchov shows that it is an out-and-out revisionist programme which totally violates the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement.

It runs counter to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement on many important questions of principle. Many of the erroneous views of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. which were rejected at the 1960 meeting of fraternal Parties reappear. For instance, it describes peaceful coexistence as the general principle of foreign policy, one-sidedly stresses the possibility of peaceful transition and slanders the policy of a socialist country's relying mainly on its own efforts in construction as "going it alone."

The Programme goes a step further in systematizing the wrong line pursued by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. since its 20th Congress, the main content of which is "peaceful coexistence," "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition."

The Programme crudely revises the essence of Marxism-Leninism, namely, its teachings on proletarian revolution, on the dictatorship of the proletariat and on the party of the proletariat, declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer needed in the Soviet Union and that the nature of the C.P.S.U. as the vanguard of the proletariat has changed, and advancing preposterous theories of a "state of the whole people" and a "party of the entire people."

It substitutes humanism for the Marxist-Leninist theory of class struggle and substitutes the bourgeois slogans of "freedom," "equality" and "fraternity" for the ideals of communism.

It is a programme which opposes revolution on the part of the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, and opposes the carrying of revolution through to completion on the part of the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population. It is a revisionist programme for the preservation or restoration of capitalism.

The Communist Party of China resolutely opposed the errors of the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. Comrade Chou En-lai, who headed the delegation of the C.P.C. to the congress, stated our Party's position in his speech there, and he also frankly criticized the errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. in subsequent conversations with Khrushchov and other leaders of the C.P.S.U.

In his conversation with the delegation of the C.P.C., Khrushchov flatly turned down our criticisms and advice and even expressed undisguised support for anti-Party elements in the Chinese Communist Party. He openly stated that after the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., when the leaders of the C.P.S.U. were beginning to take a "road different from that of Stalin" (that is, when they were be-

ginning to take the road of revisionism), they had still needed the support of the fraternal Parties. He said, "The voice of the Chinese Communist Party was then of great significance to us," but "things are different now," and "we are doing well" and "we shall go our own way."

Khrushchov's remarks showed that the leaders of the C.P.S.U. had made up their minds to go all the way down the road of revisionism and splitting. Although the Chinese Communist Party has frequently given them comradely advice, they have simply ignored it and shown not the slightest intention of mending their ways.

### **An Adverse Current That Is Opposed to Marxism-Leninism and Is Splitting the International Communist Movement**

In the open letter the leaders of the C.P.S.U. try hard to make people believe that after the 22nd Congress they "undertook new attempts" to improve relations between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to strengthen unity among the fraternal Parties and countries.

This is another lie.

What are the facts?

They show that since the 22nd Congress the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has become more unbridled in violating the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries and in pursuing policies of great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism in order to promote its own line of systematic revisionism, which is in complete violation of Marxism-Leninism. This has brought about a continuous deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations and grave damage to the unity of the fraternal Parties and countries.

The following are the main facts about how the leaders of the C.P.S.U. have sabotaged Sino-Soviet unity and the unity of fraternal Parties and countries since the 22nd Congress:

1. The leaders of the C.P.S.U. have tried hard to impose their erroneous line upon the international communist movement and to replace the Declaration and the Statement with their own revisionist programme. They describe their erroneous line as the "whole set of Leninist policies of the international communist movement of recent years," and they call their revisionist programme the "real Communist Manifesto of our time" and the "common programme" of the "Communist and Workers' Parties and of the people of the countries in the socialist community."

Any fraternal Party which rejects the erroneous line and programme of the C.P.S.U. and perseveres in the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement is looked upon as an enemy by the leaders of the C.P.S.U., who oppose, attack and injure it and try to subvert its leadership by every possible means.

2. Disregarding everything, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. broke off diplomatic relations with socialist Albania, an unprecedented step in the history of relations between fraternal Parties and countries.

3. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. has continued to exert pressure on China and to make outrageous attacks

on the Chinese Communist Party. In its letter of February 22, 1962, to the Central Committee of the C.P.C., the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. accused the C.P.C. of taking a "special stand of their own" and pursuing a line at variance with the common course of the fraternal Parties, and even made a crime out of our support for the Marxist-Leninist Albanian Party of Labour. As preconditions for improving Sino-Soviet relations, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. attempted to compel the C.P.C. to abandon its Marxist-Leninist and proletarian internationalist stand, abandon its consistent line, which is in full conformity with the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement, accept their erroneous line, and also accept as a *fait accompli* their violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties and countries. In its open letter, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. boasted of its letters to the Central Committee of the C.P.C. during this period, of Khrushchov's remarks about his desire for unity in October 1962 to our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and so on, but in fact these were all acts for realizing their base attempt.

4. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. rejected the proposal made by the fraternal Parties of Indonesia, Viet Nam, New Zealand, etc., that a meeting of representatives of the fraternal Parties should be convened, as well as the five positive proposals made by the Central Committee of the C.P.C. in its letter of April 7, 1962, to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. for the preparation for a meeting of fraternal Parties. In its reply of May 30, 1962, to the Central Committee of the C.P.C., the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. went so far as to make the demand that the Albanian comrades abandon their own stand as a precondition for improving Soviet-Albanian relations and also for convening a meeting of the fraternal Parties.

5. In April and May 1962 the leaders of the C.P.S.U. used their organs and personnel in Sinkiang, China, to carry out large-scale subversive activities in the Ili region and enticed and coerced several tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests and made repeated representations, but the Soviet Government refused to repatriate these Chinese citizens on the pretext of the "sense of Soviet legality" and "humanitarianism." To this day this incident remains unsettled. This is indeed an astounding event, unheard of in the relations between socialist countries.

6. In August 1962 the Soviet Government formally notified China that the Soviet Union would conclude an agreement with the United States on the prevention of nuclear proliferation. This was a joint Soviet-U.S. plot to monopolize nuclear weapons and an attempt to deprive China of the right to possess nuclear weapons to resist the U.S. nuclear threat. The Chinese Government lodged repeated protests against this.

7. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. has become increasingly anxious to strike political bargains with U.S. imperialism and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Kennedy, even at the expense of the interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. An outstanding example was the fact that, during the Caribbean crisis, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. committed the error of capitulationism by submitting to the nuclear blackmail of the U.S. imperialists and accept-

ing the U.S. Government's demand for "international inspection" in violation of Cuban sovereignty.

8. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. has become increasingly anxious to collude with the Indian reactionaries and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with Nehru against socialist China. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. and its press openly sided with Indian reaction, condemned China for its just stand on the Sino-Indian border conflict and defended the Nehru government. Two-thirds of Soviet economic aid to India have been given since the Indian reactionaries provoked the Sino-Indian border conflict. Even after large-scale armed conflict on the Sino-Indian border began in the autumn of 1962, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has continued to extend military aid to the Indian reactionaries.

9. The leadership of the C.P.S.U. has become increasingly anxious to collude with the Tito clique of Yugoslavia and has been bent on forming a reactionary alliance with the renegade Tito to oppose all Marxist-Leninist parties. After the 22nd Congress, it took a series of steps to reverse the verdict on the Tito clique and thus openly tore up the 1960 Statement.

10. Since November 1962 the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has launched still fiercer attacks, on an international scale, against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties and whipped up a new adverse current in order to split the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Khrushchov made one statement after another and the Soviet press carried hundreds of articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party on a whole set of issues. Directed by the leaders of the C.P.S.U., the congresses of the fraternal Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Italy and the Democratic Republic of Germany became stages for anti-China performances, and more than forty fraternal Parties published resolutions, statements or articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The facts cited above cannot possibly be denied by the leaders of the C.P.S.U. These iron-clad facts prove that the "new attempts" they made after the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. were aimed, not at improving Sino-Soviet relations and strengthening unity between the fraternal Parties and countries, but on the contrary, at further ganging up with the U.S. imperialists, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique in order to create a wider split in the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

In these grave circumstances, the Chinese Communist Party had no alternative but to make open replies to the attacks of some fraternal Parties. Between December 15, 1962, and March 8, 1963, we published seven such replies. In these articles we continued to leave some leeway and did not criticize the leadership of the C.P.S.U. by name.

Despite the serious deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations resulting from the errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U., the Chinese Communist Party agreed to send its delegation to Moscow for the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties, and, in order that there might be a systematic exchange of views in the talks, put forward its proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement in its letter of reply to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. dated June 14.

As subsequent facts have shown, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. were not only insincere about eliminating differences and strengthening unity, but used the talks as a smokescreen for covering up their activities to further worsen Sino-Soviet relations.

On the eve of the talks, the leaders of the C.P.S.U. publicly attacked the Chinese Communist Party by name, through statements and resolutions. At the same time, they unjustifiably expelled a number of Chinese embassy personnel and research students from the Soviet Union.

On July 14, that is, on the eve of the U.S.-British-Soviet talks, while the Sino-Soviet talks were still in progress, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. hastily published the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. to Party organizations and all Communists in the Soviet Union and launched unbridled attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. This was another precious ceremonial gift made by the leaders of the C.P.S.U. to the U.S. imperialists in order to curry favour with them.

Immediately afterwards in Moscow, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. signed the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain in open betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people, the people in the socialist camp including the Chinese people, and the peace-loving people of the world; there was a flurry of contacts between the Soviet Union and India; Khrushchov went to Yugoslavia for a "vacation"; the Soviet press launched a frenzied anti-China campaign; and so on and so forth. This whole train of events strikingly demonstrates that, disregarding everything, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. is allying with the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique in order to oppose fraternal socialist countries and fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. All this completely exposes the revisionist and splitting line which the leadership of the C.P.S.U. is following.

At present, the "anti-China chorus" of the imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the revisionists is making a lot of noise. And the campaign led by Khrushchov to oppose Marxism-Leninism and split the socialist camp and the international communist ranks is being carried on with growing intensity.

### **What Have the Facts of the Past Seven Years Demonstrated?**

In the foregoing we have reviewed at some length the origin and development of the differences. Our aim is to clarify the facts which were distorted in the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and to help our Party members and our people and also the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people of the world to see the truth.

The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the differences between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and within the international communist movement have arisen solely because the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has departed from Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and pursued a revisionist and splitting line in the international communist movement. The process in

which the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has gone farther and farther down the road of revisionism and splittism is the very process which has widened and aggravated the differences.

The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the present differences within the international communist movement are differences between the line of adhering to Marxism-Leninism and the line of clinging to revisionism, between the revolutionary line and the non-revolutionary and counter-revolutionary line, between the anti-imperialist line and the line of capitulation to imperialism. They are differences between proletarian internationalism and great-power chauvinism, sectarianism and splittism.

The facts of the past seven years have amply proved that the road taken by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. is the course of allying with imperialism against socialism, allying with the United States against China, allying with the reactionaries of all countries against the people of the world, and allying with the renegade Tito clique against fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties. This erroneous line of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. has led to a revisionist flood on an international scale, brought the international communist movement face to face with the danger of a split of unprecedented gravity, and brought serious damage to the peoples' cause of world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism.

The facts of the past seven years have also amply proved that the Communist Party of China has constantly striven to prevent the situation from deteriorating and to uphold principle, eliminate differences, strengthen unity and wage a common struggle against the enemy. We have exercised great restraint and done our very best.

The Communist Party of China has always stressed the importance of the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the two countries. It has always held in respect the Communist Party of the Soviet Union created by the great Lenin. We have always cherished deep proletarian affection for the great C.P.S.U. and the great Soviet people. We have rejoiced over every achievement of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet people, and we have been saddened by every error of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. that has harmed the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

It is not just today that the Chinese Communists have begun to discover the errors of the C.P.S.U. leadership. Ever since the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., we have watched with concern as the leadership of the C.P.S.U. took the road of revisionism.

Confronted with this grave situation, our Party has scores of times and for a long period considered: What should we do?

We asked ourselves, should we follow the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and suit all our actions to its wishes? In that case, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. would of course rejoice, but would not we ourselves then turn into revisionists?

We also asked ourselves, should we keep silent about the errors of the leadership of the C.P.S.U.? We believed that its errors were not just accidental, individual and

minor errors, but rather a whole series of errors of principle, which endanger the interests of the entire socialist camp and international communist movement. As a member in the ranks of the international communist movement, how could we be indifferent and keep silent about these errors? If we should do that, would not we be abandoning our duty to defend Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism?

We foresaw that if we criticized the errors of the leaders of the C.P.S.U., they would certainly strike at us vindictively and thus inevitably cause serious damage to China's socialist construction. But should Communists take a stand of national egoism and not dare to uphold truth for fear of vindictive blows? Should Communists barter away principles?

We took into consideration the fact that the C.P.S.U. was built by Lenin, that it is the Party of the first socialist state, and that it enjoyed high prestige in the international communist movement and among the people of the whole world. Therefore, over a considerable period of time, we were particularly careful and patient in criticizing the leaders of the C.P.S.U., trying our best to confine such criticism to inter-Party talks between the leaders of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and to solve the differences through internal discussions without resorting to open polemics.

But all the comradely criticism and advice given to the leaders of the C.P.S.U. by responsible comrades of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. in scores of inter-Party talks did not succeed in enabling them to return to the correct path. The leaders of the C.P.S.U. went farther and farther down the road of revisionism and splittism. In return for the advice we gave in goodwill, they applied a succession of political, economic and military pressures against us and launched increasingly violent attacks.

The leaders of the C.P.S.U. have a bad habit: they indiscriminately stick labels on anyone who criticizes them.

They say, "You are anti-Soviet!" No, friends! The label "anti-Soviet" cannot be stuck on us. Our criticism of your errors is precisely for the sake of defending the great C.P.S.U. and the great Soviet Union and preventing their prestige from being badly damaged by you. To put it plainly, it is you, and not we, who are really anti-Soviet and who are defaming and discrediting the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Union. Ever since the complete negation of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., you have committed innumerable foul deeds. Not all the water in the Volga can wash away the great shame you have brought upon the C.P.S.U. and upon the Soviet Union.

They say, "You are trying to seize the leadership!" No, friends! It is not at all clever of you to make this slander. The way you put it, it would seem that some people are contending with you for some such thing as "the leadership." Is this not tantamount to shamelessly claiming that some sort of "leadership" exists in the international communist movement and that you have this "leadership"? It is a very, very bad habit of yours thus to put on the airs of a patriarchal party. It is entirely illegitimate. The 1957 Declaration and the 1960 State-

ment clearly state that all Communist Parties are independent and equal. According to this principle, the relations among fraternal Parties should under no circumstances be like the relations between a leading Party and the led, and much less like the relations between a patriarchal father and his son. We have always opposed any one Party commanding other fraternal Parties, and it has never occurred to us that we ourselves should command other fraternal Parties, and so the question of contending for leadership simply does not arise. What confronts the international communist movement now is not whether this or that Party should assume leadership, but whether to respond to the baton of revisionism or to uphold the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement and persevere in the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism. Our criticism of the leadership of the C.P.S.U. concerns its attempt to lord it over fraternal Parties and to impose its line of revisionism and splittism on them. What we desire is merely the independent and equal status of the fraternal Parties stipulated in the Declaration and the Statement and their unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

It is the leaders of the C.P.S.U. who have provoked and extended the present great debate in the international communist movement and forced it on us. Since they have levelled large-scale attacks and all kinds of unscrupulous slanders against us, and since they have openly betrayed Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and torn up the Declaration and the Statement, they cannot expect us to abstain from replying, from refuting their slanders, from safeguarding the Declaration and the Statement and from defending Marxism-Leninism. The debate is on, and right and wrong must be thoroughly clarified.

We Chinese Communists persevere in principle and uphold unity; we did so in the past, we do so now and we shall continue to do so in the future. While engaging in polemics with the leaders of the C.P.S.U., we still hope they will realize that they have taken a most dangerous road by abandoning revolution, abandoning the revolutionary people of the world, abandoning the unity of the socialist camp and of the international communist movement and eagerly collaborating with the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the renegade Tito clique.

The interests of Chinese and Soviet peoples, of the socialist camp, of the international communist movement, and of the people throughout the world demand that all Communist and Workers' Parties should become united and oppose the common enemy.

We hereby appeal once again to the leadership of the C.P.S.U. to correct its errors and return to the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the path of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The international communist movement is going through an important period. The present debate has a vital bearing on the future of the proletarian world revolution and the destiny of mankind. As history will prove, after this great debate Marxism-Leninism will shine forth still more brilliantly and the revolutionary cause of the international proletariat and the people of the world will win still greater victories.

## Outline of Views on the Question of Peaceful Transition

November 10, 1957

I. On the question of the transition from capitalism to socialism, it would be more flexible to refer to the two possibilities, peaceful transition and non-peaceful transition, than to just one, and this would place us in a position where we can have the initiative politically at any time.

1. Referring to the possibility of peaceful transition indicates that for us the use of violence is primarily a matter of self-defence. It enables the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries to sidestep attacks on them on this issue, and it is politically advantageous — advantageous for winning the masses and also for depriving the bourgeoisie of its pretexts for such attacks and isolating it.

2. If practical possibilities for peaceful transition were to arise in individual countries in the future when the international or domestic situation changes drastically, we could then make timely use of the opportunity to win the support of the masses and solve the problem of state power by peaceful means.

3. Nevertheless, we should not tie our own hands because of this desire. The bourgeoisie will not step down from the stage of history voluntarily. This is a universal law of class struggle. In no country should the proletariat and the Communist Party slacken their preparations for the revolution in any way. They must be prepared at all times to repulse counter-revolutionary attacks and, at the critical juncture of the revolution when the working class is seizing state power, to overthrow the bourgeoisie by armed force if it uses armed force to suppress the people's revolution (generally speaking, it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie will do so).

II. In the present situation of the international communist movement, it is advantageous from the point of view of tactics to refer to the desire for peaceful transition. But it would be inappropriate to over-emphasize the possibility of peaceful transition. The reasons are:

1. Possibility and reality, the desire and whether or not it can be fulfilled, are two different matters. We should refer to the desire for peaceful transition, but we should not place our hopes mainly on it and therefore should not over-emphasize this aspect.

2. If too much stress is laid on the possibility of peaceful transition, and especially on the possibility of seizing state power by winning a majority in parliament it is liable to weaken the revolutionary will of the proletariat, the working people and the Communist Party and disarm them ideologically.

3. To the best of our knowledge, there is still not a single country where this possibility is of any practical significance. Even if it is slightly more apparent in a particular country, over-emphasizing this possibility is inappropriate because it does not conform with the realities in the overwhelming majority of countries. Should such a possibility actually occur in some country, the Communist Party there must on the one hand strive to realize it, and on the other hand always be prepared to repulse the armed attacks of the bourgeoisie.

4. The result of emphasizing this possibility will neither weaken the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie nor lull them.

5. Nor will such emphasis make the social democratic parties any more revolutionary.

6. Nor will such emphasis make Communist Parties grow any stronger. On the contrary, if some Communist Parties should as a result obscure their revolutionary features and thus become confused with the social democratic parties in the eyes of the people, they would only be weakened.

7. It is very hard to gather forces and prepare for the revolution, and after all parliamentary struggle is easy in comparison. We must fully utilize the parliamentary form of struggle, but its role is limited. What is most important is to proceed with the hard work of gathering the revolutionary forces.

III. To obtain a majority in parliament is not the same as smashing the old state machinery (chiefly the armed forces) and establishing new state machinery (chiefly the armed forces). Unless the military-bureaucratic state machinery of the bourgeoisie is smashed, a parliamentary majority for the proletariat and their reliable allies will either be impossible (because the bourgeoisie will amend the constitution whenever necessary in order to facilitate the consolidation of their dictatorship) or undependable (for instance, elections may be declared null and void, the Communist Party may be outlawed, parliament may be dissolved, etc.).

IV. Peaceful transition to socialism should not be interpreted in such a way as solely to mean transition through a parliamentary majority. The main question is that of the state machinery. In the 1870s, Marx was of the opinion that there was a possibility of achieving socialism in Britain by peaceful means, because "at that time England was a country in which militarism and bureaucracy were less pronounced than in any other." For a period after the February Revolution, Lenin hoped that through "all power to the Soviets" the revolution would develop peacefully and triumph, because at that time "the arms were in the hands of the people." Neither Marx nor Lenin meant that peaceful transition could be realized by using the old state machinery. Lenin repeatedly elaborated on the famous saying of Marx and Engels, "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes."

V. 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 variant 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.

VI. Such is our understanding of this question. We do hold differing views on this question, but out of various considerations we did not state our views after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Since a joint declaration is to be issued, we must now explain our

views. However, this need not prevent us from attaining common language in the draft declaration. In order to show a connection between the formulation of this question in the draft declaration and the formulation of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we agree to take the draft put forward today by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as a basis, while proposing amendments in certain places.

## Appendix II

# Statement of the Delegation of the C.P.C. at the Bucharest Meeting of Fraternal Parties

June 26, 1960

(1) The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China maintains that at this meeting Comrade Khrushchov of the Delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has completely violated the long-standing principle in the international communist movement that questions of common concern should be settled by consultation among fraternal Parties, and has completely broken the agreement made prior to the meeting to confine it to an exchange of views and not to make any decision; this he has done by his surprise attack, putting forward a draft communique of the meeting without having consulted the fraternal Parties on its contents beforehand and without permitting full and normal discussion in the meeting. This is an abuse of the prestige enjoyed by the C.P.S.U. in the international communist movement, a prestige which has been built up over the long years since Lenin's time, and it is, moreover, an extremely crude act of imposing one's own will on other people. This attitude has nothing in common with Lenin's style of work, and this way of doing things creates an extremely bad precedent in the international communist movement. The Central Committee of the C.P.C. considers that this attitude and this way of doing things on the part of Comrade Khrushchov will have extraordinarily grave consequences for the international communist movement.

(2) The Communist Party of China has always been faithful to Marxism-Leninism and steadfastly adhered to the theoretical positions of Marxism-Leninism. In the past two years and more, it has been completely faithful to the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and has firmly upheld all the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Declaration. There are differences between us and Comrade Khrushchov on a series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. These differences have a vital bearing on the interests of the entire socialist camp, on the interests of the proletariat and the working people of the whole world, on the question of whether the people of all countries will be able to preserve world peace and prevent the imperialists from launching a world war, and on the question of whether socialism will continue to score victories in the capitalist world, which comprises two-thirds of the world's population and three-fourths of its land area. All Marxist-Leninists should adopt a serious attitude towards these differences, give them serious thought and hold comradely discussions, so as to achieve unanimous conclusions. However, the attitude Comrade Khrushchov has adopted is patriarchal, arbitrary and tyrannical. He has in

fact treated the relationship between the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and our Party not as one between brothers, but as one between patriarchal father and son. At this meeting he has exerted pressure in an attempt to make our Party submit to his non-Marxist-Leninist views. We hereby solemnly declare that our Party believes in and obeys the truth of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism alone, and will never submit to erroneous views which run counter to Marxism-Leninism. We consider that certain views expressed by Comrade Khrushchov in his speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Party are erroneous and in contravention of the Moscow Declaration. His speech will be welcomed by the imperialists and the Tito clique and has indeed already been welcomed by them. When the occasion arises, we shall be ready to carry on serious discussions with the C.P.S.U. and other fraternal Parties on our differences with Comrade Khrushchov. As for the Letter of Information of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the Communist Party of China, which Comrade Khrushchov has distributed in Bucharest, the Central Committee of the C.P.C. will reply to it in detail after carefully studying it; the reply will explain the differences of principle between the two Parties, setting forth the relevant facts, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China will hold serious, earnest and comradely discussions with fraternal Parties. We are convinced that in any case the truth of Marxism-Leninism will triumph in the end. Truth does not fear contention. Ultimately, it is impossible to portray truth as error or error as truth. The future of the international communist movement depends on the needs and the struggles of the people of all countries and on the guidance of Marxism-Leninism, and will never be decided by the baton of any one individual.

(3) We, the Communist Party of China, have always striven to safeguard the unity of all Communist Parties and the unity of all socialist countries. For the sake of genuine unity in the international communist ranks and for the sake of the common struggle against imperialism and reaction, we hold that it is necessary to unfold normal discussions on the differences and that serious questions of principle should not be settled in a hurry by abnormal methods or simply by vote. Nor should one impose on others arbitrary views which have not been tested in practice or which have already proved to be wrong in such tests. Comrade Khrushchov's way of doing things at this meeting is entirely detrimental to the unity of international communism. But however Comrade Khrushchov

may act, the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the unity of all the Communist and Workers' Parties is bound to be further strengthened and developed. We are deeply convinced that, as the international communist movement and Marxism-Leninism develop, the unity of our ranks will constantly grow stronger.

(4) If the relations between our two Parties are viewed as a whole, the above-mentioned differences between Comrade Khrushchov and ourselves are only of a partial character. We hold that the main thing in the relations between our two Parties is their unity in the struggle for the common cause; this is so because both our countries are socialist countries and both our Parties are built on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, and are fighting to advance the cause of the whole socialist camp, to oppose imperialist aggression and to win world peace. We believe that Comrade Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and we ourselves will be able to find opportunities to hold calm and comradely discussions and resolve our differences, so that the Chinese

and Soviet Parties may become more united and their relations further strengthened. This will be highly beneficial to the socialist camp and to the struggle of the people of the world against imperialist aggression and for world peace.

(5) We are glad to see that the draft communique of the meeting put forward here affirms the correctness of the Moscow Declaration. But the presentation of the Marxist-Leninist theses of the Moscow Declaration in this draft is inaccurate and one-sided. And it is wrong that the draft avoids taking a clear stand on the major problems in the current international situation and makes no mention at all of modern revisionism, the main danger in the international working-class movement. Therefore, this draft is unacceptable to us. For the sake of unity in the common struggle against the enemy, we have submitted a revised draft and propose that it be discussed. If it is not possible to reach agreement this time, we propose that a special drafting committee be set up to work out, after full discussion, a document which is acceptable to all.

### Appendix III

## **The Five Proposals for Settlement of the Differences and Attainment Of Unity Contained in the Letter of the Central Committee of The C.P.C. in Reply to the Letter of Information of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.**

September 10, 1960

Striving to settle the differences successfully and to attain unity, we put forward the following proposals in all sincerity:

(1) The fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Declaration and the Manifesto of the 1957 Moscow Meeting are the ideological foundation for the unity between our two Parties and among all fraternal Parties. All our statements and actions must be absolutely loyal to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration, which we should use as the criteria for judging between truth and falsehood.

(2) The relations among the socialist countries and among the fraternal Parties must strictly conform to the principles of equality, comradeship and internationalism as stipulated by the Moscow Declaration.

(3) All disputes among socialist countries and among fraternal Parties must be settled in accordance with the stipulations of the Moscow Declaration through comradely and unhurried discussion. Both the Soviet Union and China, and both the Soviet and Chinese Parties, bear great responsibilities regarding the international situation and towards the international communist movement. They should have full consultations and unhurried discussions on all important questions of common concern in order to have unity of action. If the disputes between the Chinese and Soviet Parties cannot be settled for the time being in consultations between the two

Parties, then unhurried discussions should be continued. When necessary, the views of both sides should be presented completely objectively to the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries so that these Parties may make correct judgments after serious deliberation and in accordance with Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the Moscow Declaration.

(4) It is of the utmost importance for Communists to draw a clear line of demarcation between the enemy and ourselves, between truth and falsehood. Our two Parties should treasure and value our friendship and join hands to oppose the enemy, and should not make statements or take actions liable to undermine the unity between the two Parties and the two countries and thus give the enemy the opportunity of driving a wedge between us.

(5) On the basis of the above principles, our two Parties, together with other Communist and Workers' Parties, should strive through full preparation and consultation to make a success of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of all countries to be held in Moscow in November this year, and, at this meeting, should work out a document conforming to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the 1957 Moscow Declaration to serve as a programme to which we should all adhere, a programme for our united struggle against the enemy.

# Korean People's Great Day

by OUR CORRESPONDENT

SEPTEMBER 9, fifteen years ago, saw a great victory of the Korean people in their long, hard struggle for national independence and socialism: it was on that date in 1948 that the Korean Democratic People's Republic was proclaimed, an event of epochal importance in the Korean people's political life.

This year, as they have done every year since they won their own liberation, China's 650 million people celebrated this grand anniversary together with their Korean brothers.

## Chinese Leaders' Greetings

On the eve of the anniversary, Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party; Liu Shao-chi, Chairman of the People's Republic of China; Chu Teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress; and Premier Chou En-lai sent a joint message to Premier Kim Il Sung and President Choi Yong Kun, conveying the warmest greetings of the Chinese people, the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Government to the Korean people, the Korean Workers' Party and the Government of the K.D.P.R.

The message praised the dauntless heroism of the Korean people in waging an unyielding, tit-for-tat struggle against U.S. imperialism, a struggle that is a splendid example for all the revolutionary peoples. "The Korean Workers' Party," the message said, "is good at integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Korean revolution; it has formulated a correct line and policy in guiding the Korean people forward from victory to victory in the struggle against imperialism and in the cause of socialist revolution and construction. Holding firm to Marxism-Leninism and resolutely opposing modern revisionism, it has made outstanding contributions in defence of the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and in furthering the revolutionary cause of the people of the world. The Chinese people and Communists have the greatest respect and admiration for this high Marxist-Leninist principle and revolutionary fighting spirit of the long-tested Korean Workers' Party."

"The militant friendship and great unity between the Chinese and Korean Parties and the two countries have been cemented by blood shed in common in protracted revolutions and in the common struggle against imperialism; they are built on the foundation of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The Chinese and Korean Parties and the two countries are determined to carry to the end the cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction, the struggle against imperialism and in support of all oppressed peoples and nations, the cause of safeguarding world peace and the cause of opposing modern

revisionism, defending Marxism-Leninism and preserving the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement."

## Peking Mass Rally

On September 8, Peking held a giant mass rally, attended by more than 10,000 people, in the Great Hall of the People, to celebrate the achievements of Korea's socialist revolution and socialist construction. Chinese Party and state leaders Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, Tung Pi-wu, Peng Chen, Chen Yi, Kuo Mo-jo and Lo Jui-ching were present. Zung Bong Koo, Charge d'Affaires ad interim of the Korean Embassy in China and members of the delegation of the Korea-China Friendship Association headed by Han Soo Dong and other Korean guests were also present.

Vice-Premier Chen Yi and Han Soo Dong were the main speakers.

**Exploding the Myth of the Invincibility of U.S. Imperialism.** "The 15 years of the Korean Democratic People's Republic," Vice-Premier Chen Yi said, "have been a heroic history of courageous resistance to U.S. imperialist armed invasion and provocations; a glorious history of persistent efforts in socialist revolution and construction. The great victories of the Korean war for the liberation of the fatherland have written a glorious page in the contemporary history of resistance to U.S. imperialism. By their actions, the Korean people have exploded the myth that U.S. imperialism is invincible; they have exposed the nature of U.S. imperialism as a paper tiger, raised the revolutionary people's spirit and punctured imperialism's arrogance."

Vice-Premier Chen Yi went on to point out that the victory of the Korean war of liberation was won at a time when U.S. imperialism still had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. "This fully proves that no modern weapons, including nuclear weapons, can change the nature of war, nor can they be the decisive factor in the outcome of a war. The heroic Korean people have displayed a noble revolutionary quality of dauntlessness and indomitability in face of an enemy possessing atomic bombs. They thus set a brilliant example for all oppressed nations and peoples in their revolutionary struggles; and they won the respect of the people of the whole world."

**The Importance of Self-Reliance in Building Socialism.** Speaking of the Korean people's revolutionary spirit of relying on their own efforts in building socialism, Vice-Premier Chen Yi stressed that this "has a very important practical significance for the people of all socialist countries." "Korea's experience in socialist construction has proved that the constructive work of any socialist country should be carried out mainly by relying on its own efforts. Only by building up an independent national economy, can a country, no matter which it is, solidly safeguard its political independence and have complete equality and sov-



ereignty in international relations." Vice-Premier Chen Yi continued: "Only when a socialist state has built the country well by mainly relying on its own efforts can it effectively fulfil its proletarian internationalist duties. And only when all the socialist countries have solidly built their independent national economies and on this basis organized co-operation on a basis of equality and mutual benefit, can the might of the socialist camp be further strengthened and the unity of the various socialist countries be enhanced."

**Modern Revisionists' Fallacy Refuted.** "Actual practice in the Korean people's construction," Vice-Premier Chen Yi declared, "is a powerful refutation of the fallacy spread by the modern revisionists, who are doing all they can to attack self-reliant national economic construction, and slander the principle of self-reliance in construction as 'nationalism' and 'detrimental to the unity of socialism.' They are trying their utmost to propagate their 'international division of labour' and 'specialization.' In doing so they are, in fact, aiming to benefit themselves at the expense of others. Proceeding from the partial interests of their own countries, they unilaterally demand that other fraternal countries should submit to their own needs, thus damaging the independence, sovereignty and the people's interests of other fraternal countries. This is nationalism, national egoism and big-nation chauvinism pure and simple. This national egoism and big-nation chauvinism have seriously undermined the principles guiding relations between the socialist countries and their solidarity."

**Victory of Marxism-Leninism in Korea.** Vice-Premier Chen Yi hailed the victory gained by the Korean Democratic People's Republic as a triumph of Marxism-Leninism in Korea. By integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of socialist revolution and socialist construction in Korea, the Korean Workers' Party headed by Kim Il Sung, had led the Korean people from one victory to another, he said.

Vice-Premier Chen Yi expressed the full support of the Chinese people and Government for the proposals of the Korean Democratic People's Republic for the unification of Korea without interference, and for the struggle of the south Korean people against U.S. imperialism.

Vice-Premier Chen Yi stressed that the militant friendship and great unity between the Chinese and Korean peoples could stand the severest test of any tempest and were unbreakable. He added: "At the present time, when U.S. imperialism is intensifying its aggression and expansion under cover of its strategy of peace and when the modern revisionists have betrayed the fundamental interests of the people of the world, this friendship and solidarity between the Chinese and the Korean peoples is all the more of vital significance."

In his speech, Han Soo Dong gave a brief account of the Korean people's achievement in socialist construction. He also warmly praised the enormous achievements in socialist construction scored by the Chinese people holding high the three red banners — the general line for building socialism, the big leap forward and the people's communes.

"By holding high the banner of Marxism-Leninism and waging an uncompromising struggle against imperialism and revisionism, the Korean and Chinese peoples are making contributions to the great cause of world peace and world revolution," he said.

Han Soo Dong also expressed the full support of the Korean people for the Chinese people's just struggle to liberate Taiwan and for the Chinese Government's proposal to convene a conference of the government heads of all countries on the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

## Grand Reception

On September 9, Zung Bong Koo, Charge d'Affaires ad interim of the Korean Embassy in China, gave a grand reception to celebrate the Korean anniversary. Chinese Party and state leaders Liu Shao-chi, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh, Teng Hsiao-ping and others were present, and also M. Williams, Chairman of the National Committee of the Communist Party of New Zealand, and Tsunesaburo Takenaka, Member of the Central Committee of the Japanese Communist Party and leader of the Japanese Communist Party delegation visiting China.

**With the Speed of a Winged Steed.** In his banquet speech, Zung Bong Koo said that the Korean people were advancing with the speed of a winged steed, and that the Korean Democratic People's Republic had become a socialist industrial-agricultural country with a solid, self-supporting national economic base. He strongly condemned U.S. imperialist crimes of turning south Korea into a hell. He pointed out that to suit the needs of imperialism, the modern revisionists were carrying out all the more vicious schemes in an attempt to undermine the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. Revisionism was the main danger in the present international communist movement, he stressed.

"As a result of the common struggle being waged against imperialism and revisionism, and the struggle to build socialism, the friendly relations of our two countries have been further consolidated and developed. This friendship and unity are unbreakable and no force on earth can undermine them," the Korean Charge d'Affaires declared.

**Self-Reliance Makes Miracles.** In his speech at the reception, Premier Chou En-lai praised as a miracle without parallel in history the building in a short space of time of a prosperous, socialist new Korea on the ruins created by the U.S. imperialist war of aggression. "Only under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist party and under the socialist system could such a miracle take place. And only the revolutionary people who persist in self-reliance and refuse to bow to difficulties can perform such a miracle," he said.

Speaking of the extremely great significance of the Korean people's splendid achievements in socialist construction gained by self-reliance, Premier Chou said: "Facts have proved that the line of self-reliance persisted in by the socialist states is a line of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of each country, a line of integrating proletarian internationalism with revolutionary patriotism. This is the only correct revolutionary line."

Premier Chou pointed out that U.S. imperialism has suffered defeat but will never change its aggressive nature. He warned that "U.S. imperialism is now playing the trick of a fake peace and actual preparations for war," and that "the spearhead of U.S. imperialist aggression is

now directed against the Far East and the whole of Asia." He added that U.S. imperialism had no reason whatever to hang on in south Korea. The Korean question could only be solved by the Korean people themselves. He reaffirmed the Chinese Government's firm support for the just stand of the Korean Government for the peaceful unification of the country and all the efforts made for this purpose.

**Important Tasks for All Marxist-Leninist Parties.** Premier Chou noted that now "precisely at the time when imperialism is approaching nearer and nearer to its doom, modern revisionism has made its appearance in the service of imperialism and become rampant. To stand fast by Marxism-Leninism and oppose modern revisionism; to stand fast by the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement and oppose a split; to stand firm for proletarian internationalism and oppose big-nation chauvinism and national egoism—these are the important tasks which must be undertaken by all the Marxist-Leninist parties and the peoples of the socialist countries. The Korean Workers' Party and the Korean Democratic People's Republic have waged an uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism, and in defence of the purity of Marxism-Leninism, and made tremendous contributions in this respect."

**Bright Revolutionary Prospect.** "Marxist-Leninists are revolutionary optimists. We believe that over 90 per cent

of the people of the world are for revolution and only a handful of people are dead against it. The adverse currents stirred up by imperialism, the reactionaries of various countries and the modern revisionists can never change the course of history. The prospects of the revolutionary cause are immeasurably bright," Premier Chou declared.

The Chinese press gave wide coverage to the celebration activities in Pyongyang, the achievements of the Korean people in socialist revolution and socialist construction and feature stories about the militant friendship of the Chinese and Korean peoples. *Renmin Ribao*, in its editorial of September 9, wrote: "The strengthening of the friendship and unity of the Chinese and Korean peoples accords with the common interests of the socialist camp and helps the cause of world peace and the progress of mankind. The Chinese people will stand for ever by the Korean people and fight shoulder to shoulder and march hand in hand with them for the common cause and common ideals which they share."

In telegrams and letters sent to their counterparts in Korea, various Chinese people's organizations warmly congratulated the Korean people on their national festival. The Korean anniversary was also celebrated at mass meetings in Shenyang, Changchun, Harbin, Wuhan, Shanghai and Canton.

# The Indonesian Revolution and the Immediate Tasks of the Communist Party of Indonesia

Excerpts From a Political Report Given by Comrade D.N. Aidit at the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. on September 2, 1963

## 1. A Brief Account of the Various Historical Stages In the Growth of Indonesian Society and of the Basic Questions of the Indonesian Revolution

The historical development of Indonesian society can be divided in the main into the following periods:

1. The period of primitive communes (up to circa 500 B.C.).
2. The period of the slave-owning system (circa 500 B.C.-500 A.D.).
3. Feudal society (5th to 17th century).
4. Feudal and colonial society (from the end of 17th century to the end of 19th century).
5. Colonial and semi-feudal society (from the end of 19th century to 1945).

6. Independence and semi-feudal society (from 1945 to 1949).

7. Semi-colonial and semi-feudal society (from 1949 on).

**The Colonial and Semi-Feudal Period.** During this period, Indonesia was completely under the colonial rule of Dutch imperialism and then, during World War II, under the colonial rule of Japanese fascism; both engaged in brutal political oppression and economic exploitation. All important branches of the economy were controlled by foreign monopoly capital.

The export of capital on a big scale carried capitalism into all corners of the country. With feudal economic relations being destroyed, the economic system no longer remained a natural economy; a commodity economy gradually advanced to a dominant position. The feudal system no longer remained independent but owed its

---

## Comrade Kang Sheng's Welcoming Speech

**K**ANG SHENG, Alternate Member of the Political Bureau and Member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, speaking at the Higher Party School Meeting, warmly welcomed D.N. Aidit and other comrades of the Indonesian Communist Party delegation.

"Comrade Aidit," Kang Sheng said, "is the beloved leader of the Communist Party of Indonesia, a revolutionary activist respected by the Indonesian people, an outstanding fighter of the international communist movement and a close comrade and friend of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people." "Led by him, the Indonesian Communist Party has made great contributions to the struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism and against modern revisionism."

**A Great and Steadfast Marxist-Leninist Party.** "Since 1951, the Indonesian Communist Party has established as its leadership the Central Committee headed by Comrade Aidit. From that time the Party, which has always been under the correct leadership of the Central Committee led by Aidit, has charted and carried out a Marxist-Leninist line and policy, thereby providing the most important guarantee for the advance of the revolutionary cause of the Indonesian Communist Party and people. Since 1951, the Party, rallying all patriotic and democratic forces in Indonesia, has won great victories in the struggle for people's democracy against all kinds of reactionary forces at home, and in the struggle against U.S. and Dutch imperialism for complete national independence. The Chinese Communist Party and people regard every victory and every success of the Indonesian Communist Party as their own; they rejoice with them and are inspired by them."

Kang Sheng continued: "Within the ranks of the international communist movement the Indonesian Communist Party is a great, firm, Marxist-Leninist party. Under the leadership of its Central Committee headed by Comrade Aidit, the Party has been adept in combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with revolutionary practice in Indonesia and in summing up its revolutionary experience. It has evolved a systematic theory and policies which are guiding the Indonesian

revolution. As a result, the Party is enriching and developing Marxism-Leninism. This is exactly why the revolutionary cause of the Indonesian Communist Party and people has developed with vigour. Today, the Indonesian Communist Party, comprising several million members, has become the largest Communist Party in any country outside the socialist camp."

**Friendship and Solidarity Between the Chinese and Indonesian Parties.** "By persisting along a correct Marxist-Leninist line," Kang Sheng noted, "the prestige and influence of the Communist Party of Indonesia is growing daily at home and abroad. It has an ever increasing attraction for the Communists and revolutionary people of the capitalist world, particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The great success and rich experience it gained as a result of persisting along a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line is of great world significance for the international communist movement."

Kang Sheng stressed: "In the common struggle against imperialism, reactionaries of all countries, and revisionism, the Communist Parties of Indonesia and China have always supported and aided each other.

"The friendship and unity of the Indonesian and Chinese Communist Parties are deep and unbreakable. They are built on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism; on defending Marxism-Leninism and opposing revisionism and dogmatism; and on the principles of independence, equality, reaching agreement through consultation and mutual support set forth in the Moscow Declaration of 1957 and Moscow Statement of 1960. They are based on the common struggle against U.S.-led imperialism and for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism, and on the common cause in striving for victory of the proletarian world revolution."

In conclusion, Comrade Kang Sheng pointed out that "the rich experience of the Indonesian Communist Party and the theoretical generalization of this — found in the works of Comrade Aidit — are of great educational value to us. We must be modest and learn from the Indonesian Communist Party's revolutionary experience and from Comrade Aidit's works."

---

existence solely to imperialist support. Feudalism was no longer an integrated whole. Only the remnants of it remained. Such was the condition of semi-feudalism.

During that period, the interests of all classes suffered from imperialism; the only exceptions were the landlords and the agents of imperialism. It was at the beginning of this period that Indonesia's national-liberation movement sprang up. From then on, in waging their struggle against Dutch colonialism the Indonesian people used various modern organizational forms, such as the State Railway Workers' Union (S.S.-Bond), the Railway Trade Union (V.S.T.P.), Budi Oetomo, Islamic Association (Seri-

kat Islam), the East-Indies Party (Indische Party), the East-Indies Social Democratic Association (I.S.D.V.), etc.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is the product of integrating the theory of Marxism-Leninism with the Indonesian working-class movement. After the birth of the Indonesian Communist Party on May 23, 1920, the national-liberation movement in Indonesia found its core in the Indonesian Communist Party. The struggle of the Indonesian people for independence grew vigorously day by day and in 1926 the first national uprising led by the Indonesian Communist Party broke out, dealing a blow to Dutch imperialism. The uprising was defeated and after

this the Party was forced to go underground. In the years that followed such nationalist political parties as the Indonesian National Party (1927) and others came into being.

During the Japanese fascist occupation, the Indonesian people carried on their revolutionary struggle, sabotaging enterprises and mobilizing the peasants to stage uprisings (for instance in Singaparna, Indramaju, Tanah Karo and other places), mobilizing the troops to stage uprisings (as in Blitar), and organizing resistance among the intellectuals, college students, youth and students. As the people's sufferings increased, their struggle too grew in intensity. After Japan's surrender to the allied powers in World War II, the Indonesian people proclaimed their national independence on August 17, 1945, and founded their republic.

**The Period of Independence and Semi-Feudalism.** In announcing the establishment of the Republic of Indonesia on August 17, 1945, the Indonesian people seized state power in Indonesia from the hands of the Japanese fascists. During this period, in order to defend the independence and sovereignty of the republic, the Indonesian people continued uninterruptedly to fight Dutch imperialism in various fields. At that time, it may be said, the feudal landlord class, another main enemy, received no blows during the revolution and so semi-feudal conditions remain by and large unchanged. This is the basic reason why the August Revolution of 1945 could not be thoroughly completed.

The aims of the August Revolution of 1945 were not achieved owing to, among other things, the following factors:

1. Implementation of an irresolute anti-imperialist policy and the making of continuous compromises — this is shown in the signing of the Linggardjati and Renville agreements and later the Round Table Conference Agreement, which was even worse;
2. Failure to work out an anti-feudal policy of resolutely striking blows at the feudal landlords and winning the peasants to the revolution;
3. Failure to understand the policy of establishing a united front with the national bourgeoisie in the bourgeois democratic revolution;
4. Failure to establish working-class sole leadership of the revolution although this does not mean that the leadership of the revolution at that time was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The failure of the August 1945 Revolution showed that the Indonesian bourgeoisie was unable to lead the bourgeois democratic revolution in the era of imperialism or a new-type bourgeois democratic revolution. The failure of the revolution also proved that the Indonesian proletariat at that time was not yet capable of leading the new-type bourgeois democratic revolution to complete victory. During the August Revolution of 1945, the Indonesian proletariat played an important part in the state power, including the armed forces, and in other fields.

In September 1948, the reactionary Hatta government carried out a policy of White terror against the Indonesian Communist Party. This was widely known as the Madiun Incident. In the struggle against the White

terror, many Indonesian Communist Party leaders laid down their lives. I have said that "the Indonesian Communist Party joined the August Revolution under circumstances in which the Party had not summed up its experience in united-front work and still lacked experience in building up the Party and in armed struggle."

**The Semi-Colonial and Semi-Feudal Period, or the Period of Semi-Feudalism and Without Complete Independence.** The Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party points out: "The Round Table Conference Agreement concluded between the Hatta government and the Dutch Government on November 2, 1949, determined the semi-colonial status of Indonesia. The so-called transfer of sovereignty made on December 27, 1949, in accordance with the above-mentioned agreement aimed to create illusions among the Indonesian people by declaring that Indonesia had gained complete independence and that 'the transfer of sovereignty' was 'genuine, complete and unconditional.'" In actual fact, by concluding the Round Table Conference Agreement, the Hatta government enabled the Dutch imperialists to restore their influence in the economic field in Indonesia. But the national-liberation movement and the democratic movement of the Indonesian people were not to be held in check. Under pressure of the broad masses, the Indonesian Government in April 1956 unilaterally abrogated the unequal and traitorous Round Table Conference Agreement and later also unilaterally cancelled its "debts" to the Netherlands. Later, with the strength of the masses grown more powerful, the enterprises owned by Dutch monopoly capital were taken over one by one and nationalized in 1957; moreover, West Irian was returned to the domain of the Indonesian Republic in 1963. But this does not mean that these positive anti-imperialist measures have brought about fundamental changes in Indonesian society.

The fact that Indonesia is not yet economically independent most clearly demonstrates that Indonesia has not attained complete independence. Imperialists, and first of all the U.S. imperialists, can still make use of Indonesia's raw materials, tap its mineral resources and exploit its cheap labour power. So they have held back the development of the national industry, both the state-owned part and that owned by the national bourgeoisie.

According to the speech of the Dutch Foreign Minister Luns at the United Nations, in 1958, Dutch capital taken over by Indonesia amounted to about \$1,200 million. Thus, if Luns' figure is correct and if there has been no new investment, foreign investments in Indonesia today must amount to \$1,040 million, i.e., \$2,240 million minus \$1,200 million. The actual situation now is like this: imperialist capital, and first of all U.S. capital, has in recent years steadily increased its new investments in Indonesia. Since 1945, the United States has increased its investments in oil enterprises as follows:

Investments in the Shell Oil Company have increased by \$84 million; in Standard Vacuum, by \$40 million; in Caltex, by \$47 million. According to a report made by the U.S. Ambassador Jones to the American Men's Association, U.S. "economic aid" since 1950 has already reached the amount of \$639 million. It is estimated that this figure is smaller than the actual one. Foreign invest-

ments, such as those in Indonesia, which take the form of "economic aid," are one form of neo-colonialism. The peoples of the Asian, African and Latin American countries are firmly opposed to neo-colonialism.

With the help of the compradors and bureaucrat-capitalists, the imperialists have damaged the state-owned economy and, directly or through the so-called International Monetary Fund, and making use of what is called the "programme to stabilize the economy," have succeeded to a certain extent in injecting the poison of neo-colonialism into the Indonesian economy. Thus, the Indonesian economy is to a great extent dependent on the capitalist world economic system. Since Dutch imperialism was ejected from almost every economic field and from West Irian, U.S. imperialism has replaced Dutch imperialism to become the most dangerous, the enemy No. 1 of the Indonesian people.

As the reality of the Indonesian countryside shows, the feudal nature of land relations remains unchanged while the peasants are living in poverty and dependence on the feudal landlords. This can be proved by the following facts:

Firstly, the landlords have a monopoly of the land tilled by the landless peasants.

Today the fundamental goal of the struggle of the Indonesian Communist Party and the peasants is to abolish landlord monopoly ownership of land and to realize the slogan "land to the peasants."

Secondly, peasants pay the landlords ground rent in kind, which, amounting to 50 per cent or more of what a peasant produces, impoverishes most of the peasants.

In view of this kind of exploitation by the landlords, the revolutionary movement puts forward for the peasants a demand for a better ratio of distribution; this is generally known as the demand of six to four, which means that at least 60 per cent of the produce should go to the peasants who till the land while the land-owners at most should only get 40 per cent.

Thirdly, peasants working on landlords' land are virtually slaves because there is the system of corvee and all kinds of forced labour.

Fourthly, heavy debts are strangling the overwhelming majority of peasants who are being enslaved by the landlords and usurers. For example, the average monthly interest is from 10 to 100 per cent; the upcoming harvest as green shoots in the field is sold at an average price equivalent to 25 to 50 per cent of the price at harvest time; there are many other examples.

The drawing up of the Decree on the Harvest Distribution Contract and the Basic Decree on Land is the result of the peasants' revolutionary struggle combined with the revolutionaries' struggle in parliament. Although these two decrees only limit, but do not abolish, feudal exploitation in the countryside, their implementation has been very slow and suffered much sabotage. While supporting these two decrees, the Indonesian Communist Party has explained to the peasants its own land programme.

So, present-day Indonesian society is still a semi-feudal society that has not yet achieved the complete independence we often talk about.

The revolutionary forces in Indonesia are composed of all classes and groups suffering imperialist and feudal oppression. They are the proletariat (the working class), the peasants, petty bourgeoisie, national bourgeoisie and other democrats. They must be united in an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal national united front based on the worker-peasant alliance and led by the working class. The moving force of the Indonesian revolution includes the firmly anti-imperialist working class, the peasants, petty bourgeoisie and other democrats whose interests suffer at the hands of the imperialists. They are also the progressive forces in Indonesia because they are firm in the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, because they are the working people and, moreover, can accept socialism. But from the viewpoint of importance and size, the basic force of the Indonesian revolution is the peasantry.

In Indonesian society there exist three kinds of forces, namely, the diehards (who are the obstacle to the revolution and the object of the revolution), the middle force and the progressives, each having a concept of their own regarding the Indonesian revolution. In relation to these three forces, the political line of the Indonesian Communist Party is to develop untiringly and to the best of its ability the progressive force, unite with the middle force and isolate the diehard force. In order to change the balance of forces in Indonesian society, it is most important to carry out this political line. Up to now, the implementation of this line is in conformity with what we have stipulated, that is, the progressive force grows stronger, the national unity has been further strengthened and the reactionaries are becoming daily more isolated. In the national united front against imperialism and feudalism, the tactic of uniting with while struggling against the national bourgeoisie is manifested in the practical activities of the cadres and members of the Indonesian Communist Party in various spheres of life and in Indonesia's revolutionary struggle.

At its present stage, the Indonesian revolution is a bourgeois democratic revolution in nature, not a proletarian socialist revolution. But the bourgeois democratic revolution in Indonesia is no longer of the old type, nor a part of the out-dated world bourgeois democratic revolution; it is of a new type and, moreover, part of the world proletarian socialist revolution firmly opposed to imperialism.

In view of the fact that the Indonesian revolution is a new-type bourgeois democratic revolution, it is the historical task of the proletariat to contend for the leadership of the revolution. Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said that the condition for winning the leading position in the revolution is to put forward "basic political slogans in accordance with historical development," that the Party should "set an example" in realizing "these specific aims," "establish proper relations with its allies and develop and consolidate this alliance," and that "the Communist Party must expand its ranks, maintain ideological unity and observe strict discipline." Having studied the above-mentioned thesis of Comrade Mao Tse-tung, we are able to say that, as of late, the Indonesian working class and the Indonesian Communist Party have already brought about these conditions. Of course, these conditions, though already realized, still need to be continuously reinforced.

The future of the Indonesian revolution is socialism and communism, not capitalism. This special feature lies

not only in the fact that our present era is an era of transition to socialism but that a concrete revolutionary struggle is now being unfolded in Indonesia, striving for the victory of the new-type bourgeois democratic revolution, the people's democratic revolution, or the national-democratic revolution, which is the first stage of the revolution, so as to continue to develop it in the future into a socialist revolution, or the second stage of the Indonesian revolution. The present-day revolutionary movement in Indonesia led by the Indonesian Communist Party is an integrated revolutionary movement; its task consists of two revolutionary stages, the democratic stage in preparation for the socialist stage and the future socialist stage as a continuation of the democratic stage.

For the Indonesian people, there is no other road to take apart from the socialist road. The capitalist road has been blocked because neither the Indonesian working people nor the imperialists will allow Indonesia to take that path. The Indonesian working people do not allow Indonesia to take the capitalist road because they want to take the socialist road. The imperialists do not allow Indonesia to take the capitalist road because, as far as they are concerned, a semi-colonial or a neo-colonial Indonesia is the only one that suits them. The imperialists will not allow the Indonesian capitalists to develop freely because this kind of development is tantamount to tolerating the birth and growth of a competitor they do not like. This being the case, Indonesian capitalists are regarded as people who can only become imperialism's compradors. To take the semi-colonial or neo-colonial road means to let present condition continue, but this is also impossible because the whole population, especially the working people, already have a strong desire to change the present situation and this can be achieved only by taking the socialist road.

To take the socialist road, the Indonesian Communist Party has set itself the task of building, consolidating and reinforcing the vanguard role of the proletariat in the Indonesian revolution. Only in this way will it be really possible to turn the present national and democratic revolution in Indonesia into a part of the world proletarian socialist revolution, thereby assuring Indonesia's revolution of a socialist and communist future.

## 2. Building of the Party Since 1951

An important event in the reconstruction of the Party was the plenary session of the Central Committee at the beginning of 1951 called under pressure from the Leninists in the Central Committee. In this meeting the opponents to the "New Road" were defeated and a new political bureau was formed. The Party journals, both *Revolutionary Tribune* published underground and *Red Star*, played important roles in the preparation of the victory of the Leninists. The new political bureau exercised its leadership with energetic efforts in accordance with the line of the "New Road" and successfully laid down a Marxist-Leninist constitution for the Indonesian Communist Party. Materials concerning the Party constitutions and the experience of Party building of other Communist Parties, the Chinese Communist Party in particular, gave us great assistance in working out our Party's Constitution. Combined with the concrete experience of Party building gained by the Indonesian Communist Party in the course

of its history, our Party Constitution played an important role in the reconstruction of the Party.

The experience of the Indonesian Communist Party in the period of Party reconstruction can be summarized as follows: in conditions where the Party was in a state of organizational, political and ideological confusion, what was most urgently needed was to work for the firm solidarity and ideological unity in the organ of central leadership (the Central Committee). After this, steps should be taken, from the upper level downwards, to re-establish Party organizations at the lower levels. As soon as the committees of the lower level Party organizations had taken root and begun to develop, there would be further development of inner-Party democracy.

In the course of the work of establishing a nationwide mass party, the Indonesian Communist Party encountered all sorts of special problems brought about by the actual situation of our state and our nation. In the first place, Indonesia is an archipelago made up of thousands of islands on which the Party had to establish organizations and committees. The solution to this problem lay not only in drawing the people who lived on these islands into the Party but also in the solution of the problems of communications, transport and liaison networks. In these circumstances the extremely great significance of the ideological unity of the whole Party became all the more obvious. Only through such unity was it possible for all the regional committees and leading cadres to base themselves firmly on the general line and Programme of the Party while carrying out their work independently and with full measure of initiative. This is the special meaning of our wanting to found the Party on a nationwide scale.

The next problem was that of the various nationalities and the citizens of foreign descent in Indonesia. The Indonesian nation is made up of many nationalities differing in language, customs and levels of social development, as well as of citizens of foreign descent, such as citizens of European, Arab and Chinese ancestry. The most fundamental problem of striking root among the nationalities is the peasant problem. The Party's cadres have carried out their work and established the Party organization by basing themselves resolutely on the Indonesian Communist Party's land programme. One of the most important factors in the development of the Party among all nationalities has been the Party's policy striving for complete equality of rights among all nationalities. Because of this policy, the Party has begun to take root among all the nationalities and healthy competition has developed within the Party in developing those things in each nationality which are helpful and beneficial to the working people so as to achieve complete national independence and total solidarity in the anti-imperialist struggle. In carrying out this policy the Indonesian Communist Party has also launched a struggle against big-nation chauvinism and parochial nationalism. These two tendencies both have their origins in bourgeois ideology.

On the question of citizens of foreign descent, the Indonesian Communist Party has always demanded the carrying out of the policy of equal rights for "native inhabitants" and citizens of foreign descent and opposed all racial discrimination. Owing to the occurrence of

racialist counter-revolutionary incidents in the recent past (May 1963) which mainly involved the destruction of Chinese property, the Indonesian Communist Party has laid down its policy towards citizens of foreign descent in even more concrete terms. This policy is called the policy of revolutionary integration. That is to say, the Indonesian Communist Party is strengthening its work among citizens of foreign descent organizing them into the Indonesian Communist Party or the revolutionary mass bodies, so that they will take an active part in the revolutionary struggle. This policy is of great significance both in eradicating surviving influences of racialism in the ranks of the proletariat itself and in destroying manifestations of exclusivism among citizens of foreign descent. This policy has also shown citizens of foreign descent a way forward, and more and more of them are realizing that, in dealing with racialism and chauvinism on the part of the "native inhabitants," they cannot adopt an attitude of "keeping aloof from politics" and that they must adopt an attitude of dealing with racialism and chauvinism through active participation in revolutionary political activities. The policy of revolutionary integration is also of great value in defeating the policy of so-called "assimilation," which in fact amounts to forcing citizens of foreign descent to change their names and alter their customs and their cultural traditions. The policy of revolutionary integration is, in fact, a policy strengthening the course of the Indonesian nation to socialism, in contrast with the bourgeois policy of "assimilation," which, in fact, strengthens the course to capitalism.

Since 1952 the Indonesian Communist Party has held several large-scale campaigns to increase Party membership, and has never in fact failed to accompany each with a simultaneous movement for educating Party members. In particular, new members have to study the Programme and Constitution of the Party while old members have to study Party documents and Marxist-Leninist theoretical works systematically. For example, the movements for leading cadres to study Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder* in 1951 and 1952 played a decisive role in ridding the Party of the defect of sectarianism. The movement for studying Comrade Liu Shao-chi's *On the Mass Line* was of the greatest help to the cadres of the Indonesian Communist Party in building a Party rooted in the masses. Similarly, Comrade Mao Tse-tung's works *On Practice, On Contradiction* and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People* were of the greatest significance to the Indonesian Communist Party in learning to summarize its own experience and in resolving contradictions within the Party.

With the formal inauguration of the First Three-Year Plan for organizational and educational work on August 17, 1956, a new, unified system of Marxist-Leninist education was begun in Party schools at all levels. All kinds of Party schools and training groups were organized from the central down to the basic-level organizations. Their educational content was closely linked to the tasks of the Party in a given period. Thus, through education within the Party it was possible to equip ourselves ideologically and sweep aside ideological obstacles, so as to bring about the successful completion of all the Party's tasks.

During the First Three-Year Plan four courses were taught at Party schools and in training groups at all levels. They were the history of social development, basic problems of the Indonesian revolution, questions of the national united front and the questions of building the Party. In the Central Party School an additional course was taught: dialectical materialism and historical materialism.

The Second Three-Year Plan was called the Plan for Educational and Organizational Work, and during the period of this plan educational work was further strengthened. The Indonesian Communist Party pointed out with great emphasis that while to build up the Party organizationally was important, it was still more important to build up the ideological level of the Party.

Another important course was added at Party schools at all levels: the international workers' movement. The main aim in starting this course was to strengthen education in patriotism and proletarian internationalism so as to combat national nihilism and chauvinism.

The proletarian internationalism of the Indonesian Communists has been tested many times by domestic and foreign events. One of these was the incident of the Hungarian counter-revolutionary revolt (in 1956) and question of Soviet aid to the Hungarian Workers' and Peasants' Government for its suppression. The Indonesian Communist Party fully and unhesitatingly supported the actions of the Soviet Government. Another test was the carrying out of the Presidential Decree No. 10 in 1959 which was intended to strike at small traders of Chinese descent and at friendship between the Republic of Indonesia and the People's Republic of China. The latest outbreak of racialist counter-revolutionary disturbances was for a similar purpose. We may say that the Indonesian Communist Party has passed these tests. The Indonesian Communists resolutely combated racialism and defended the friendship between the Republic of Indonesia and the People's Republic of China. Taking this attitude has not done the Indonesian Communist Party any harm; it has actually had the opposite effect: in taking this attitude the Party has been able to call on the whole nation to deliver a powerful blow against racialist counter-revolutionary disturbances, and so speed up still more the growth of the Party.

The experience of the Indonesian Communist Party in carrying on systematic Marxist-Leninist education demonstrates that it is most important to put the emphasis from the very beginning on educating the cadres at the central level (in the Central Committee and the big-area committees) as they are the backbone of the whole Party organization. When this has been done this education will spread down to the lower levels.

In the First Three-Year Plan we trained a great number of cadres and activists: 301,884 of them in fact—over 30 times the number of full and candidate Party members in 1951.

In carrying out our educational plans, we also held specialized discussion meetings on some political and organizational questions, and meetings for theoretical discussions, and we initiated various kinds of rectification movements to overcome the mistaken thoughts and tendencies that can emerge at every stage of the struggle.

By carrying out the plans made for building up the Party—and in particular by its work in the educational field—the Party has achieved one of its greatest successes since 1951: the Indonesian Communists have achieved Marxist-Leninist ideological unity.

One of the most important experiences in building up the Indonesian Communist Party has been in carrying out work in a planned way. From 1951 onwards, working to a plan has become the generally used method of work within the Party.

Practical experience in building up the Indonesian Communist Party has fully demonstrated that working to a plan and planning revolutionary activities is not only desirable and possible but is, moreover, necessary. From the theoretical viewpoint the method of working to a plan is completely correct and Marxist-Leninist.

Another advantage of this working method is that it can train cadres to carry on all kinds of work at the same time, to combine different kinds of work, to combine stirring work with hard and diligent efforts, and to know at every moment which task is the most important.

Starting from August 17, 1963, our Party began to implement its grand third plan, that is, its Four-Year Plan of cultural, ideological and organizational work. Like our past plans, this is also a plan for revolution. Therefore, if the targets set under the plan are fulfilled, this will exercise an extremely important influence on the progress of the Indonesian revolutionary movement. Many urgent tasks in Party building are listed in the plan.

In carrying out the tasks of cultural work set by this plan, the Indonesian Communist Party will launch a large-scale movement to raise the cultural level of the working people, particularly Communists; this includes the wiping out of illiteracy, the development of general education ranging from primary- to middle-school education, special education in the arts and other specialized knowledge and even the establishment of all sorts of colleges and universities.

The more the Party develops, the greater the varieties of work Party cadres will undertake. The present stage of struggle demands that right now we train cadres from Communists with general and specialized knowledge, that is to train cadres to become "both Communists and experts." This is one of the main targets of the Four-Year Plan.

In carrying out the tasks in ideological work set in the Four-Year Plan, the Indonesian Communists take as their task the acceleration of the work which we started in the First and Second Three-Year Plans. In this respect, we shall pay special attention to training teachers for Party schools and theoretical workers.

During the period of the Second Three-Year Plan, the Indonesian Communist Party established the Central Party School equivalent to college level and with a study period of three years. This is to meet the needs of the Party for theoretical workers. The Party's practical experience in revolution has been enriched and is developing at a very rapid rate, but the work to sum up these experiences theoretically still lags behind.

It is also one of the urgent tasks in the Four-Year Plan to carry on Marxist-Leninist ideological education among artists and writers. The Party now exercises a

far-reaching influence among artists and writers, but it does insufficient Marxist-Leninist education among them. As a result, their creative work still lags behind the political progress of the Party.

The wider revolutionary concepts spread in Indonesian society, the greater grow the number of progressives who want to study Marxism. The Four-Year Plan lays down that we should organize certain forces to help them. Then, not only the people inside the Party, but the progressives outside the Party, with the assistance of the Party, will study Marxism.

As to organizational tasks under the Four-Year Plan, it is laid down that the number of Party members and members of the mass organizations should be doubled.

Work among the masses, especially among the peasants, will also be carried on and strengthened continually. Essentially our revolution is an agrarian revolution. Though the Party has made tremendous progress in its work among the peasants, its achievements are still far from being sufficient. The Party must strengthen the work of investigation and study in the rural areas and accelerate the training of peasant cadres. In recruiting new Party members special emphasis must be put on recruiting peasants.

Correct methods of leadership are an important factor for progress in organizational work. The Sixth National Congress of the Indonesian Communist Party emphasized this point and the Seventh National Congress once again emphatically pointed this up. The First Plenary Session of the Party's Central Committee, convened in February 1963, held further concrete discussions on the question of methods of leadership. This concerns the question of integrating the general call with concrete guidance, of linking leadership with the masses. The plenary session emphatically pointed out: methods of leadership must be combined with a correct style of work, that is, the style of work of integrating theory with practice, keeping close contact with the masses and conducting self-criticism. During the Four-Year Plan, this method of leadership must be resolutely carried out not only within the Party but also in the mass organizations.

Fulfillment of these tasks will enable the Indonesian Communist Party to develop further on a wider scale and achieve further consolidation; it will also equip our Party cadres with ability, courage and culture. To complete these tasks, the Indonesian Communist Party calls on its cadres to firmly carry out the following: to work well, study well and maintain a high moral standard. When this Four-Year Plan is completed, the Indonesian Communist Party will be in a better position to take great and important steps to complete the Indonesian revolution.

### **3. The Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party, the Political Manifesto, and Certain Tactics Of the Indonesian Communist Party**

For those who want to understand the present revolutionary struggle of the Indonesian people, it is most important to know the common points and differences between the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party and the Political Manifesto of the Republic of Indonesia. On the one hand, the Indonesian Communist Party has its own programme, a complete programme which was basically formulated by the Fifth National



Congress of the Indonesian Communist Party in 1954 and amended and supplemented by the Sixth National Congress in 1959 and the Seventh National Congress in 1962. On the other hand, the Indonesian Communists have the Political Manifesto, namely, the speech of President Sukarno delivered on August 17, 1959, and the details for its concrete implementation which have become the common programme of the Indonesian people and have been approved by the Provisional People's Consultative Conference as the Outline of the National Policy of the Indonesian Republic.

The resolute struggle waged by the Indonesian people under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party has successfully convinced the broad masses of the correctness of the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party. The Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party is one against imperialism and feudalism, so naturally there is a very close link between the Political Manifesto and the Indonesian Communist Party Programme; moreover, the struggle of the Indonesian people waged under the leadership of the Indonesian Communist Party has clarified the contents of the Political Manifesto and ensures its scientific interpretation and resolute implementation.

Both the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party and the Political Manifesto which has become the common programme of the Indonesian people point out that there are two stages in the Indonesian revolution, namely: the national-democratic stage and the socialist stage. This constitutes the common starting point of the general strategy of the Indonesian revolution. Though the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party and the Political Manifesto have different ways of presenting the basic questions of the Indonesian revolution at the present stage such as the targets, tasks, strength, character and future of the revolution, actually they have their common points.

There are certain differences between the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party and the Political Manifesto. The Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party is the programme of the working class to carry through the Indonesian revolution, while the Political Manifesto is the common programme of all the Indonesian people to carry through the Indonesian revolution (a programme for co-operation with other classes). From this it can be seen clearly that the most important difference lies in the question of the leadership of the revolution. The Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party clearly points out that to achieve the aims of the Indonesian revolution the revolutionary leadership must be in the hands of the working class. It is impossible to expect that the question of the leadership of the working class should be included in the Political Manifesto. The Political Manifesto only points out that the workers and the peasants are the supporters of the revolution and it says nothing about which class shoulders the task of leading the revolution.

In its programmatic statement, the Programme of the Indonesian Communist Party is clearly divided into a general programme and a programme of specific demands; while making a clear distinction between the two, it also shows their mutual relations. The general programme is the strategic programme and the line, while the programme of specific demands is the executive guide for carrying

out the general programme or, in other words, it paves the way for implementation of the general programme. The demand for the formation of a Cabinet of Mutual Help and Co-operation (Kabinet Gotong Rojong) with NASAKOM as its core is a tactical demand to realize the future strategic demand: the people's government or the people's democratic government. Should the Political Manifesto be carried out by those who do not understand the differences and mutual relations between the two, confusion will result. The Indonesian Communist Party persists in its Programme, so that it can continue to give a correct interpretation of the Political Manifesto and lead the people correctly and resolutely to carry out the Political Manifesto.

When held in the hands of the Indonesian Communist Party and people, the Political Manifesto is a weapon to unite the Indonesian people to wage the struggle for complete national independence and democracy and against imperialism, feudalism, the bureaucrat-capitalists and comprador elements.

The question of slogans plays an important role in the struggle to carry out the Party's policies. In 1956 the Fourth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party put forward the strategic slogan of "Unite and strive for the realization of the demands of the August 1945 Revolution!" This slogan has played a very important role in widely disseminating the correct understanding of the basic questions concerning the Indonesian revolution, that is, the bourgeois democratic revolution of a new type. In addition, the Fifth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party put forward in 1957 the tactical slogan of "Changing the balance of forces so as to realize President Sukarno's plan 100 per cent!" and this has played a significant role in uniting all kinds of revolutionary forces so as to fulfil the demand for the organization of a national coalition government or the formation of a Cabinet of Mutual Help and Co-operation with NASAKOM as its core.

In order to guide the development of the political situation, the Indonesian Communist Party is carrying out the following general line: continuing to build up the national united front and continuing to build up the Party so as to fulfil thoroughly the demands of the August 1945 Revolution. Following this general line, the Indonesian Communists hold aloft the Party's three banners: 1) the banner of the national united front; 2) the banner of Party building; and 3) the banner of the August 1945 Revolution.

To the Indonesian Communists, holding aloft the banner of the national united front means at the present time strengthening its work among the peasants, strengthening its work among the national united front organizations and enhancing the unity of NASAKOM, namely, the unity of the nationalists, the religious circles and the Communists on the basis of the common programme of the Political Manifesto. Without a vigorous and resolutely anti-feudal peasant movement, a broad, firm national united front against imperialism cannot be established, nor can there be a mighty national united front organization or powerful NASAKOM co-operation.

To hold high the banner of Party building means to carry on and to perfect the work of building up a nation-

wide Party which is fully consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally. The Indonesian Communist Party can accomplish its historical tasks only if it has a large number of cadres who are imbued with communist morality and are professionally skilled. Such cadres, the most politically conscious executors of the Party's political and organizational lines, can have a decisive effect on the Party's achievements.

To hold high the banner of the August 1945 Revolution means to rally as many of the people around us as possible and to strive for the thorough realization of the demands of the August Revolution, that is, to eliminate the existing forces of imperialism and feudalism in Indonesia. The banner of the August Revolution is an affirmation of the importance of utilizing the experience of the struggle during the period of the August 1945 Revolution. The experience of that revolution taught us that guerrilla warfare was of extreme importance in the defence of Indonesian sovereignty. But had we adopted the method of combining the three forms of struggle, that is, guerrilla fighting (mainly by the peasants) in the rural areas, revolutionary struggles of the workers (mainly communications and transport workers) in the cities, and effective and more intensified work among the enemy's armed forces, the guerrilla war at that time would have been more effectively waged and, moreover, would have been successful.

To hold high the banner of the August 1945 Revolution also means to carry out three forms of struggle, that is, to work well among the peasants in the rural areas, among the workers (mainly communications and transport workers) in the cities, and to forge close ties between the armed forces and the people so that these armed sons of the workers and peasants will not be used by the reactionaries against the people.

In order to mobilize the strength of the entire nation, the Indonesian Communist Party raises high the three banners of the nation—democracy, unity and mobilization—which were raised for the first time at the Party's Seventh National Congress. At first, the slogan of holding high the three banners of the nation was put forward for the purpose of firmly opposing wartime martial law, which suppressed democratic life in a most severe way, of consolidating the national united front rooted in NASAKOM and of mobilizing the masses of the people to liberate West Irian and overcome the crisis in clothing and food supplies. Holding aloft the three banners of the nation, the Indonesian Communist Party shouts the slogan "Struggle with one hand on the gun and the other on the hoe!"

Today, while holding high the three banners of the Party and three banners of the nation, the Indonesian Communists call on the masses of the people to carry out the three most pressing tasks of the nation: 1) to consolidate the victories already won; 2) to overcome its economic difficulties; and 3) to oppose neo-colonialism. Hence we usually say: Hold high the two sets of three banners and carry out the three tasks.

#### **4. The Communist Party of Indonesia and the International Communist Movement**

The essence of the differences in the international communist movement at present boils down, in the final analysis, to a question of the international communist

movement's strategy and tactics in the world socialist revolution. On a previous occasion I pointed out that the differences in the varying views in the international communist movement stem from the question of what way will enable us to bury imperialism most quickly. The question is "What is the best way to bury imperialism?" The wrong way would prolong the existence of imperialism, and that would be to its advantage. To defend with unsparing efforts what is obviously wrong and what has been proved more and more clearly to be advantageous to imperialism, would be a different matter, a matter no longer within the scope of how to bury imperialism.

Why is it that it is precisely the imperialists and revisionists who are at the bottom of the rift in the international communist movement? Because the international communist movement is the main obstacle to the imperialists, who concentrate all their energy on smashing the international communist movement. Apart from their usual tactics (violence and intrigues), they use the revisionists, first of all, the Yugoslav modern revisionists.

Today, when the international communist movement has become the most influential political force in our age, the imperialists and revisionists are directing their spearhead against it.

Past experience proves that an enduring unity must have a solid foundation—a foundation that cannot be affected by changes in circumstances and that never gets rusty with time. Particularly at this stage of the international communist movement, the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960 are, as the Indonesian Communist Party has often pointed out, the foundations on which the international communist movement today must anchor itself. That is to say, the international communist movement must eliminate the poison of revisionism and hold firm to the kernel of Marxism-Leninism. This means to cherish revolution warmly and to oppose imperialism in all its respects. At the same time, we must continuously oppose both classic and modern dogmatism, because dogmatism, too, impedes the advance of revolution.

The cadres of the Indonesian Communist Party are stimulated and they take a more deeply critical attitude in studying and drawing upon the experience of the international communist movement. Events are spurring them on to make an ever deeper study of Marxist-Leninist theory. It is the policy of the Indonesian Communist Party to put all the available material on the international communist movement within the reach of all, in order that they can use the approach of the Indonesian Communist Party to the questions facing the international communist movement to study and discuss this material in a critical spirit.

You comrades are already quite familiar with the attitude of the Indonesian Communist Party towards the current problems of the international communist movement. The Indonesian Communist Party was one of the first Marxist-Leninist parties to propose talks between the Soviet and the Chinese Parties. We are therefore glad that talks between the Soviet and Chinese Parties were held in July, and that they were not terminated but will be resumed in the future. Since we are aware of the seriousness of the questions at issue and their essence, we do not hope for more than this.

Experience up to now proves that in adopting an independent attitude towards the problems in the international communist movement, the Indonesian Communist Party has been able to enhance inner-Party unity. To be independent is not to be neutral, but is to hold firm to Marxism-Leninism, to play a positive role in eliminating the rift in the international communist movement. By holding aloft the banner of independence of a Marxist-Leninist party, we give expression to the principle of equality and independence guiding the relations between the Communist Parties of the world. Thus, serious as the contradictions within the international communist movement may be, we are able to safeguard and strengthen unity within the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The adoption of an independent attitude has taught the cadres of the Indonesian Communist Party to take a critical attitude in their approach to various problems and enabled the Party to reject dogmatism and keep it well away, thereby greatly advancing the work of the Party in "Indonesianizing" Marxism-Leninism, in other words, in fully combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the actual practice of the revolution in Indonesia. The Indonesian Communist Party has consistently safeguarded its close friendship with other fraternal Parties and refrained from interfering in their internal affairs. That is to say, it has consistently taught its members in day-to-day activities constantly to learn from other fraternal Parties; at the same time, it expects that other Parties will not interfere in its internal affairs. This is entirely in accord with the principle guiding the relations between Marxist-Leninist parties as set forth in the Statement of 1960. It is clear to all that we can benefit from both the positive and the negative experience of other fraternal Parties. We can even learn from a bad teacher, that is to say, we can learn how not to become like such a teacher.

The Communist Party of Indonesia adopts an attitude of resolutely combating imperialism with the slogan "We love peace but we love independence still more." That is to say, the most important thing is that only by directing the revolutionary struggle against imperialism with the United States at its head can peace be preserved and the unity of the international communist movement be strengthened.

The Statement of 1960 stresses the importance of the struggle against modern revisionism. From our experience we are clear that the Yugoslav modern revisionists are continuing in a way that was severely criticized by the 1960 Statement. This is borne out by the fact that they have been spreading the idea of a "third road" in an attempt to lead astray the struggle of the countries now fighting imperialism and neo-colonialism. Everyone knows that this "third road" idea has been opposed in Indonesia. People hold high the banner of the idea of revolution, the revolutionary idea that there are two mutually opposed forces in the world today — the new emerging forces versus the old dying forces. The Yugoslav revisionists engage in demagogy and are trying to obstruct the formation of a NASAKOM cabinet in Indonesia. The Indonesian people are implacably opposed to the Malaysian confederation, while the modern Yugoslav revisionists have voiced their agreement. The Yugoslav revisionists are also painstakingly undermining and splitting the rev-

olutionary movement of the people of various Asian and African countries.

Yugoslavia has been increasingly degenerating into a country serving the interests of the capitalist bloc. This is borne out by the fact that U.S. economic aid accounts for one-third of Yugoslavia's budget every year and by 1962 the total amount had reached 3,500 million U.S. dollars. Following the publication of the 1960 Statement, i.e., since 1961, Yugoslavia has "liberalized" its foreign trade, stimulating its import and export trade, while paralysing domestic industrial production.

Therefore, as is stressed in the 1960 Statement, it is obligatory for us to expose the modern revisionists of Yugoslavia resolutely.

At the present time no Communists can cut themselves off from the serious and real differences existing in the international communist movement, nor can they assume a neutral attitude towards them. Because of its correct attitude towards the differences arising in the communist movement, the Indonesian Communist Party has suffered no damage in its growth; the contrary is the case. This can be seen from the fact that the Indonesian Communist Party has registered a steady growth, its theoretical level has steadily risen and the Marxist-Leninist spirit of its cadres and members is being continuously enhanced.

In face of the serious differences of views within the international communist movement, the Communists of Indonesia are more aware than ever of the correctness of their attitude in this period, namely, one of independence, loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, loyalty to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, struggle against subjectivism and struggle against classical and modern revisionism and classical and modern dogmatism. Faced with the serious and substantial differences of views within the international communist movement, the Communists of Indonesia regard this as a temporary phenomenon and are therefore imbued with realistic optimism.

The comrades will see from what I have said above that we Indonesian Communists have learnt a great deal from the Chinese revolution and from the revolutions of other countries, too. Now as always, we shall be modest in learning from the Chinese revolution and the revolutions of other countries.

We shall continue modestly and sincerely to study Marxism-Leninism. At the present stage of the struggle of the international communist movement especially we should study Marxism-Leninism more, in order to acquire a real understanding of the meaning of Marxist-Leninist teachings. Only by so doing can we avoid becoming sham Marxist-Leninists or wobbling statesmen; only so can we firmly uphold the real Marxist-Leninist stand.

Indonesian Communists feel that they have embarked on the correct road, the road of fully combining the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the actual practice of the revolution in Indonesia. We have to a certain extent "Indonesianized" Marxism-Leninism. But it is not possible that there is now no room for improvement here. Therefore, as regards our work and study, we hold firm to our slogan: "Know Marxism-Leninism well and grasp the facts."

# Outstanding Contributions of the Communist Party of Indonesia

*Following are excerpts from the speech made by Peng Chen, Member of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and First Secretary of the Peking Municipal Committee of the Party, at the Peking mass rally held on September 4 to welcome Comrade D.N. Aidit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Indonesian Communist Party, and the Party delegation led by him. —Ed.*

THE name of Comrade D.N. Aidit is known to all of us and arouses warm feelings among us. He is the leader of the Communist Party of Indonesia which enjoys high prestige in the international communist movement, and is an outstanding fighter against imperialism and colonialism, an outstanding Marxist-Leninist theorist and social activist and a close friend and comrade-in-arms of the Chinese people.

The Indonesian Communist Party is a mighty vanguard of the proletariat, filled with creative spirit and militancy. It is a great, nationwide Party having close ties with the masses of the Indonesian people. It is a stalwart Marxist-Leninist shock force of the international communist movement. It is now the biggest Communist Party in the countries outside the socialist camp and one of the biggest in the world.

The brilliant achievements of the Indonesian Communist Party have resulted from its correct Marxist-Leninist line and policies.

The Communist Party of Indonesia has always held aloft a bright anti-imperialist banner. In the struggle against Dutch colonialism and for the recovery of West Irian, the Communists and the people of Indonesia displayed a great, heroic fighting spirit and have won the admiration of the world's revolutionary people.

After the neo-colonialist force of U.S. imperialism infiltrated Indonesia, the Indonesian Communist Party clearly and promptly pointed out that U.S. imperialism is the most dangerous and No. 1 enemy of the Indonesian people. Together with the people of Indonesia, the Party has gained very rich experience in the prolonged revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

The Indonesian Communist Party has raised high a bright revolutionary banner. Proceeding from Indonesian reality, the Party has summed up the experience of the struggle of the masses at home and is creatively applying and developing Marxism-Leninism according to Indonesia's conditions.

The Indonesian Communist Party holds aloft a bright banner of proletarian internationalism. It consistently upholds the fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and, on this basis, safeguards the unity of the international communist movement and opposes a split. The Party is guided by a high sense of principle and is never swayed by the wind; it is loyal

to the common agreements reached among the fraternal Parties and wages an uncompromising struggle against the main danger in the present-day international communist movement, modern revisionism, and against dogmatism; it continuously exposes the criminal activities of the Tito group of renegades as a special detachment of U.S. imperialism. The Indonesian Communist Party has demonstrated its boundless devotion to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat of the world and has made outstanding contributions to it.

The example of the Indonesian Communist Party shows that only by upholding Marxism-Leninism, persisting in the fight against imperialism and in revolutionary struggle, abiding by proletarian internationalism, determinedly repudiating and opposing modern revisionism and modern dogmatism which follow servilely the baton of a foreign country, proceeding from concrete conditions and the needs and demands of the masses of its own country, only through all this can a Party lead the people's revolutionary struggle from victory to victory and ensure the constant growth of its ranks and strength. If, on the contrary, a Party pursues a line of revisionism, wheeling round and round at the command of a baton, stops itself from opposing imperialism and making revolution, and repudiates proletarian internationalism, it will not only damage the revolutionary cause of the people, but will also disintegrate its own ranks and dissipate its strength.

The history of mankind will advance irresistibly and a handful of imperialists and reactionaries cannot alter the course of history. In any case, the people of the world will inevitably want to take their own road, oppose imperialism and be for revolution. The people are in the majority and those who oppose them are in the minority. Those who want revolution are in the majority and those who oppose revolution are in the minority. The more the modern revisionists make common cause with the imperialists and reactionaries and the more they scorn, hate and oppose the people's revolutionary cause of various countries, the more isolated they will find themselves.

The present visit to China of the Indonesian Communist Party delegation led by its Chairman Aidit will enhance the fraternal unity of the Chinese and Indonesian Communist Parties and the militant friendship between the peoples of the two countries. Based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the fraternal unity of the two Parties was forged in the flames of their common struggle and has stood tests for a long time.

The Chinese and Indonesian people have always supported and co-operated with each other in the common cause of opposing imperialism and colonialism, defending world peace and promoting Asian-African solidarity. The Chinese people will always stand side by side with the Indonesian people in their future struggles.

# Some Questions of the Indonesian Revolution and the Communist Party Of Indonesia

*At the Peking mass rally on September 4, Comrade D. N. Aidit gave a report entitled "Some Questions of the Indonesian Revolution and the Communist Party of Indonesia." In the first part of this report, he gave a brief outline of Indonesian history and the growth of the national movement and then dealt with the basic questions of the Indonesian revolution, the question of the national united front and the question of state power in the Indonesian Republic. In the second part of his report, he dealt with some experiences in building the Party. Following are excerpts from this report.—Ed.*

**T**HE national revolution which broke out in August 1945 was an upsurge in Indonesia's national-liberation struggle. With the proclamation of the founding of the Republic of Indonesia on August 17, 1945, the Indonesian people took the state power into their own hands. In the course of the revolution, the Indonesian people have waged a firm struggle against their main enemy — imperialism. However, another major enemy — the feudal landlord class which provides the most important social basis for imperialist domination — has not yet been overthrown. Therefore, Indonesian society is still semi-feudal in nature.

The anti-imperialist, anti-feudal struggle is still going on. Imperialism still has quite a big influence in political power and in the economy. U.S. imperialism has now replaced Dutch imperialism and become the No.1 enemy of the Indonesian people. Meanwhile, Dutch imperialism remains a dangerous enemy, and other imperialist countries, such as Britain, West Germany and Japan, are intensifying their penetration into Indonesia. The influence of feudal landlords still largely survives and is one of the props of the domestic reactionary forces.

The Indonesian working class and its political party — the Communist Party of Indonesia, born on May 23, 1920 — from the very beginning integrated itself with the national movement and became the vanguard of its Left wing. On the basis of an analysis of the Indonesian society and the Indonesian revolution, the Constitution of the Indonesian Communist Party stresses that the Indonesian revolution is protracted and complex. In order to be able to guide the revolution, the Indonesian Communist Party must carry the people's revolutionary struggle forward by using the tactics of advancing steadily and carefully but surely. In the course of the struggle, the Indonesian Communist Party must consistently oppose two trends: capitulationism and adventurism.

## Basic Questions of the Indonesian Revolution

The August Revolution has taught the Communists of Indonesia the following: the nature of the revolution in Indonesia; which classes support the revolution and which oppose it; the reasons why a national united front is indispensable for the victory of the revolution; which allies

of the proletariat are reliable, and which allies are wavering and, under certain circumstances, would betray the revolution. The August Revolution has also taught us that armed struggle is the most important form of struggle in the revolution. One of the main lessons derived from the August Revolution is that the national-democratic revolution of Indonesia can only be victorious when the working class seizes absolute leadership of the revolution. In order to achieve this, the Indonesian Communist Party must be able to combine the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the Indonesian revolution and it must "Indonesianize" Marxism-Leninism.

Since Indonesia is still a semi-colonial, semi-feudal society, the targets (enemies) of the revolution are imperialism and feudalism. The tasks of the revolution are to carry out a national revolution to drive out imperialism and to carry out a democratic revolution to eliminate feudalism. The driving forces of the revolution are the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and other democrats who suffer from imperialism and resolutely oppose it. The national bourgeoisie are capable of taking part in the revolution. At the present stage, the Indonesian revolution is not a socialist revolution of the proletariat but a national-democratic revolution or a bourgeois democratic revolution. The future of the revolution is socialism and communism and not capitalism.

The Communist Party of Indonesia advances the theory that there are three forces existing in Indonesia, namely, the progressive force, the middle force and the diehard force. Facts have proved the correctness of this. The Party's line towards these three forces is to develop the progressive force, unite with the middle force and isolate the diehard force. While uniting with the middle force, the Party also conducts struggles with it. The Party unites with the middle force in order to oppose imperialism and feudalism. But the Party struggles against it if it wants to weaken the independence of the Party and of the working people's movement or if it wavers in the struggle against imperialism and feudalism.

The Communist Party of Indonesia has put forward another theory: that in the armed struggle like that of the 1945-48 period of the revolution the Party should not have copied the theory of armed struggle in foreign countries but should have adopted a method combining three forms of struggle — guerrilla struggle in the countryside (the participants being mainly hired hands and poor peasants), revolutionary struggle by workers (mainly transport workers) in enemy-held cities and strengthening the work among the enemy armed forces. This is a very important theory which could ensure the victory of guerrilla warfare in a country of islands like Indonesia.

The Communist Party of Indonesia advances the theory that, in order to win the Indonesian revolution, all

its members and the mass of the working people should be educated in the spirit of combining patriotism with proletarian internationalism. The Communists of Indonesia should oppose national nihilism and bourgeois chauvinism.

To be able to guide the development of the political situation, the Party must pursue the general line of continuing to unfold the work of the united front and of building the Party so as to realize thoroughly the demands of the August 1945 Revolution. In other words, the Communists of Indonesia should hold high the three banners of the Party—the banner of the united front, the banner of Party building and the banner of the August 1945 Revolution. The general line of the Communist Party regarding the united front is to form an anti-imperialist united front of the working class, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and national bourgeoisie under the leadership of the working class and based on the worker-peasant alliance against feudalism. The general line regarding Party building is to build a Party throughout the country that has a broad mass character and is completely consolidated ideologically, politically and organizationally. The general line of the Communist Party of Indonesia concerning the revolution of August 1945 is to use all the experience in struggle, mobilize the broad masses and teach them to prepare themselves for all eventualities.

### Questions of the National United Front

The Fifth National Congress of the Indonesian Communist Party set the formation of a national united front as its most urgent task. The congress pointed out that the basis for the front was the worker-peasant alliance.

On the question of the national bourgeoisie, the August Revolution provided the Indonesian Communist Party with important experience about the wavering character of this class. Under certain circumstances, the national bourgeoisie can take part in the revolution and side with the revolution with a clear-cut attitude, as shown in the initial period of the August Revolution. However, under other circumstances, it wavers and changes sides, as shown during the provocative Madiun incident manufactured by the Hatta government. The national bourgeoisie also surrendered to imperialism and agreed to the treacherous Round Table Conference Agreement. Therefore, the proletariat and the Communist Party of Indonesia must perseveringly strive to win the national bourgeoisie over to the side of the revolution and at the same time must guard against its possible betrayal of the revolution.

In the light of the tradition of the national-liberation struggle of Indonesia, there were three major political trends against Dutch colonial rule, namely, the nationalist trend, the religious (mainly Islam) trend and the communist trend. If, therefore, these three political trends form a NASAKOM, one can say that the national unity of Indonesia is achieved.

Apart from the worker-peasant alliance and the NASAKOM unity, national unity in Indonesia also finds expression in the form of the National Front under the chairmanship of President Sukarno. The Vice-Chairmen of the National Front are representatives of the three sides of the NASAKOM. The National Front has adopted a five-point programme as the guide for its activities. This five-point programme accords with the three current tasks

of the Communist Party of Indonesia (to consolidate the victories already won, overcome economic difficulties and continue the struggle against neo-colonialism).

### The Question of State Power in Indonesia

The most fundamental question in every revolution is the question of state power. The Indonesian Communist Party appreciates the correctness of this formula not only in theory but also in practice and as a result of bitter lessons.

As early as 1951, the Communist Party of Indonesia put forward the demand for a national coalition government to be formed by those democratic parties and non-party democrats who agreed to annul the Round Table Conference Agreement.

In November 1960, the Provisional People's Consultative Congress adopted the "Political Manifesto of the Republic of Indonesia" as the main line of the state policy. The Political Manifesto, which was a speech made by President Sukarno on August 17, 1959, has truly become the common programme of the entire Indonesian people for carrying out the revolution.

In March 1963, President Sukarno issued another important document: the Economic Declaration. Representatives of the three sides of NASAKOM played an important role in drawing up this declaration.

Embodied in the Political Manifesto and Economic Declaration, progressive political and economic plans for carrying out the Indonesian revolution have, in effect, become official state policy.

### Some Experiences in Building the Party

The question of Marxist-Leninist education is a very urgent and decisive one on which the success of building the Party depends. Since 1952, the Indonesian Communist Party has launched several large-scale campaigns to enrol new members, each time synchronized with activities to educate Party members. Comrade Mao Tse-tung's works *On Practice*, *On Contradiction* and *On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People*, which was published in 1957, have been of extremely great significance for the Indonesian Communist Party in learning to sum up its own experience and in resolving inner-Party contradictions.

The experience in building the Party leads to the conclusion that the Indonesian Communists have three characteristics: (1) the Party members are educated in the spirit of patriotism and proletarian internationalism; (2) in building the Party, they attach importance to organizational work, but lay even greater emphasis on the ideological aspect; (3) they firmly adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and are flexible in applying these principles.

The work of the Indonesian Communists in building and strengthening the Party cannot be separated from the development of the international communist movement, which exerts a great influence on the building of the Indonesian Communist Party. It is unfortunate that serious differences of views on questions of substance have arisen in the international communist movement. The situation would have been better for the international communist movement and for the Indonesian Communist Party without these differences and public polemics. However,

in the past few years, no Communist could keep aloof from these serious differences on questions of substance in the international communist movement, or take a neutral attitude towards them.

The Communist Party of Indonesia has taken a correct approach to the differences of views in the international communist movement, and therefore has avoided losses in building the Party. This is shown by the continuous growth and consolidation of the Party and the steady increase in its members' understanding of Marxism-Leninism and the strengthening of their Marxist-Leninist spirit. The existence of differences in the international communist movement has helped the Indonesian Communists understand even more clearly the correctness of having an independent attitude. This is the only correct attitude to be taken in this period, an attitude which is loyal to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and loyal to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and which is relentless towards subjectivism, classic and modern revisionism, and classic and modern dogmatism.

### International Communist Movement

# Reply to Khrushchov

## Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil

*Following are excerpts of the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil adopted on July 27, 1963, and published in the August 1-15 issue of the Brazilian fortnightly "A Classe Operaria."—Ed.*

**I**N its attempt to reply to the arguments raised by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in its June 14 letter, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in an open letter published in *Pravda* on July 14, accused the Chinese comrades of "organizing and supporting various anti-Party groups who come out against the Communist Parties in the United States, Brazil, Italy, Belgium, Australia and India," and mentioned by name members of the leading organ of the Communist Party of Brazil.

The accusation of the C.P.S.U. leaders is extremely absurd and without any reason whatsoever; it runs counter to the interests of the revolutionary movement.

On what ground did the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. make the above-mentioned charge? The leaders of the C.P.S.U. are well aware of the events that have happened in the communist movement in our country since 1956. As a result of these events, two Parties have appeared: the Communist Party of Brazil and the Brazilian Communist Party.

### Facts Which Provoked the Split

It is well known that following the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U., a powerful revisionist trend appeared in

An important aspect of the experience gained by the Indonesian Communist Party in Party building is to carry out its work according to plan. Since 1951, this has become a method of work universally adopted in the Party. In 1956, the Party started its First Three-Year Plan for organizational and educational work, which was followed by the Second Three-Year Plan for educational and organizational work. Now the Party is in the initial period of a Four-Year Plan for cultural, ideological and organizational work.

The great progress we have made in building the Party is definitely inseparable from the correct political line pursued by the Party. It may well be said that the correctness of the Party's policies is the decisive factor in this progress. The correct policies, which reflect the interests of the revolutionary classes in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, have rallied more and more people of various social strata round our Party or into our ranks.

The progress in the building of the Party has, on the other hand, created favourable conditions for carrying out the policies of the Party.

the communist ranks, with Agildo Barata as its main spokesman. At that time, the majority of the members of the Communist Party of Brazil and its Central Committee were against the various manifestations of revisionism. Although certain mistakes were committed in the course of the ideological struggle, measures were taken to protect the Party from the influence of the ideas incompatible with the proletariat, and to safeguard the unity of the Party. Luiz Carlos Prestes also took part in this struggle against revisionism. But, after the development in the C.P.S.U. in June 1957 in which Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and other comrades were excluded from the Party's leading organization, Prestes made a sudden change which seemed difficult to comprehend. He expressed complete agreement with the ideas then upheld by Agildo Barata and his clique. From then on, he has become a fervent defender of revisionism, and notorious persons of this group have all gathered around him. He has become a fanatic apologist for capitalist development in Brazil, working still more energetically than he did when he supported the stand of Earl Browder in 1945.

In March 1958, Prestes, by dint of anti-Party tactics, made the Central Committee adopt a typical opportunist policy. This policy has not only brought serious harm to the Brazilian revolutionary movement but also openly repudiated the militant tradition of the Party.

However, this new political line began to meet with growing opposition in the Central Committee and among Party members. The revisionists were losing ground.

In 1960, the position of Prestes and the other reformists in the leading organ of the Party was by no means stable. Even a majority under their control became quite unreliable. In these circumstances they decided to convene the Fifth Party Congress with the sole aim of removing all those opposed to this Rightist policy from the Party's leading organ. They attempted to control the Party by holding out prospects of an easy victory in the elections, asserting that once Marshal Lott was elected the Party would be sure to obtain a legal status and to hold government posts.

The Fifth Congress was prepared with great deliberation. Although an extensive debate had been unfolded on the pages of the organ of the Central Committee during a period preceding the congress, currency was given to lies and slanders against those comrades opposing revisionism. Undue interference was made in conferences of Party organizations at all levels and in the congress aimed at making them adopt this opportunist political line and elect persons who agreed to this line as delegates. It is enough to point out the fact that in the polemics unfolded in the press more than half of the articles published expressed disagreement with Prestes' views; at many preparatory meetings of the congress large numbers of Party members opposed the arguments advanced by the Central Committee. However, as a result of the machinations mentioned above, only a small number of the Party members who disagreed were among the delegates to the Fifth Congress. Consequently, the congress failed to reflect the will of the Party. The Fifth Congress attained the real purpose for which it was convened: the expulsion of 12 full Members of the Central Committee out of a total of 25, and several Alternate Members from the Central Committee.

The comrades holding different views, though subjected to such despicable discrimination, observed the resolution of the Fifth Congress with good discipline. But, Prestes and his followers continued their revisionist activities and finally set out to undermine the foundation of the Party. In August 1961, in violation of the resolution of the congress and under the pretext of acquiring legal status for the Party they decided to found a new party. The Communist Party of Brazil was cast aside and was replaced by the Brazilian Communist Party. Provisions that the Party is guided by Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism were deleted from the Party Constitution. The programme advanced was less radical than that of the Labour Party or the Socialist Party.

Party members who disagreed with such a flagrant violation of democratic centralism and who were determined to preserve Party unity demanded that the Central Committee renounce the position it had taken or call an extraordinary congress. They made clear that they would never approve the abolition of the Communist Party of Brazil. The answer from the opportunist leading clique was to take disciplinary measures, dissolve organizations, expel long-tested Party members and whip up a despicable calumny campaign against the honest Communists.

#### **Unjustified Attacks by the C.P.S.U. Central Committee**

In these circumstances what were the true revolutionaries to do? They had no alternative but to reorganize the Communist Party of Brazil. They convened

an extraordinary national representative conference in Sao Paulo in February 1962 to discuss the situation and decide future policies. Representatives from several states took part in the conference. The conference decided to rebuild the Party, adopted a Marxist-Leninist programme, resolved to publish the Party's traditional organ, and elected a new central committee. Remaining in the Communist Party of Brazil are eight members of the former central committee, some leaders of trade union and youth organizations, and many rank-and-file members who have worked in the Party for more than 20 years. Among their leaders are many comrades who had spent many years in reactionary prisons.

As a result of the work done in the past year, the Party's membership has swelled from several hundred to several thousand, its organizations have been set up in all parts of the country, and its influence has been widened among the masses. The Party has intensified its political activity and substantially increased the circulation of its organ.

Such being the case, how could the C.P.S.U. Central Committee led by Khrushchov say that the Communist Party of Brazil is an anti-Party group? How could they accuse this legitimate vanguard of the working class of Brazil, this organization which remains true to Marxism-Leninism and to the principles of proletarian internationalism, of being engaged in splitting activities? Could Khrushchov and the C.P.S.U. Central Committee substantiate their charges and cite any action taken by the Communist Party of Brazil that is against the revolution and the interests of the Brazilian people?

These charges of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee can only be regarded as all-out encouragement to the rotten reformist faction headed by Prestes which has led the Brazilian communist movement to a split, and as an attempt to shift the blame on to the Chinese comrades for the splits in the Communist Parties of certain countries.

It is indeed distressing to Brazilian revolutionaries that such charges should have come from the leaders of the Party founded by Lenin which had in its history relentlessly opposed opportunism and given resolute support under all circumstances to revolutionaries. Being Communists educated in the tradition of the Bolshevik Party, we have consistently looked upon the Soviet Union as a powerful base of the world revolutionary movement. Consequently we cannot agree to the acts of those people who, holding leading positions in the biggest socialist country, have betrayed the glorious tradition of Bolshevism and overtly supported the revisionists in various parts of the world. Notwithstanding the slanders of the present C.P.S.U. leaders and their distortion of truth, we would like to take this opportunity to convey our admiration and gratitude to the Soviet people who carried out the Great October Revolution, established socialism on one-sixth of the land of the world and smashed Nazism-fascism in a most brutal war. Nothing can make us depart from the principles of proletarian internationalism, Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary struggle.

By supporting and abetting the Prestes revisionist faction, Khrushchov and the C.P.S.U. Central Committee



are, objectively, opposing the revolutionary movement in our country.

### **Bankruptcy of the Opportunist Line**

Facts have shown that pursuing an opportunist political line, the Brazilian Communist Party has become discredited in the eyes of the broad masses and the democratic forces.

The name of the Party has been changed and Party principles violated for the sake of registering in accordance with the electoral law. Yet, more than a year has passed and this new reformist party has not acquired legal status.

These and many other events fully testify to the bankruptcy of the Brazilian Communist Party's policy.

### **Revolutionary Party and Reformist Party**

How could the C.P.S.U. Central Committee consider such a party the leading organization of the working class and at the same time label as an anti-Party group that party which truly represents the interests of the proletariat?

The Communist Party of Brazil is struggling to overthrow the existing state power of the large latifundia owners and big bourgeoisie and to establish a true people's government which alone can carry out the reforms necessary for the progress of the state, the well-being of the people and the winning of complete national independence. The Brazilian Communist Party, on its part, does not oppose the existing state power but merely advocates the realization of a partial structural reform of the state within the framework of the existing state power. Their pretext is that this reform paves the way for complete transformation.

The Communist Party of Brazil is striving for the formation of a people's revolutionary government representing the progressive classes and strata of society to replace the state power of the large latifundia owners and big bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the aim of the Brazilian Communist Party is to establish a so-called nationalist-democratic government the realization of which would involve exclusion from the government those ministers standing for capitulation, and the appointment of other persons regarded as nationalists and democrats.

The Communist Party of Brazil, in order to realize a people's democratic, national-liberation revolution, insists on establishing a united front comprising all the revolutionary forces in Brazilian society, with the workers and peasants as its basic core. The Brazilian Communist Party, because it merely seeks partial reforms, tries its best to establish a so-called nationalist-democratic front comprising all the bourgeoisie, even including the stratum of the large latifundia owners.

The Communist Party of Brazil holds that under present circumstances the ruling classes have blocked the path of peaceful revolution and so the people, while not abandoning the use of various forms of legal struggle, should be well prepared for a non-peaceful solution. On the other hand, the Brazilian Communist Party, taking no account of the actual situation in the country and in order to deceive the people, alleges that the aim of

the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution can be realized by peaceful means.

The Communist Party of Brazil has put forward a revolutionary programme, set forth the objective of socialism, openly affirmed that it follows Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism, and it does not hide its name and its class nature. The Brazilian Communist Party, on the other hand, has betrayed the former party, abandoned the revolutionary programme and hides its own name. Therefore, it has ceased to be a proletarian party.

In a word, the Communist Party of Brazil is a revolutionary party whereas the Brazilian Communist Party is a reformist party. The Communist Party of Brazil fights for safeguarding proletarian leadership in the revolution. The Brazilian Communist Party, on the other hand, is led by the nose by the ruling classes and helps the bourgeoisie to deceive the working masses.

Therefore, there is no difficulty in Brazil in telling which faction follows the revolutionary road and which faction pursues a revisionist line. One faction defends the Marxist-Leninist policy while the other practises a typical Rightist policy.

### **Causes for the Split in the Brazilian Communist Movement**

The Soviet leaders have charged the comrades of the Chinese Communist Party with causing a split in the Brazilian communist movement. This is but an arbitrary assertion which goes completely against the actual state of affairs and is an outright slander. Facts have proved that internal factors are the main cause of the split, which essentially arose from the penetration of bourgeois ideas into the Party. With the advance of capitalism in our country and as a result of cajoling by the bourgeoisie, the influence of these ideas has become ever greater. The split also arose from the intolerable attitude of the reformist leaders headed by Prestes who, in the course of the ideological struggle, used methods which deserved the severest condemnation. It is equally undeniable that there exist external influences, with the greatest influence coming from the 20th Congress (of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). By adopting a number of highly debatable propositions and raising the question of the cult of the individual, this congress created confusion and encouraged the opportunists of various stripes and colours and all those who opposed the existence of an independent, truly revolutionary party of the working class. Meanwhile, the vigorous ideological offensive launched by imperialism also affected the ranks of the Party.

In accusing the Chinese comrades of being responsible for the split in the Brazilian communist movement, the C.P.S.U. leaders revealed their contempt for the strength and militancy of the Brazilian workers. Obsessed by a sense of superiority, they were unable to see that in the face of the betrayal by the opportunists, there was bound to appear in our country a number of people who would be determined to hold high the banner of revolution, to found a political party of the proletariat, to carry on a ruthless struggle against imperialism and the latifundia system and to persist in the struggle until socialism is successfully realized in Brazil. When discussions were

first begun within the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Brazil, those comrades who later endeavoured to rebuild the Party were unaware of the existence of differences in the world communist movement. Later on, when they realized there were disputes on some questions they still did not know how deep the differences actually were. It was not until this year when a series of articles were published in the Peking *Renmin Ribao* and the journal *Hongqi* (Red Flag) that the members of the Communist Party of Brazil realized exactly the extent of the differences. It was only then that they came to see that these differences involved not only the Chinese and Soviet Parties. What was involved was a struggle of historic significance between Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism.

The viewpoints of the Chinese Communist Party expounded in the above-stated articles and the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. cannot but make the rank-and-file members and leaders of the Communist Party of Brazil and the broad sections of workers and progressive intellectuals feel elated and inspired and greatly satisfied. These documents are a highly valuable contribution to the struggle against modern revisionism and in defence of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. Many theories which these documents defend completely correspond to the actual conditions in our country. They help us to understand better the struggle against opportunism and enable us to see that the ideological problems confronting us today are not confined to Brazil. These problems are phenomena which exist in the world communist movement as a whole.

### **The Theory of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee Harms the Revolutionary Movement**

The revolutionary struggles in Latin America have also proved the correctness of the Chinese Communist Party's thesis concerning the national-liberation movement of oppressed nations and the role of these struggles in the world situation as a whole. The peoples of Latin America cannot afford to wait for their liberation by "peaceful competition." They are brutally oppressed by U.S. imperialism which interferes ever more flagrantly in their internal affairs, propping up this or overthrowing that government, tramples on their national feelings and, under the false label of "Alliance for Progress," intensifies the ruthless exploitation of the various countries on this continent. Latin America is a battlefield of silent warfare between U.S. imperialism and the broad masses of people. Therefore, only the most vigorous struggles, especially armed struggles, can pave the way for the liberation of the oppressed nations of this hemisphere. This is proved by the Cuban revolution, the armed struggles in Venezuela and the guerrillas expanding in other countries.

The revisionist policy spreads illusions about U.S. imperialism, bows to its dictates and tries to damp down the struggle against it and the internal reactionaries. This policy seriously harms the revolutionary movement in Latin America. All those who are not prepared to expose resolutely the U.S. imperialists and drive them out of their own country are doomed to complete failure. Genuine revolutionaries cannot agree to Khrushchov's state-

ments prettifying U.S. imperialism and are opposed to his frequent eulogizing of Kennedy. How can one agree to the assertion that the top chieftain of imperialism is interested in peace, that he can act sensibly in face of the contradictions between the people and imperialism? How can one believe that Kennedy, who planned the invasion of Cuba, wages "special warfare" in south Viet Nam, organizes military coups in Latin America and is engaging in an unprecedented arms drive, is a representative of the less aggressive, less reactionary group of U.S. monopolists? To Latin Americans, Kennedy is the most ferocious enemy of peace and independence of the peoples. Thus, the broad masses of our continent see that what Khrushchov has said are lies.

Especially serious is the fact that while creating illusions about U.S. imperialism, Khrushchov crudely attacks the Chinese Communists who have led a most important revolution of our time and who have opened a new stage in the struggle for liberation of the oppressed nations. He said that China wanted thermonuclear war, that it wanted to bring about victory of socialism throughout the world on the ruins of an atomic explosion. Such utterances are an insult to the conscience of the people of the world.

If one studies the documents of the Chinese Communist Party and the foreign policy of People's China, one readily comes to the conclusion that the Chinese are the real defenders of peace and the Chinese leaders have pointed out the correct road to prevent the outbreak of an atomic war. Khrushchov has posed a threat to peace by his unprincipled demagoguery, concessions to imperialism, propaganda of atomic terror, adventurist activities, policy of lulling the people's vigilance and splitting the socialist camp. To avoid war, it is necessary to expose energetically the aggressive policy of imperialism, to prevent it from deceiving the masses of people, to enhance the unity of the peace-loving forces, particularly that of the socialist countries and finally to enable the peoples to take the cause of peace into their own hands and to struggle for the defence of peace until victory.

The allegation made by Khrushchov and certain leaders of some Parties that the Chinese leaders want to drag mankind into a thermonuclear war is unworthy of Communists. All the attempts to show that the Chinese Communists are out of step, and telling tales that they are the advocates of atomic war will be condemned by revolutionaries and all fair-minded people. To what length the revisionists have gone! In their eyes, it is the Chinese Communists but not the imperialists who want to fight an atomic war!

### **Unite on the Basis of Principles**

The violent attacks by Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. on the revolutionaries of other countries have disrupted the unity of the world communist movement and are part of the splitting activities of the modern revisionists. This is not the first time they have attacked fraternal Parties. For some time now they have been fulminating against the Albanian Party of Labour which fought heroically against Nazism and fascism. This Party has led the Albanian people's liberation movement and is now leading the country in advancing victoriously

along the road of socialist construction; it has consistently adhered to Marxism-Leninism and the position of proletarian internationalism. They have even instigated to overthrow Albania's leaders. Not satisfied with this, they have gone further and adopted economic measures which have damaged the country and created difficulties for its socialist construction. While pursuing this policy which should be condemned, Khrushchov and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. have done all they could to win the sympathy of Tito who has betrayed Marxism-Leninism in order to get American dollars. They have also lavished economic aid on Nehru's reactionary group, which is pursuing a policy of aggression and endless provocations against People's China.

The charges of Khrushchov against the Communist Party of Brazil, like the slanders spread by Prestes and his followers against the long-tried revolutionary fighters, are futile. The vilifications of the revisionists can only make those who join the genuine working-class party feel proud. Revisionists support revisionists but not revolutionaries. Revolutionaries support revolutionaries but not revisionists.

In taking this position we are upholding a principled policy. We stand for the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist ideas contained in the Moscow Declaration and the Moscow Statement. But we are of the opinion that the Brazilian Communists can only seek unity on the basis of a revolutionary political line and that the working class and people all over the world must maintain unity in order to deal with imperialism, defend the cause of peace, and hold high the banner of revolution in the march towards victory.

We should not interpret unity as mere compromise, and so conceal the differences. Unity can never be obtained if the viewpoint expressed by Khrushchov to the Chinese comrades — "put aside all disputes and differences, not to try and establish who is right and who is wrong, not to rake up the past, but start our relations with a clear page" — is allowed to prevail. This has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism. It is characteristic of the policy of the social democratic parties. Differences should not be concealed, let alone put aside. Differences should be overcome by the ideological struggle which is indispensable in forwarding the revolutionary movement so as to guarantee the solid unity of the Communists and uphold the purity of the great proletarian teachings.

We believe that the heroic and experienced great Party of Lenin will find the best way to liquidate the erroneous position of its leading organ which has caused untold damage to the revolutionary struggle, establish a correct relationship with the fraternal Parties and oppose the most dangerous trend in the world communist movement — revisionism.

The Communist Party of Brazil holds that truth must be told. Truth will triumph sooner or later. Defying all obstacles, we are determined to hold aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism in our country and do all in our power to strive for the victory of the cause of revolution.

**The Central Committee of the  
Communist Party of Brazil**

Rio de Janeiro, July 27, 1963

## THE WEEK

(Continued from p. 5.)

dent and guarantee that there would be no repetition of such incidents in the future.

### **New Provocation in Prague**

While this anti-China demonstration was being held in front of the Chinese Embassy in Moscow, a fresh provocative measure was taken against China in Prague by the Czechoslovak Government.

On September 2 R. Urx, Director of the Seventh Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Czechoslovakia, verbally presented Counsellor Hu Cheng-fang of the Chinese Embassy in Prague with the unreasonable demand for the recall of Chang Lien-chung, a staff member of the Commercial Counsellor's Office of the Chinese Embassy, and Li Chun-heng, a Chinese student in Czechoslovakia.

The pretext was nothing new — that the two Chinese had distributed docu-

ments of the Chinese Communist Party and Government. Urx charged that Chang Lien-chung had given a copy of Chinese material in Czech to a staff member of the Czechoslovak machinery export company, material which he said "crudely distorted the Czechoslovak Government's demand for the recall of the Hsinhua correspondents and deliberately covered up the reason for the demand advanced by the Czechoslovak Government."

He also charged that Li Chun-heng had given to some workers at the Kladno steel combine copies of the Chinese statement of July 31 and the August 3 editorial of the *Renmin Ribao*, which "crudely attacked the Soviet Union" in connection with the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

But the truth was that these materials were either asked for or borrowed from the Chinese by Czechoslovak people.

The Chinese Counsellor in reply to Urx, therefore, pointed out that

"it is entirely justified for us to provide and lend our documents to others at their request. It is also legitimate even if we take the initiative in distributing them." He made a protest in the strongest terms, and placed full responsibility on the Czechoslovak Government for all resulting consequences.

A spokesman of the Chinese Foreign Ministry issued a statement on September 6 protesting strongly against this new provocation by the Czechoslovak Government.

Pointing out that in the last two months, the Czechoslovak Government had repeatedly sought pretexts and taken increasingly serious steps to vitiate Sino-Czechoslovak relations, the statement warned: "If the Czechoslovak Government, not caring for the relations between the two countries, makes up its mind to widen the differences and create a split, it will not gain anything but will only be lifting a rock to crush its own feet."

# We Have Friends and Comrades All Over the World

*From August 30 onwards, "Renmin Ribao" has been publishing letters received from people throughout the world. Here we reprint excerpts from some of the letters and the accompanying "Renmin Ribao" editorial note. Excerpts from some letters were carried in the last issue of "Peking Review" and more will be carried in subsequent issues. — Ed.*

## "RENMIN RIBAO" EDITORIAL NOTE

**S**INCE the beginning of this year and particularly since the publication of the June 14 letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in reply to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Chinese press and Radio Peking have received a large number of letters from all the continents of the world. Tens of thousands of friends and comrades hitherto unknown to us have expressed in these letters their sincere sympathy with and support for the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people, and have given their views on some major issues of the current international communist movement. These heart-warming letters have strengthened our conviction that Marxist-Leninists, the proletariat and revolutionary people all over the world will surely close their ranks still more tightly, that they will overcome all difficulties and obstacles and score still greater victories in their struggle to oppose imperialism, to defend world peace and to promote the revolutionary cause of the world's people and the cause of world communism. We now select a number of these letters and publish them in separate series. We are withholding the names of certain writers of these letters out of consideration for their security.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our deepest respect and heartfelt thanks to all friends and comrades who have struggled valiantly to uphold Marxism-Leninism and for our common cause.

\* \* \*

## The Chaff Will Be Separated From the Wheat

In these weeks of confusion and uncertainty, I carry in my heart a firm conviction: the Chinese people will never harbour any evil designs against the people of other countries. A nation which has had to fight domestic and external enemies for so many years and to shed blood and tears all over its land, will never start the conflagration of war in other countries, nor will it ever "spread" revolutions in Europe by force as is alleged by certain quarters.

Your valuable articles have proved in black and white that my reasoning is right. I can now stand firm against all charges against the Chinese People's Republic. I simply will not allow or tolerate insults against your people in my presence, which I regard as an attack on my own reputation.

I am very happy too that I can share my thoughts and get such friendly ideological support from you. This gives

me strength to stand firm against all antagonisms though they are today not few in number. However, right will always triumph. The chaff will eventually be separated from the wheat.

**Anna, G.D.R.**

## Our Chinese Brothers in Defence of Leninism

I have read your pamphlets on the international communist movement. I want to express my heartfelt thanks to beloved Comrade Mao Tse-tung and the other leaders of the fraternal Chinese Communist Party, to the heroes of the great Chinese revolutionary movement and to the builders of socialism in the most populous country in the world. Our Chinese brothers have come out in defence of the communist movement against the increasingly dangerous deviations and departures from the correct Marxist-Leninist line, and to save the solidarity of the great socialist camp.

I consider all sincere and honest Communists in the world will be grateful to our Chinese brothers. I consider the attitude taken by the Chinese leaders towards the Leninist line under the present circumstances to be one hundred per cent correct.

**A.W., POLAND**

## My Sympathies Are With the C.P.C.

In the divergences between the C.P.C. and the C.P.S.U., my sympathies are on the side of the C.P.C. The leaders of the C.P.S.U. have gone against the Marxist-Leninist line. They have led the Soviet people away from the correct path of communism. This is why I pay my deepest respects to the Central Committee of the C.P.C. and the Chinese Government which are waging a determined struggle against the mistaken Soviet leaders.

**L. Lolanhua, INDONESIA**

## Why So Many Bouquets for Renegades

According to the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, I remember that all the fraternal Parties and Comrade Khrushchov have acknowledged that Yugoslav revisionism is at present the main danger. I cannot understand why one should present bouquets to the renegades who toe the line of U.S. imperialism.

I cannot forgive Tito for he is, in my view, a renegade in the service of imperialism. During the American bandits' aggression against Korea, Tito did his utmost to oppose the heroic Korean people. During the tragic events in Hungary, the Tito clique took part in and aided the fascist counter-revolution.

Are these facts not sufficient to condemn this clique of mercenary traitors? This is why I want to tell you once again that I completely agree with your statements.

Dear comrades, I have just listened carefully to your broadcast of the reply of the Chinese Communist Party to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I share your criticism of the theory of transition from capitalism to socialism without revolution which our Party maintains.

As you have always said, there is, in the history of the socialist countries, no precedent of transition from capitalism to socialism without proletarian revolution, for the bourgeoisie will never agree to co-operate with the working class. In fact, in France we have had plenty of experience in this matter in dealing with the reactionary regime of the big monopolists. Some day, sooner or later, we'll have to take over state power by armed struggle.

**Roger, FRANCE**

### **Hold High Your Banner**

Chinese comrades, please continue to hold high the banner of Marxism-Leninism which is the only way to reinforce unity of the socialist camp. This can be done only by the liquidation of reformist and modern revisionist theories.

It is just these theories which threaten to paralyse the anti-imperialist actions of the masses. The historical role of the Chinese Communist Party is most important. We supporters of the correct Chinese position, which must never be abandoned, are ever growing in numbers.

**Houard, BELGIUM**

### **We Are Counting on You**

Now that the U.S.S.R. is letting down and betraying millions of Communists the world over, our thoughts go out to your people and its gallant leaders. Your country is the symbol of progress and there must be millions of people outside your country who hope that one day the balance of power will change and place your country where it belongs: in the vanguard of the world.

I am a former volunteer of the Spanish Civil War and a Dutch anti-Nazi underground fighter. My wife is also an ardent and devoted Communist. I want to write to tell you how grateful we are that your leaders spoke out for international solidarity at the Party congresses in Budapest, Sofia and Rome.

We are no longer members of the C.P. now. It became impossible after the destalinization started and we are waiting for the tide to turn. We are counting on your gallant people and find it reassuring to know that there are so many millions of you ready to stand up for our cause. We have nothing but contempt for the C.P. in India which is backing Nehru against a communist country.

**Groot, HOLLAND**

### **What Disgusting Betrayal**

I found the theses of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party irrefutable. I wonder how the Russian comrades could find the falsehood and calumnies in them. Here people can see that those who defend the erroneous theses of the Tito clique are coming ever closer to the views of the capitalists. Our reactionary papers are full of praise for Mr. Khrushchov. Former Secretary-General of NATO Mr. Spaak too ceaselessly pays homage to Mr. Khrushchov. It seems that these gentlemen understand each other perfectly.

Together with the U.S. and British imperialists, the modern revisionists have armed India to oppose socialist China. What disgusting betrayal! I don't believe these modern revisionists will renounce their erroneous views and subscribe to yours. But sooner or later they will lose their audience among the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and probably also in Europe.

I see in this man Khrushchov another Tallien come to behead Robespierre in order to make communism pleasant and acceptable in the eyes of the bourgeoisie. Fortunately there is Peking to guarantee the survival of true revolutionary communism. All people of goodwill should be grateful to the Chinese for saving communism and carrying on the cause of Marx, Lenin and Stalin.

**Donat, LUXEMBOURG**

### **Rain on Thirsty Land for Emigres**

The actions of the Soviet authorities against your embassy staff in Moscow and their expulsions to China, as well as the treacherous attacks on the Chinese women's delegation to the World Congress of Women, have been considered by every single one of us as regrettable and provocative acts.

Despite the calumny against and the blockade of this [C.P.C.] letter by all the modern revisionists and the imperialists, the interest shown by people in the letter has grown bigger and bigger. Everyone is inquiring about it and tries to get hold of it, to read and study this historic document for the revolutionary movement. Hundreds of Greek political emigres have recently read this letter. Everybody has accepted with unparalleled enthusiasm the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary principles of this document and declared them their banners in their struggle for the revolutionary cause. At the same time, they have expressed their indignation at the hostile actions of the Soviet authorities towards the People's Republic of China.

One can see and feel the same phenomenon among all the people around us — listening in to, looking for and reading the letter and expressing the same feelings as us. This letter, like rain on thirsty land, is a great inspiration for us emigres living in exile.

The letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.C. is a great help to us Greek revolutionary emigres. It has given us the possibility of dissipating certain notions and prejudices which have been created among our comrades by the deceptive propaganda of the revisionist group. We will struggle resolutely and actively to unmask the hideous faces of the modern revisionists and to purge our dear Communist Party of Greece of the revisionists.

**Greek Political Emigres**

### **Khrushchov and the Pope**

Right now I feel that Mr. Khrushchov has betrayed the trust of us all who thought the U.S.S.R. was marching along at the head of the proletarian cause. But ever since I heard the report about Khrushchov's daughter and her husband going on a visit to the Pope and her showing such deep emotion over being in the presence of His Holiness, etc., I couldn't understand why a Marxist, or one being raised by a Marxist father, acted in such a peculiar manner. Mr. Khrushchov has said our grandchildren would live and grow up under communism but these reports sound like his grandchildren will grow up with Catholicism.

We always know that the interests of capital and labour are never, at no time or place, the same. I know which side I'm on. I hope our Chinese comrades do too, and stand firm.

**Calkins, U.S.A.**

## Mounting Barrage of Slanders

THE leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has stepped up its slander campaign against China and some other Communist Parties have followed suit.

Under the banner headline "Look, How the Soviet Press Slanders and Attacks China," *Renmin Ribao* on September 2, 3 and 5 devoted several pages to articles attacking China recently published in the Soviet press.

In reprinting these articles in full or in excerpts *Renmin Ribao* also published an editor's note, which reads as follows:

Following the publication of the open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to its Party organizations at all levels and to all its Party members on July 14, the Soviet leaders set in motion their propaganda machine and started a noisy anti-China campaign. According to incomplete data, in the period between July 15 and August 31 a total of 286 editorials and articles attacking the Communist Party of China were published by the Soviet Union's national press alone. Volumes of material of the same nature were also carried by local Soviet publications. These attacks on China, like the open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., resorted to the method of perverting the truth and rumour-mongering to mislead the public, the customary method of bourgeois politicians.

These publications pinned innumerable labels on the Chinese Communist Party such as "Left opportunism," "dogmatism," "adventurism," "pseudo-revolutionary," "nationalism," "racialism," "sectarianism," "splittism," etc.

They slandered China as wanting to "promote international revolution through world war," to "push the U.S. and the Soviet Union to nuclear war," and to "destroy the centres of civilization in Europe and North America." They accused China of "opposing peaceful coexistence," "standing on the same front with such anti-Soviet, anti-communist demons as Nixon, Goldwater, de Gaulle and the West German revanchists," "instigating the coloured people against the whites," cherishing a "real cult of the individual" of Genghis Khan, being a "defender of the cult of the individual," etc.

They wildly attacked China's domestic policies and slandered the establishment of the people's communes in China as embarking on a "road departing from Marxism-Leninism," the policy of mainly relying on itself in construction as "anti-scientific, nationalist, most harmful," and "undermining the unity and solidarity of the socialist community," etc.

They attacked the theses of Comrade Mao Tse-tung that "imperialism and all reactionaries are 'paper tigers'" and that "the East wind prevails over the West wind." They even reprinted reactionary caricatures published in the imperialist press to assail Comrade Mao Tse-tung, the great leader of the Chinese people.

Though outwardly very fierce, the anti-China campaign launched by the Soviet leaders actually betrays their guilty conscience and further exposes the ugly features of the revisionists as being hostile to Marxism-Leninism.

Where will this slander and rumour offensive lead to? Let them recall how Goebbels ended up!

In order to let our readers see to what depths the authors of these rumours and slanders have sunk, we have selected some of them and will again devote part of our precious space to their publication in instalments.

ON September 4 *Renmin Ribao* devoted two full pages to excerpts from resolutions, statements, speeches and articles published by some fraternal Parties in which they wantonly attacked the Chinese Communist Party. In reprinting these documents and articles *Renmin Ribao* ran a banner headline: "How Some Fraternal Parties Following the Conductor's Baton Have Attacked China" and an editor's note. The note says:

Since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union published on July 14 this year an open letter to its Party organizations at all levels and to all its Party members, the leading organs of some fraternal Parties, instead of presenting the facts and reasoning things out, have followed the baton of the C.P.S.U. leadership and parroted their words, lashing out in violent attacks on the Communist Party of China by publishing resolutions, statements, speeches and articles or by other means. One only needs to read the slanders and attacks made against China by the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and by the Soviet press to know what the leading organs of these fraternal Parties say. However, we still select some of these resolutions, statements, speeches and articles and publish them in part, and we hope that our readers will be patient enough to read them through, to see how unrepresentable their slanders and attacks are.

The excerpts carried in *Renmin Ribao* are from:

The statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia of July 19;

The statement issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria on August 1;

The resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party at its enlarged session held on August 2 this year;

The speech delivered by Janos Kadar, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on August 5;

The communique of the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany held from July 29 to 30, 1963;

The July 18 editorial of *Trybuna Ludu*, organ of the Polish United Workers' Party;

The July 21 editorial of *Unian*, organ of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party;

The resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Italy at its plenary session held in July this year;

The statement issued by the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of France on July 19;

The article by Daniel Mason published on August 11 in the *Worker*, organ of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.;

The article by Luiz Carlos Prestes, General Secretary of the Brazilian Communist Party, appearing in the July 26 issue of *Novos Rumos*, organ of the Party; and the statement issued by the Political Committee of the Communist Party of Chile on July 20.

# POETRY

## Poets Back Negro Struggle

In Peking, the voice of freedom spoke poetry. Poets of the Asian, African and Australasian continents added their support to the American Negroes' insistent and not-to-be-denied demand for freedom and equality — now!

The Capital Theatre was filled to hear the poetry recital sponsored by *Poetry* magazine on August 25. Distinguished Chinese poets and poets and writers from Ghana, Sudan, Viet Nam, Indonesia and New Zealand took part. A large cutout of a red torch decorated the backdrop of the stage. Tsang Ke-chia, chief editor of *Poetry*, presided.

The lyrics which Kuang Wei-jan wrote for Hsien Hsing-hai's *Yellow River Cantata* made him known to millions long before China's liberation. Now he led off the programme with a recital of his new poem *Song of Freedom*. Describing the Negroes' irrepressible call for freedom which no iron bars can stop, he recited:

*Skyscraping towers built with corpses;  
The flower of American kultur  
watered with the blood of slaves.  
What right have they to mulct the  
toiler?  
This is a debt that must be paid!  
Can we coexist with murderers?  
Even beautified?  
Those Yankee carpet-baggers,  
Killers of Negroes,  
Are the enemies of all the world!*

Yuan Shui-po in his new poem "Getting Closer" made fun of the saying that "the earth is becoming

smaller, men are getting closer to each other." He demanded to know: Can the people in south Viet Nam get closer to the aggressors who are using "flame-throwers, chains, and rat poison against them"? Can the American Negroes get closer to the racists who are using "bullets, fire hoses, police hounds and electrified police clubs against them"?

*Only a traitor can get closer to the  
enemy,  
To bend the knee, and embrace him.  
Only the oppressed can get closer to  
the oppressed,  
To unite as comrades and class  
brothers in revolution!*

Other well-known Chinese poets including Tien Chien, Lou Shih-yi, Li Ying, Fang Yin and Kao Shih-chih read their new poems in person or had them recited by Peking actors to a keenly responsive audience.

Guests from abroad who recited new poems composed for the occasion received an enthusiastic welcome. Beating out the rhythm on a pair of hand drums in the style of his native country, Ghanaian poet George Awoonor-Williams gave a moving recital of *The Black Eagle Awakes*. The audience listened in deep absorption to his protest against the imperialist marauders who came "splashing" through the Atlantic waters" in slave-ships to destroy ancient civilizations, to "exile our great sons, kill our chiefs, defile our fathers' gods and violate our virgins." "We did not sleep, we never surrendered," the poet recalled.

*One morning the drums sounded . . .  
I saw two hundred million black men,  
Marching like their fathers did.  
The revolt of the slaves had  
begun. . . .*

*Under the Statue  
of Liberty on  
New York's  
shores,*

*The freedom  
shouts of our  
black brothers  
reach us,*

*C o m m i n g l -  
ing with the  
voices of our  
drums.*

He ended with the great shout for freedom of the African people: "Uhuru! Uhuru! Uhuru!"

In *To Negro Brothers in Alabama* Sudanese poet Ahmed Mohammed Kheir exposed Kennedy's talk of "peace," "justice" and "humanitarianism." He cried:

*A thief and murderer is in power;  
Only with fire, and the struggle of  
the masses,  
Will he be conquered!*

He exhorted:

*Strike your blows, a giant's blows!  
Act! Take the revolutionary road!*

In *We Are With You, Negro Friends!* the Vietnamese poet Pham Nang Hong, after describing the close feeling of kinship between the Vietnamese and the Negro people, exclaimed:

*We swear we will not live in shame!  
Let us march with giant strides  
To Wall Street, to the White House,  
To besiege the fountainhead of crime  
and shame!*

Indonesian poet F.L. Risakotta in *The Voice of Mao Tse-tung, the Voice of Friendship* hailed the voice of Mao Tse-tung echoing through the world and called on people of all colours and races to fight together shoulder to shoulder against American imperialism. In *A People Seeking Freedom*, Risakotta spoke with anger of the criminal treatment of Negroes in America, and went on:

*And this is the country with the  
utmost freedom in the world!  
It has a full assortment of freedoms,  
Including the freedom to kill!*

The stirring verses of New Zealand poet Rewi Alley in *Rising Force* described the vain attempt of Kennedy to soothe the Negroes and keep them "in their place." The Negroes have awakened:

*For now the Negro American has  
found  
that when he is armed, the racists  
stand back; when he holds his ground  
the enemy retreats; when he  
organizes  
ruthlessly, relentlessly,  
then only do they respect him.  
Now too, the Negro American has  
found  
that his united millions have many  
an ally. . . .*

The recital gave the Chinese audience another opportunity to enjoy many American songs which are part of the folklore of the Negro and American revolutionary struggle. The programme ended with a dozen navy men in uniform giving a ringing chorus of Lu Yuan's new song *The Heroic Negroes March to Washington*.



Battle Drum

Woodcut by Chiang Mi

WELCOME TO THE

# CHINESE EXPORT COMMODITIES FAIR *at Canton*

Sponsored by the China National Foreign Trade Corporations

*Autumn 1963*

October 15 — November 15

In the Chinese Export Commodities Exhibition Hall

Every facility for doing business will be at your service.

Whether you wish to BUY or SELL, representatives of every branch of China's foreign trade will be at the Fair ready to discuss trade with you.

**CHINA TRAVEL SERVICE (HONGKONG) LTD.**

6 Queen's Road Central, Hongkong

acting for **CHINA INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL SERVICE**  
will be pleased to look after all your travel arrangements

For full information, please write to

**CHINESE EXPORT COMMODITIES FAIR**

Canton, China

Cable Address: CECA CANTON

---