

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, ALLIANCE AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE
BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE C.P.R.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Central and cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R., jointly to prevent the revival of Japanese imperialism and repetition of aggression on the part of Japan or of any other State that may join in any way with Japan in acts of aggression, desirous of promoting durable peace and general security in the Far East and throughout the world in conformity with the purposes and principles of the U.N.O., firmly convinced that the strengthening of good-neighbourly and friendly relations between the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. conforms with the fundamental interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and China, have decided to this end to conclude the present Treaty and have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.--A. Y. Vyshinsky, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.; the Central People's Government of the C.P.R.--Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Administration Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs of China.

The two Plenipotentiaries' Republics, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

Article I

The two Contracting Parties undertake jointly to adopt all necessary measures within their power to prevent a repetition of aggression and violation of peace on the part of Japan or of any other State that may directly or indirectly join with Japan in acts of aggression. Should either of the Contracting Parties be attacked by Japan or by States allied with her and thus find itself in a state of war, the other Contracting Party shall immediately render it military and other assistance with all the means at its disposal.

The Contracting Parties likewise proclaim their readiness to take part in a spirit of sincere co-operation in all international actions designed to safeguard peace and security throughout the world, and will devote all their energies to the speediest attainment of this end.

Article II

The two Contracting Parties undertake in mutual agreement to strive for the conclusion at the earliest possible date, in conjunction with the other Powers who were their allies in the second world war, of a Peace Treaty with Japan.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1964

Article III

Neither of the Contracting Parties shall conclude any alliance directed against the other Party, nor participate in any coalitions or in any actions or measures directed against the other Party.

Article IV

The two Contracting Parties shall consult with each other on all important international questions affecting the common interests of the Soviet Union and China, guiding themselves by the interest of strengthening peace and general security.

Article V

The two Contracting Parties undertake in a spirit of friendship and co-operation, and in accordance with the principles of equality, mutual interests and mutual respect for their state sovereignty and territorial integrity, and non-interference in the internal affairs of the other Party, to develop and strengthen the economic and cultural ties between the Soviet Union and China, to render each other all possible economic assistance and to carry out necessary economic co-operation.

Article VI

The present Treaty shall come into force immediately after its ratification; the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Peking.

The present Treaty shall remain in force for 30 years. If neither of the Contracting Parties give notice a year before the expiration of that period of its desire to denounce the Treaty, it shall continue to remain in force for another five years and shall thereafter be prolonged in accordance with this provision.

Done in Moscow, February 14, 1950, in two copies, each in Russian and Chinese, the two texts having equal validity.

For the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

A. Vyshinsky

For the Central People's Government of the C.P.R.

Chou En-Lai

СОГЛАШЕНИЕ

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE C.P.R. ON THE
CHINESE CHANGCHUN RAILWAY, PORT ARTHUR AND DALNY

Article I

The two Contracting Parties have agreed that the Soviet Government shall transfer to the Government of the C.P.R. without compensation all its rights to joint administration of the Chinese Changchun Railway together with all property belonging to the Railway. The transfer shall be made directly after a Peace Treaty has been concluded with Japan, but not later than the end of 1952.

Until the transfer is effected, the present status of the joint Soviet-Chinese Administration of the Chinese Changchun Railway shall remain unchanged; however, after the present Agreement has come into force, the procedure of filling posts by representatives of the Soviet and Chinese Parties shall be altered and a procedure shall be established whereby the posts shall be filled for a definite period in rotation (Manager of the Railway, Chairman of the Board, etc.).

Article II

The two Contracting Parties have agreed that the Soviet troops shall be withdrawn from the jointly used naval base of Port Arthur and that the installations in this area shall be transferred to the Government of the C.P.R. directly after the conclusion of a Peace Treaty with Japan, but not later than the end of 1952, the Government of the C.P.R. compensating the Soviet Union for expenditure incurred by the Soviet Union since 1945 on restoring and constructing the installations.

Until the Soviet troops are withdrawn and the aforesaid installations transferred, the Governments of the Soviet Union and China shall appoint an equal number of military representatives to constitute a Joint Chinese-Soviet Military Commission, in which the two Parties shall preside in rotation, and which shall have charge of military affairs in the Port Arthur area; the concrete measures to this effect shall be defined by the Joint Chinese-Soviet Military Commission within three months after the entry into force of the present Agreement and shall be carried out after these measures have been endorsed by the Governments of the two Parties.

Civil administration in the aforesaid area shall be directly exercised by the Government of the C.P.R. Until the Soviet troops are withdrawn, the zone of location of the Soviet troops in the Port Arthur area shall remain unchanged within the present boundaries.

Should either of the Contracting Parties become the victim of aggression on the part of Japan or of any State that may join with Japan, and as a result be involved in military operations, China and the Soviet

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

Union may, on the proposal of the Government of the C.P.R. and with the consent of the Soviet Government, jointly use the naval base of Port Arthur for the conduct of joint military operations against the aggressor.

Article III

The two Contracting Parties have agreed that the question of the Port of Dalny shall be examined after the conclusion of a Peace Treaty with Japan.

As to the administration of Dalny, it is entirely in the hands of the Government of the C.P.R.

All property at present in Dalny that is temporarily administered or leased by the Soviet Party shall be taken over by the Government of the C.P.R. For the purpose of affecting the transfer of the aforesaid property, the Governments of the Soviet Union and China shall appoint three representatives from each Party to constitute a Joint Commission which shall within three months after the entry into force of the present Agreement determine the concrete methods of effecting the transfer of the property and after the proposals of the Joint Commission have been endorsed by the Governments of the two Parties, shall carry them out in the course of 1950.

Article IV

The present Agreement shall come into force on the date of its ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Peking.

Done in Moscow, February 14, 1950, in two copies, each in Russian and Chinese, the two texts having equal validity.

For the Central People's Government of the C.P.R.

Chou En-Lai

For the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

A. Vyshinsky

ПРЕДУМОВИ

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE U.S.S.R. AND THE
CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE C.P.R. FOR THE
GRANTING OF CREDIT TO THE C.P.R. *

Whereas the Government of the Union of Soviet Social Republics has acceded to the request of the Central People's Government of the C.P.R. for a credit to China to pay for the equipment and other materials which the Soviet Union has consented to supply to China, the two Governments have agreed on the following:

Article I

The Government of the U.S.S.R. shall grant the C.P.G. of the C.P.R. a credit in terms of dollars to the amount of 300,000,000 U.S. dollars, at the rate of 35 U.S. dollars per ounce of fine gold.

In view of the extremely devastated condition of China, caused by the prolonged military operations on its territory, the Soviet Government has agreed to provide the credit at the favourable rate of interest of 1% per annum.

Article II

The credit referred to in Article I shall be made available over a period of five years, beginning from January 1, 1950, in equal annual parts of one-fifth of the total credit, for the payment of deliveries from the U.S.S.R. of equipment and materials, including equipment for power stations, metallurgical and machine-building plants and coal and ore mines, railway and other transport equipment, rails and other materials for the rehabilitation and development of China's national economy.

nomenclature, quantities, prices and dates of delivery of the equipment and materials shall be defined in a separate Agreement of the Parties, the prices being determined on the basis of the prices in the world markets.

Any part of the credit remaining unutilized in any annual period may be utilized in succeeding annual periods.

Article III

The Central People's Government of the C.P.R. shall repay the credit referred to in Article I, as well as the interest on it, in deliveries of raw materials and tea, gold and U.S. dollars. The prices for the raw materials and tea and the quantities and dates of delivery shall be fixed by a separate Agreement, the prices being determined on the basis of the prices in the world markets.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

The credit shall be repaid over a period of ten years in equal annual parts amounting to one-tenth of the credit received, not later than December 31 of each year. The first repayment shall be made not later than December 31, 1954, and the last not later than Dec. 31, 1963:

Payment of interest, which shall accrue from the date of utilization of each part of the credit, shall be made half-yearly.

Article IV

For the purpose of conducting accounts of the credit provided for in the present Agreement, the State Bank of the U.S.S.R. and the National Bank of the C.P.R. shall open special accounts and jointly establish the procedure of settlement and management of the accounts under this Agreement.

The present Agreement comes into force from the date of its signing and is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Peking.

Done in Moscow, February 14, 1950, in two copies, each in Russian and Chinese, the two texts having equal validity.

For the Government of the U.S.S.R.

A. Vyshinsky

For the C.P.G. of the C.P.R.

Chou En-Lai

COMMUNIQUE

COMMUNIQUE ON SOVIET-CHINESE NEGOTIATIONS

On the invitation of the Chinese Government, a Soviet Government Delegation arrived in China on September 29 for the celebrations of the fifth anniversary of the C.P.R. and stayed until October 12. The members of the delegations were: N.S. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.; N.A. Bulganin, First Vice Chairman of the Central Council of the Ministers of the U.S.S.R.; N.M. Shvernik, Chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions of the U.S.S.R.; G.F. Alexandrov, Minister of Culture of the U.S.S.R.; D.T. Shepilov, Chief Editor of Pravda; E.A. Furtseva, Secretary of the Moscow City Committee, C.P.S.U.; Y.S. Nasriddinova, Minister of the Building Materials Industry of the Uzbek S.S.R.; V.P. Stepanov, Departmental Chief, C.C., C.P.S.U., and P.F. Yudin, U.S.S.R. Ambassador to the C.P.R.

During the delegation's stay in the C.P.R., negotiations on Soviet-Chinese relations and international affairs were held between members of the delegation, on the one hand, and C.P.R. Premier and Foreign Minister Chou En-lai and Vice-Premiers Chen Yun, Peng Te-huai, Teng Hsiao-ping, Teng Tsu-hui and Li Fu-chun, on the other. Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the C.P.R., Chu Teh, Vice Chairman of the C.P.R., and Liu Shao-chi, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Assembly, participated in the conversations.

The negotiations proceeded in an atmosphere of sincere friendship and mutual understanding.

Joint declarations of the Governments of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic on Soviet-Chinese relations and international affairs and on relations with Japan, and joint communiques on the Port Arthur naval base, on the joint Soviet-Chinese companies, on the conclusion of a scientific and technical cooperation agreement, and on the building of a railway between Lanchow and Alma-Ata via Urumchi are published below.

In addition, an agreement was signed providing for the granting of a long-term credit of 520 millions rubles by the Government of the U.S.S.R. to the Government of the C.P.R., and also a protocol envisaging assistance by the Government of the U.S.S.R. to the Government of the C.P.R. in the building of 15 additional industrial establishments and the supply of additional equipment for the 141 establishments provided for in the earlier agreement, the total value of the additional equipment to be supplied by the U.S.S.R. amounting to upward of 400 million rubles.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

ПРОДУКТ №

1
SOVIET-CHINESE COMMUNIQUE ON THE CONCLUSION OF A
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT

Negotiations on Soviet-Chinese scientific and technical cooperation which were concluded in an atmosphere of friendship and cordiality between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Chinese People's Republic in Moscow and Peking, ended on October 12 with the signing in Peking of a Scientific and Technical Cooperation Agreement. The agreement was signed on behalf of the Soviet Government by A. Mikoyan, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and on behalf of the Chinese Government by Li Fu-chun, Vice-Premier of the Government of the C.P.R.

In accordance with the agreement, scientific and technical cooperation between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Chinese People's Republic will be effected through a pooling of experience gained in all branches of economy.

The two parties will exchange technical documents and pertinent information, and also send experts to tender technical assistance and to study the achievements of the two countries in the scientific and technical fields.

Technical documents will be made available by each Party to the other free of charge, except for the cost of making the requisite copies of the documents.

For the purpose of elaborating measures of cooperation and presenting the respective recommendations to the two Governments, a Soviet-Chinese Commission has been set up to which the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. have each appointed seven members. The meetings of the Commission will be held not less than twice a year, alternately in Moscow and Peking.

The agreement has been signed for a period of five years. If not later than one year before the expiration of this period neither of the Parties intimates its desire to terminate the agreement, it shall remain in force for another period of 5 years.

The conclusion of the Soviet-Chinese Scientific and Technical Cooperation Agreement is another important contribution to cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. in promoting the interests of the two countries and in furthering the interests of peace.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin,
Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong,
1962

JOINT DECLARATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION *
OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE C.P.R.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Government of the C.P.R. note the full coincidence of their views both on the all-round cooperation developing between their two countries and on international affairs.

In the five years since the historic victory of the Chinese people and the establishment of the C.P.R. the relations between the Soviet Union and the C.P.R. have evolved on the basis of close cooperation in full accordance with the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Assistance of February 14, 1950 That treaty is founded on the sincere desire of the Chinese and Soviet peoples to assist one another, to promote the economic and cultural progress of their two countries, to continually strengthen and broaden their ties of brotherly friendship, and thereby contribute to peace and security in the Far East and throughout the world, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Experience has demonstrated the supreme vitality of the cooperation established between the Soviet Union and the C.P.R., and shown that it is a reliable bulwark of peace and security in the Far East and an important factor of universal peace.

The Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the C.P.R. declare that the friendly relations which have arisen between the U.S.S.R. and China will be the basis of their continued close cooperation in accordance with the principles of equality, mutual benefit, and respect for one another's national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The two Governments are one in their desire to continue to participate in all international actions designed to promote peace, and will, whenever questions arise affecting the common interests of the Soviet Union and the C.P.R., consult with each other with a view to concerting their actions in safeguarding the security of the two countries and in maintaining peace in the Far East and throughout the world.

The Geneva Conference, having led to the cessation of hostilities in Indo-China and opened up the possibility of an Indo-China settlement consistent with the legitimate national interests of the peoples of that area, demonstrated how important for the cause of peace is the participation in the examination of pressing international problems of all the Great Powers upon which the U.N. Charter lays primary responsibility for the maintenance of world peace. It also demonstrated how utterly groundless is the policy pursued by U.S. leading circles of preventing the C.P.R. from occupying the seat to which it is lawfully entitled in the United Nations.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

That policy, as well as the overt acts of aggression committed by the U.S. against the C.P.R., and especially its continued occupation of a part of the C.P.R.'s territory, the Island of Taiwan, and also the military and financial support it is rendering the enemies of the Chinese people, the Chang Kai-shek clique, are incompatible with the task of maintaining peace in the Far East and lessening international tension.

The two Governments consider it abnormal that Korea continues to be divided into two parts, despite the natural desire of her people for reunification in an integral, peaceful and democratic Korean state. Recognizing that reunification of Korea is one of the problems whose solution is of great importance for the promotion of peace in the Far East, they consider that a conference on the Korean question, with the broad participation of the states concerned, should be convened in the earliest future.

The Soviet Union and the C.P.R. emphatically condemn the aggressive military bloc formed in Southeast Asia, since it is based on the imperialist aims of its sponsors, which are directed primarily against the security and national independence of the Asian countries, and also against peace in Asia and the Pacific.

The Soviet Union and the C.P.R. deem it necessary to declare that they will continue to base their relations with the countries of Asia and the Pacific, and also with other states, on strict observance of the principles of mutual respect for one another's sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence, which opens up broad possibilities for fruitful international cooperation.

It is the profound conviction of the two Governments that this policy accords with the fundamental interests of all nations, including the Asian nations, whose security and welfare can be guaranteed only by the concerted efforts of the states in protecting the peace.

For their part, the Soviet Government and the Government of the C.P.R. will do everything in their power to assist the settlement of outstanding international problems, including the problems of Asia.

СОВЕТСКО-КИТАЙСКОЕ

SOVIET-CHINESE COMMUNIQUE ON WITHDRAWAL OF THE SOVIET ARMED
FORCES FROM THE JOINTLY USED CHINESE NAVAL BASE OF PORT
ARTHUR AND THE PLACING OF THE BASE AT THE FULL
DISPOSAL OF THE C.P.R.

In view of the change which has taken place in the international situation in the Far East with the cessation of the war in Korea and the restoration of peace in Indo-China, and also of the enhanced defensive power of the C.P.R., the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the C.P.R., acting in accordance with the relations of friendship and cooperation which have arisen and are growing ever stronger between the two countries, have agreed that the Soviet armed forces shall be withdrawn from the jointly used Port Arthur naval base and that the installations in that area shall be transferred, without compensation, to the Government of the C.P.R.

The two Parties have agreed that the carrying out of the measures connected with the withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces and the transfer of the installations in the area of the Port Arthur naval base to the Government of the C.P.R. shall be entrusted to the Joint Soviet-Chinese Military Commission in Port Arthur, set up in accordance with the agreement of February 14, 1950.

The withdrawal of the Soviet forces and the transfer of the installations in the area of the Port Arthur naval base to the Government of the C.P.R. shall be completed by May 31, 1955.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, hongkong, 1962

ПРОГЛАШЕНИЕ

*

SOVIET-CHINESE COMMUNIQUE ON THE TRANSFER TO THE C.P.R. OF
THE SOVIET SHARE IN THE JOINT SOVIET-CHINESE COMPANIES

In 1950 and 1951, by agreement between the Soviet Government and the Chinese Government, four joint Soviet-Chinese companies were formed on a parity basis, to wit:

A company for the mining of nonferrous and rare metals in Sinkiang Province, C.P.R.;

A company for the extraction and refining of oil in Sinkiang Province, C.P.R.;

A company for the building and repair of ships in Dalny, and

A company for the organization and operation of civil air lines.

That was at a time when the young C.P.R. was faced with the problem of rehabilitating its national economy. The formation of the Soviet-Chinese Companies made it possible in a short period to restart the enterprises incorporated in the companies, substantially to enlarge their producing capacity, and generally to improve their technical efficiency by drawing on the Soviet Union's advanced experience in economic development. Thereby the joint companies played a valuable role and made a definite contribution to China's economic recovery and development.

Now that the C.P.R. has rehabilitated its economy and is successfully carrying out its first five-year plan, and the Chinese economic organizations have amassed the necessary experience and can themselves manage the enterprises incorporated in the joint companies, the Governments of the Soviet Union and the C.P.R. have agreed that the Soviet share in the joint Soviet-Chinese companies shall be transferred in its entirety to the C.P.R. as of January 1, 1955. The value of the share shall be repaid over a period of years in the form of deliveries to the Soviet Union of commodities which are customary items of Chinese export.

Thus the enterprises thus incorporated in the joint Soviet-Chinese Companies will completely become state-owned enterprises of the C.P.R.

It is the common belief of the two Governments that their decision accords with the relations of friendship established between the Soviet Union and the C.P.R., and that it will further promote their economic cooperation on the basis of equality, mutual assistance and respect for each other's interests.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

33333333 3

*

SOVIET CHINESE COMMUNIQUE ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILWAY
AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THROUGH COMMUNICATION BETWEEN
LANCHOW AND ALMA-ATA VIA URUMCHI

With a view to promoting economic and cultural intercourse between their countries, the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Government of the C.P.R. have agreed to commence in the earliest future the construction of a railway from Lanchow via Urumchi, on Chinese territory, to Alma-Ata on Soviet territory. The Chinese Government undertakes to build the section on Chinese territory, and the Soviet Government the section on Soviet territory. The Soviet Government will render the Chinese Government every technical assistance in the building of the section of the railway on Chinese territory. The construction of the section between Lanchow and Yuzen on Chinese territory was already begun in 1953.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

00000000 00

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE U.S.S.R.,
THE C.P.R. AND THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILWAY AND THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF A THROUGH COMMUNICATION
BETWEEN CHINING AND ULAN-BATOR *

With a view to promoting economic and cultural intercourse between their countries, the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the C.P.R. and the Mongolian People's Republic concluded, on September 15, 1952, an agreement providing for the construction of a railway from Chining to Ulan-Bator in the Mongolian People's Republic. This railway will be linked with the railway connecting Ulan-Bator with Soviet Territory. The Government of the C.P.R. has undertaken to build the section from Chining through Erhlien to the borders of China, while the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the Mongolian People's Republic have undertaken to build the section from Ulan-Bator through Dzamyn-Ude to the border of the Mongolian People's Republic. The three Governments have agreed to complete the construction and linking up of the railway and to establish through communication in 1955.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

COMMUNIQUE ON SESSION OF SOVIET-CHINESE COMMISSION
ON SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION *

The first session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the C.P.R. was held in December, 1954, in Moscow.

The session, which took place in an atmosphere of friendly mutual understanding, examined organizational problems and measures for implementing scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries, and approved an agreement defining the mutual obligations of the parties in giving technical aid in various spheres of national economy.

The Soviet Union will aid the C.P.R. by turning over, free of charge, plans and blueprints for industrial construction (of metallurgical and machine-building plants, power stations and others), blueprints for producing machines and equipment and plans for producing many types of industrial goods. Soviet scientific, technical and training materials, certain standard and reference materials, will also be transmitted.

The C.P.R. will turn over to the Soviet Union, free of charge, a description of production methods and samples of products from light, pharmaceutical and local industry. Samples of agricultural crops, including subtropical plants, citrus, vegetables, grain and others will also be transmitted. The C.P.R. will enable Soviet specialists to learn about the achievements and work experience of individual branches of the national economy.

During the first session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission the Chinese delegation was shown industrial enterprises and scientific institutions in Moscow, Leningrad and the Urals.

Representatives from a number of ministries and scientific institutions of the U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. took part in the session, along with member of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

*

COMMUNIQUE ON MEETING BETWEEN N. S. KHRUSHCHEV
AND MAO TSE-TUNG

A meeting between N. S. Khrushchev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman of the C.P.R., was held in Peking from July 31 through August 3, 1958.

The following took part in the meeting:

On the Soviet side: Marshal of the Soviet Union R.Ya. Malinovsky, U.S.S.R. Minister of Defense; V. V. Kuznetsov, U.S.S.R. Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs; and B. N. Ponomarev, member of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.;

On the Chinese side: Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council; Marshal Peng Teh-huai, Vice-Premier of the State Council and Minister of Defense; Chen Yi, Vice-Premier of the State Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs; and Wang Chia-hsiang, member of the Secretariat of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee.

In an atmosphere of exceptional cordiality and warmth...

...

The U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. severely condemn the flagrant aggressive actions of the U.S.A. and Britain in the Near and Middle East, demand the immediate convening of a heads-of-government conference of the great powers to discuss the situation in the Near and Middle East and resolutely insist on the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon and of British troops from Jordan.

The U.S.S.R. and the C.P.R. vigorously support the just struggle of the peoples of the United Arab Republic, the Iraqi Republic and other Arab countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The Soviet Union and the C.P.R. are doing everything possible to reduce international tension and to avert the disasters of a new war. Both sides again declare that the right of the peoples of all countries to choose their socio-political system must be respected; states with different social systems must peacefully coexist in accordance with the well-known five principles that have received wide international recognition; all contentious international issues must be settled peacefully by negotiation; the development of economic and cultural relations on the basis of mutual advantage and peaceful competition among different countries, relations contributing to mutual understanding among peoples and fully according with the aims of reducing international tension and preserving peace, must be encouraged.

At present, the primary task for preserving and consolidating peace is the achievement of an agreement among states on reducing armaments and stop tests of and banning atomic and hydrogen weapons, on liquidating all military alignments and military bases set up on foreign territory and on concluding a pact of peace and collective security.

...

* Peter Mayer, Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research institute, Hongkong, 1962

Both sides note with great satisfaction that fraternal relations of friendship, all-round cooperation and mutual aid between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party, between the Soviet Government and the Government of the C.P.R. and between the peoples of our countries are successfully developing and becoming more and more firmly established. Both countries are making rapid economic progress, and their might is growing with every day. The unity and cooperation that both countries are building on the basis of complete equality and comradely mutual aid are a great vital force. This unity and cooperation are conducive not only to the rapid advancement of both countries along the path of socialism and communism but also to strengthening the might of the socialist camp as a whole.

Both sides have resolved to ensure the further comprehensive development of thorough cooperation between our countries and to strengthen still more the unity of the Socialist camp and solidarity with all peace-loving states and peoples and have expressed complete agreement on all questions considered.

Both sides are completely of one view in evaluating the tasks confronting the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party. The unshakable unity of both Marxist-Leninist parties will forever be a reliable guarantee of the triumph of our common cause.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party will tirelessly guard this sacred unity, struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism, defend the principles of the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties and wage an uncompromising struggle against the chief danger of the Communist movement—revisionism. This revisionism found clear expression in the program of the Yugoslav League of Communists.

Both sides express full confidence that the constantly growing forces of peace and socialism will undoubtedly overcome all the obstacles in the path of progress and will score a great victory.

N. Khrushchev,
First Secretary of C.P.S.U.
Central Committee
Chairman of U.S.S.R. Council of
Ministers.

Mao Tse-tung,
Chairman of Chinese Communist
Party Central Committee
Chairman of the Chinese People's
Republic.

August 3, 1958.

TEXT OF A JOINT COMMUNIQUE *

ON TALKS AMONG DELIGATES OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Moscow, November 14 - 16, 1957

DECLARATION

MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES
OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES, HELD IN MOSCOW, NOV. 14 TO 16, 1957

Representatives of the Albanian Party of Labor, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Vietnamese Working People's Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Communist Party of China, the Korean Party of Labor, the Mongolian People's Revolution-ary Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Czecho-slovakia discussed their relations, current problems of the international situation and the struggle for peace and socialism.

The exchange of opinions revealed identity of views of the parties on all the questions examined at the meeting and unanimity in their assess-ment of the international situation.

...The question of war or peaceful coexistence is now the crucial question of world policy. All the nations must display the utmost vigilance in regard to the war danger created by imperialism.

At present the forces of peace have so grown that there is a real possibility of adverting wars as was dmonstrated by the collapse of the imperialist designs in Egypt. The imperialist plan to use the couter - revolutionary forces for overthrow of the people's democratic system in Hungary has failed as well.

The cause of peace is upheld by the powerful forces of our era: the invincible camp of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union; the peace - loving countries of Asia and Africa taking an anti - imperialist stand and forming, together with the socialist countries, a broad peace zone; the international working class and above all its vanguard, the communist parties; the liberation movement of the people of the colonies and semi - colonies; the mass peace movement of the peoples; the peoples of the European countries who have proclaimed neutrality, the peoples of Latin America and the masses in the imperialist countries are putting up increasing resistance to the plans for a new war.

An alliance of these might forces could prevent war, but should the belicose imperialist maniacs venture, regardless of anything, to unleash a war, imperialism will doom itself to destruction, for the peoples will not tolerate a system that brings them so much suffering and exacts so many sacrifices.

The Communist and workers' parties taking part in the meeting declare that the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems, which has been further developed and brought up to date in the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party, is

* Dux, Dieter, Ideology in conflict; communist political theory, D. Van Nostrand co., U.S., pp. 68 - 75

the sound basis of the foreign policy of the socialist countries and the dependable pillar of peace and friendship among the peoples. The idea of peaceful coexistence coincides with the five principles advanced jointly by the Chinese People's Republic and the Republic of India and with the program adopted by the Bandung Conference of African - Asian countries. Peace and peaceful coexistence have now become the demands of the broad masses in all countries.

The communist parties regard the struggle for peace as their foremost task. They will do all in their power to prevent war.

The meeting considers that in the present situation the strengthening of the unity and fraternal cooperation of the Socialist countries, the Communist and Workers' parties and the solidarity of the international working class, national liberation and democratic movements acquire special significance.

In the bedrock of the relations between the countries of the world Socialist system and all the communist and workers' parties lie the principles of Marxism - Leninism, the principles of proletarian internationalism which have been tested by life. Today the vital interests of the working people of all countries call for their support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist countries who, pursuing a policy of preserving peace throughout the world, are the mainstay of peace and social progress. The working class, the democratic forces and the working people everywhere are interested in tirelessly strengthening fraternal contacts for the sake of the common cause, in safeguarding from enemy encroachments the historic political and social gains effected in the Soviet Union --- the first and mightiest Socialist power --- in the Chinese People's Republic and in all the Socialist countries, in seeing these gains extended and consolidated.

The Socialist countries base their relations on principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty and non - interference in one another's affairs. These are vital principles. However, they do not exhaust the essence of the relations between them. Fraternal mutual aid is part and parcel of these relations. This aid is a striking expression of Socialist internationalism.

The Socialist countries are united in a single community by the fact that they are taking common Socialist road, by the common class essence of the social and economic system and state authority, by the requirements of mutual aid and support, identity of interests and aims in the struggle against imperialism, for the victory of socialism and communism, by the ideology of Marxism - Leninism, which is common to all.

The solidarity and close unity of the Socialist countries constitute a reliable guarantee of their sovereignty and independence of each. Stronger fraternal relations and friendship between the Socialist countries call for a Marxism - Leninism international policy on the part of the Communist and workers' parties, for educating all the working people in the spirit of combining internationalism with patriotism and for a determined effort to overcome the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. All issues pertaining to relations between the Socialist countries can be fully settled through comradely discussion, with strict observance of the principles of Socialist internationalism.

. . . The meeting confirmed the identity of views of the Communist and workers' parties on the cardinal problems of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction. The experience of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries has fully borne out the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the processes of the Socialist revolution and the building of socialism are governed by a number of basic laws applicable in all countries embarking on a socialist course. These laws manifest themselves everywhere, alongside a great variety of historic national peculiarities and traditions which must by all means be taken into account.

These laws are: Guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist party, in effecting a proletarian revolution in one form or another and establishing one form or other of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the alliance of the working class and the bulk of the peasantry and other sections of the working people; the abolition of capitalist ownership and the establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production; gradual Socialist reconstruction of agriculture; planned development of the national economy aimed at building socialism and communism, at raising the standard of living of the working people; the carrying out of the Socialist revolution in the sphere of ideology and culture and the creation of a numerous intelligentsia devoted to the working class, the working people and the cause of socialism; the abolition of national oppression and the establishment of equality and fraternal friendship between the peoples; defense of the achievements of socialism against attacks by external and internal enemies; solidarity of the working class of the country in question with the working class of other countries, that is, proletarian internationalism.

Marxism-Leninism calls for a creative application of the general principles of the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction depending on the concrete conditions of each country, and rejects mechanical imitation of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties of other countries.

Lenin repeatedly called attention to the necessity of correctly applying the basic principles of communism, in keeping with the specific features of the nation, of the national state concerned. Disregard of national peculiarities by the proletarian party inevitably leads to its divorce from reality, from the masses and is bound to prejudice the cause of socialism. And, conversely, exaggeration of the role of these peculiarities or departure, under the pretext of national peculiarities, from the universal Marxist-Leninist truth on the Socialist revolution and Socialist construction is just as harmful to the Socialist cause.

The participants in the meeting consider that both these tendencies should be combated simultaneously. . . .

The theory of Marxism-Leninism derives from dialectical materialism. This world outlook reflects the universal law of development of nature, society and human thinking. It is valid for the past, the present and the future.

. . . Of vital importance in the present stage is intensified struggle against opportunist trends in the working class and Communist movement. The meeting underlines the necessity of resolutely overcoming revisionism and dogmatism in the ranks of the Communist and workers' parties.

Revisionism and dogmatism in the working class and Communist movement are today, as they have been in the past, international phenomena. Dogmatism and sectarianism hinder the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in the changing conditions, replace the study of the concrete situation with merely quoting classics and sticking to books and lead to the isolation of the party from the masses. A party that has withdrawn into the shell of sectarianism and that has lost contact with the masses cannot bring victory to the cause of the working class.

In condemning dogmatism, the Communist parties believe that the main danger at present is revisionism or, in other words, right-wing opportunism, which as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralyzes the revolutionary energy of the working class and demands the preservation or restoration of capitalism. However, dogmatism and sectarianism can also be the main dangers at different phases of development in one party or another. It is for each Communist party to decide what danger threatens it more at a given time.

It should be pointed out that the conquest of power by the proletariat is only the beginning of the revolution, not its conclusion. After the conquest of power, the working class is faced with the serious tasks of effecting the Socialist reconstruction of the national economy and laying the economic and technical foundation of socialism. At the same time the overthrown bourgeoisie always endeavors to make a comeback, the influence exerted on society by the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia, is still great. That is why a fairly long time is needed to resolve the issue of who will win--capitalism or socialism. The existence of bourgeois influence is an internal source of revisionism, while surrender to imperialist pressure is its external source.

Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teachings of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is "outmoded" and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to exercise the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, reject the principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of party organization and, above all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist party from a militant revolutionary organization into some kind of debating society.

The experience of the international Communist movement shows that resolute defense by the Communist and workers' parties of the Marxist-Leninist unity of their ranks and the banning of factions and groups sapping unity guarantee the successful solution of the tasks of the socialist revolution, the establishment of socialism and communism. . . .

The forms of the transition of socialism may vary for different countries. The working class and its vanguard--the Marxist-Leninist party--seek to achieve the Socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole as well as with the national interests of the country.

Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class headed by its vanguard has the opportunity, given a united working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations to unite a majority of the people, to win state power without civil war and insure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people, relying on the majority of the people and decisively rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords. The working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch a non-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the Socialist revolution.

All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

In the event of the ruling classes' resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

The possibility of one or another way to socialism depends on the concrete conditions in each country . . .

After exchanging views, the participants in the meeting arrived at the conclusion that in present conditions it is expedient, besides bilateral meetings of leading personnel and exchange of information, to hold, as the need arises, more representative conferences of Communist and workers' parties to discuss current problems, share experience, study each other's views and attitudes and concert action in the joint struggle for the common goals--peace, democracy and socialism.

- - - - -

STATEMENT ISSUED

BY THE CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

Moscow—November, 1960

. . . The People's Democratic Republics of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, which, together with the great Soviet Union, form the mighty socialist camp, have within a historically short period made remarkable progress in socialist construction. . .

The socialist countries and the socialist camp as a whole owe their achievements to the proper application of the general objective laws governing socialist construction, with due regard to the historical peculiarities of each country and to the interests of the entire socialist system. They owe them to the efforts of the peoples of those countries, to their close fraternal cooperation and mutual internationalist assistance from the Soviet Union.

The experience of development of the socialist countries is added evidence that mutual assistance and support, and utilization of all the advantages of unity and solidarity among the countries of the socialist camp, are a primary international condition for their achievements and successes. Imperialist, renegade and revisionist hopes of a split within the socialist camp are built on sand and doomed to failure. All the socialist countries cherish the unity of the socialist camp like the apple of their eye.

The world economic system of socialism is united by common socialist relations of production and is developing in accordance with the economic laws of socialism. . . .

It requires study of collective experience, extended cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance, gradual elimination, along these lines, of historical differences in the levels of economic development, and the provision of a material basis for a more or less simultaneous transition of all the people of the socialist system to communism.

Socialist construction in the various countries is a source of collective experience for the socialist camp as a whole. A thorough study of this experience by the fraternal parties, and its proper utilization and elaboration with due regard to specific conditions and national peculiarities are an immutable law of the development of every socialist country. . . . The socialist camp is a social, economic and political community of free and sovereign peoples united by the close bonds of international socialist solidarity, by common interests and objectives, and following the path of socialism and communism. It is an inviolable law of the mutual relations between socialist countries strictly to adhere to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. Every country in the socialist camp is insured genuinely equal rights and

* Dux, Dieter, Ideology in conflict; Communist political theory, D. Van Nostrand co., U.S., 1963, pp. 139 - 151

independence. Guided by the principles of complete equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance, the socialist states improve their allround economic, political and cultural cooperation, which meets both the interests of each socialist country and those of the socialist camp as a whole.

One of the greatest achievements of the world socialist system is the practical confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that national antagonisms diminish with the decline of class antagonisms.

In contrast to the laws of the capitalist system, which is characterized by antagonistic contradictions between classes, nations and states leading to armed conflicts, there are no objective causes in the nature of the socialist system for contradictions and conflicts between the people and states belonging to it. Its development leads to greater unity among the states and nations and to the consolidation of all the forms of cooperation between them.

Under socialism, the development of national economy, culture and statehood goes hand in hand with the strengthening and development of the entire world socialist system, and with an ever greater consolidation of the unity of nations. The interests of the socialist system as a whole and national interests are harmoniously combined. It is on this basis that the moral and political unity of all the peoples of the great socialist community has arisen and has been growing. Fraternal friendship and mutual assistance of peoples, born of the socialist system, have superseded the political isolation and national egoism typical of capitalism.

The common interests of the peoples of the socialist countries and the interests of peace and socialism demand the proper combination of the principles of socialist internationalism and socialist patriotism in politics. Every Communist party which has become the ruling party in the state, bears historical responsibility for the destinies of both its country and the entire socialist camp.

The declaration of 1957 points out quite correctly that undue emphasis on the role of national peculiarities and departure from the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism regarding the socialist revolution and socialist construction prejudice the common cause of socialism.

The declaration also states quite correctly that Marxism-Leninism demands creative application of the general principles of socialist revolution and socialist construction, depending on the specific historical conditions in the country concerned, and does not permit of a mechanical copying of the policies and tactics of the Communist parties of other countries. Disregard of national peculiarities may lead to the party of the proletariat being isolated from reality, from the masses, and may injure the socialist cause.

Manifestations of nationalism and national narrow-mindedness do not disappear automatically with the establishment of the socialist system. If fraternal relations and friendship between the socialist countries are to be strengthened, it is necessary that the Communist and workers parties pursue a Marxist-Leninist internationalist policy, that all working people be educated in a spirit of internationalism and patriotism, and that a resolute struggle be waged to eliminate the survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. . . .

The time has come when the socialist states have, by forming a world system, become an international force exerting a powerful influence on world development. There are now real opportunities of solving cardinal problems of modern times in a new way, in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

The problem of war and peace is the most burning problem of our time.

War is a constant companion of capitalism. The system of exploitation of man by man are two aspects of the capitalist system. Imperialism has already inflicted two devastating world wars on mankind and now threatens to plunge it into an even more terrible catastrophe.

Monstrous means of mass annihilation and destruction have been developed which, if used in a new war, can cause unheard-of destruction to entire countries and reduce key centers of world industry and culture to ruins. Such a war would bring death and suffering to hundreds of millions of people, among them people in countries not involved in it. Imperialism spells grave danger to the whole of mankind.

The peoples must now be more vigilant than ever. As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression.

The peoples of all countries know that the danger of a new world war still persists. U.S. imperialism is the main force of aggression and war. Its policy embodies the ideology of militant reaction.

The U.S. imperialists, together with the imperialists of Britain, France and West Germany, have drawn many countries into NATO, CENTO, SEATO and other military blocs. Under the guise of combating the "Communist menace," it has enmeshed the so-called "free world," that is, capitalist countries which depend on them, in a network of military bases spearheaded first and foremost against the socialist countries.

The existence of these blocs and bases endangers universal peace and security and not only encroaches upon the sovereignty but also imperils the very life of those countries which put their territory at the disposal of the U.S. militarists. . . .

The aggressive nature of imperialism has not changed. But real forces have appeared that are capable of foiling its plans of aggression. War is not fatally inevitable. Had the imperialists been able to do what they wanted, they would already have plunged mankind into the abyss of the calamities and horrors of a new world war.

But the time is past when the imperialists could decide at will whether there should or should not be war. More than once in the past years the imperialists have brought mankind to the brink of world catastrophe by starting local wars. . . .

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

The development of international relations in our day is determined by the struggle of the two social systems--the struggle of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy against the forces of imperialism, reaction and aggression--a struggle in which the superiority of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy is becoming increasingly obvious.

For the first time in history, war is opposed by great and organized forces: the mighty Soviet Union, which now leads the world in the decisive branches of science and technology, the entire socialist camp, which has placed its great material and political might at the service of peace, a growing number of peace-loving countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have a vital interest in preserving peace, the international working class and its organizations, above all the Communist parties, the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, the world peace movement, and the neutral countries which want no share in the imperialist policy of war and advocate peaceful co-existence.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is also favored by a definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries, which takes a sober view of the relationship of forces and of the dire consequences of a modern war. The broadest possible united front of peace supporters, fighters against the imperialist policy of aggression and war inspired by U.S. imperialism, is essential to preserve world peace. Concerted and vigorous actions of all the forces of peace can safeguard the peace and prevent a new war.

The democratic and peace forces today have no task more pressing than that of safeguarding humanity against a global thermonuclear disaster. The unprecedented destructive power of modern means of warfare demands that the main actions of the anti-war and peace-loving forces be directed towards preventing war. The struggle against war cannot be put off until war breaks out, for then it may prove too late for many areas of the globe and for their population to combat it. . . .

The Communist parties regard the fight for peace as their prime task. They call on the working class, trade unions, cooperatives, women's and youth leagues and organizations, on all working people, irrespective of their political and religious convictions, firmly to repulse by mass struggles all acts of aggression on the part of the imperialists.

But should the imperialist maniacs start war, the peoples will sweep capitalism out of existence and bury it. . . .

The near future will bring the forces of peace and socialism new successes. The U.S.S.R. will become the leading industrial power of the world. China will become a mighty industrial state. The socialist system will be turning out more than half the world industrial product. The peace zone will expand. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependencies will achieve new victories. The disintegration of the colonial system will become completed. The superiority of the forces of socialism and peace will be absolute.

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

. . . Peace is a loyal ally of socialism, for time is working for socialism against capitalism.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle, as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

In conditions of peaceful coexistence favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In their turn, the successes of the revolutionary class and national-liberation struggle promote peaceful coexistence.

The Communists consider it their duty to fortify the faith of the people in the possibility of furthering peaceful coexistence, their determination to prevent world war. They will do their utmost for the people to weaken imperialism and limit its sphere of action by an active struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation.

Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of socialist ideas. But ideological and political disputes between states must not be settled through war. . . .

The choice of social system is the inalienable right of the people of each country. Socialist revolution is not an item of import and cannot be imposed from without. It is a result of the internal development of the country concerned, of the utmost sharpening of social contradictions in it.

The Communist parties, which guide themselves by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, have always been against the export of revolution. At the same time, they fight resolutely against imperialist export of counter-revolution. They consider it their internationalist duty to call on the peoples of all countries to unite, to rally all their internal forces, to act vigorously and, relying on the might of the world Socialist system, to prevent or firmly resist imperialist interference in the affairs of any people who have risen in revolution.

The Marxist-Leninist parties head the struggle of the working class, the masses of working people, for the accomplishment of the Socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one form or another. The forms and course of development of the Socialist revolution will depend on the specific balance of the class forces in the country concerned, on the organization and maturity of the working class and its vanguard, and on the extent of the resistance put up by the ruling classes.

Whatever form of dictatorship of the proletariat is established, it will always signify an extension of democracy, a transition from formal, bourgeois democracy to genuine democracy, to democracy for working people.

The Communist parties reaffirm the propositions put forward by the declaration of 1957 with regard to the forms of transition of different countries from capitalism to socialism.

The declaration points out that the working class and its vanguard--the Marxist-Leninist party--seek to achieve the Socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the people as a whole, with the national interests of the country.

Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has the opportunity, given a united

working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political cooperation between the different parties and public organizations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and insure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people.

Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in parliament, transform parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the Socialist revolution.

All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

In the event of the exploiting classes' resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, on these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism.

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

In our time, when communism is not only the most advanced doctrine but an actually existing social system which has proved its superiority over capitalism, conditions are particularly favorable for expanding the influence of the Communist parties, vigorously exposing anti-communism, a slogan under which the capitalist class wages its struggle against the proletariat, and winning the broadest sections of the working masses for Communist ideas. . . .

The growth of the Communist parties and their organizational consolidation, the victories of the Communist parties in a number of countries in the struggle against deviation, elimination of the harmful consequences of the personality cult, the greater influence of the world Communist movement open new prospects for the successful accomplishment of the task facing the Communist parties.

Marxist-Leninist parties regard it as an inviolable law of their activity steadfastly to observe the Leninist standards of party life in keeping with the principle of democratic centralism. They consider that they must cherish party unity like the apple of their eye, strictly to adhere to the principle of party democracy and collective leadership, for they attach, in keeping with the organizational principles of Leninism, great importance to the role of the leading party bodies in the life of the party, to work indefatigably for the strengthening of their bonds with the party membership and with the broad masses of the working people, not to allow the personality cult, which shackles creative thought and initiative of Communists, vigorously to promote the activity of Communist, and to encourage criticism and self-criticism in their ranks.

The Communist parties have ideologically defeated the revisionists in their ranks who sought to divert them from the Marxist-Leninist path. Each Communist Party and the international Communist movement as a whole have become still stronger, ideologically and organizationally, in the struggle against revisionism, Right-wing opportunism.

The Communist parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist theories in concentrated form. After betraying Marxism-Leninism, which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed their anti-Leninist revisionist program to the declaration of 1957, they set the League of Communists of Yugoslavia against the international Communist movement as a whole, severed their country from the Socialist camp, made it dependent on so-called aid from United States and other imperialists, and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing the revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle.

The Yugoslav revisionists carry on subversive work against the Socialist camp and the world Communist movement. Under the pretext of an extra-bloc policy, they engage in activities which prejudice the unity of all the peace-loving forces and countries. Further exposure of the leaders of the Yugoslav revisionists, and active struggle to safeguard the Communist movement and the working-class movement from the anti-Leninist ideas of the Yugoslav revisionists, remains an essential task of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

The practical struggles of the working class and the entire course of social development have furnished a brilliant new proof of the great all-conquering power and vitality of Marxism-Leninism, and have thoroughly refuted all modern revisionist theories.

The further development of the Communist and working-class movement calls, as stated in the Moscow declaration of 1957, for continuing a determined struggle on two fronts—against revisionism, which remains the main danger, and against dogmatism and sectarianism.

Revisionism, Right-wing opportunism, which mirrors the bourgeois ideology in theory and practice, distorts Marxism-Leninism, emasculates its revolutionary essence and thereby paralyzes the revolutionary will of the working class, disarms and demobilizes the workers, the masses of the working people, in their struggle against oppression by imperialists and exploiters, for peace, democracy and national liberation, for the triumph of socialism.

Dogmatism and sectarianism in theory and practice can also become the main danger at some stage of development of individual parties, unless combated unrelentingly.

They rob revolutionary parties of the ability to develop Marxism-Leninism through scientific analysis and apply it creatively according to the specific conditions, they isolate Communists from the broad masses of the working people, doom them to passive expectation or Leftist, adventurist actions in the revolutionary struggle, prevent them from making a timely and correct estimate of the changing situation and of new experience, using all opportunities to bring about the victory of the working class and all democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism, reaction and war danger, and thereby prevent the peoples from achieving victory in their just struggle.

At a time when imperialist reaction is joining forces to fight communism, it is particularly imperative vigorously to consolidate the world Communist movement. Unity and solidarity redouble the strength of our movement and provide a reliable guarantee that the great cause of communism will make victorious progress and all enemy attacks will be effectively repelled.

Communists throughout the world are united by the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism and by a joint struggle for its realization. The interests of the Communist movement require solidarity in adherence by every Communist party to the estimates and conclusions concerning the common tasks in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism, jointly reached by the fraternal parties at their meetings.

The interest of the struggle for the working-class cause demand ever closer unity of the ranks of each Communist party and of the great army of Communists of all countries, they demand of them unity of will and action. It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world Communist movement.

A resolute defense of the unity of the world Communist movement on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the prevention of any actions which may undermine that unity, are a necessary condition for victory in the struggle for national independence, democracy and peace, for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of the Socialist revolution and of the building of socialism and communism. Violation of these principles would impair the forces of communism.

All the Marxist-Leninist parties are independent and have equal rights, they shape their policies according to the specific conditions in their respective countries and in keeping with Marxist-Leninist principles, and support each other. The success of the working-class cause in any country is unthinkable without the internationalist solidarity of all Marxist-Leninist parties. Every party is responsible to the working class, to the working people of its country, to the international working-class and Communist movement as a whole.

The Communist and workers parties hold meetings whenever necessary to discuss urgent problems, to exchange experience, acquaint themselves with each other's views and positions, work out common views through consultations and coordinate joint actions in the struggle for common goals.

Whenever a party wants to clear up questions relating to the activities of another fraternal party, its leadership approaches the leadership of the party concerned. If necessary, they hold meetings and consultations.

The experience and results of the meetings of representatives of the Communist parties held in recent years, particularly the results of the two major meetings--that of November, 1957, and this meeting--show that in present-day conditions such meetings are an effective form of exchanging views and experience, enriching Marxist-Leninist theory by collective effort and elaborating a common attitude in the struggle for common objectives.

The Communist and workers parties unanimously declare that the Communist party of the Soviet Union has been, and remains, the universally recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement, being the most experienced and steeled contingent of the international Communist movement. The experience which the Communist party of the Soviet Union has gained in the struggle for the victory of the working class, in Socialist construction and in the full-scale construction of communism, is of fundamental significance for the whole of the world Communist movement.

The example of the Soviet Communist party and its fraternal solidarity inspire all the Communist parties in their struggle for peace and socialism, and represent the revolutionary principles of proletarian internationalism applied in practice.

The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party are not only of great importance for the Soviet Communist party and Communist construction in the U.S.S.R., but have initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement, and have promoted its development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

All Communist and workers parties contribute to the development of the great theory of Marxism-Leninism. Mutual assistance and support in relations between all the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties embody the revolutionary principles of proletarian internationalism applied in practice. . . .

STATEMENT OF

*

Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of
November 29, 1963 to the Central Committee of the CPC

November 29, 1963

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China
Comrade Mao Tse-tung

Dear Comrades,

The communist press has recently published documents in which the Marxist-Leninist parties have publicly expounded their positions on fundamental questions of the international communist movement raised in the debate that has unfolded. These documents show that there are serious differences in the communist movement, differences in the understanding and interpretation of the fundamental theses of the Declaration and the Statment of the Moscow meetings. We will not conceal the fact that, like many other fraternal parties, irrespective of the position they are taking, we are seriously concerned over the fact that the differences which have arisen are constantly becoming deeper and the scope of the questions under debate is constantly widening, while the sharp public polemics are assuming forms impermissible in relations among Marxist-Leninists.

Particularly disquieting is the fact that the differences on ideological questions are being transferred to inter-state relations and are manifesting themselves in the field of conceret policies, thus shaking the friendship and unity of the peoples of the socialist community and weakening the anti-imperialist front. The strength and attention of the fraternal parties are being deflected from the solution of urgent problems of socialist construction and from the struggle against imperialism.

This situation in the communist movement grieves us greatly. We have more than once declared, and now reiterate, that the abnormal relations between the CPC and the CPSU are dividing the communist forces and benefiting only our enemies who on their part are seeking in every way to play on the contradictions and making use of the existing difficulties for their own anti-communist aims.

Of course parties like the CPSU and the CPC, standing at the head of the world's two biggest states, can go on with their work even if the polemics continue. We agree that for our two parties even in such circumstances, as you said to the Soviet Ambassador Comrade Chervonenko, the skies will not fall, and grass and trees will continue to grow, women to bear children and fish to swim in the water.

But we cannot fail to see that the differences and sharp polemics are doing great harm to the communist movement. We also have no right to fail to think of those detachments of the communist movement which are forced to carry on the struggle against imperialism in extremely difficult and complex circumstances. Such parties rightly consider that they require friendship with both the CPSU and the CPC. All Marxist-Leninist parties draw strength from the unity and solidarity of the communist movement for the overcoming of difficulties.

* American Consulate General, Current Background, No. 733,
Hongkong, May 13, 1964

The communists of all countries want unity of action. And they are right without unity of action our struggle against class enemies will be many times harder.

In the present circumstances, the most important and urgent task of the Marxist-Leninists is to prevent an undesirable development of events, and to turn the events from the zone of danger toward normalization, toward the strengthening of cooperation and unity among all the fraternal parties and socialist countries. Timelier than ever now are Lenin's injunctions that each party must be conscious of its high responsibility for our common cause, and be ready to give first place to the fundamental interests of the communist movement.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, firmly following the Leninist course of the world communist movement as expressed in the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings, has considered, and still considers, itself duty bound to do all it can for the strengthening of unity.

We understand, of course, that the elimination of the difficulties that have arisen in the world communist movement requires great exertion by all the Marxist-Leninist parties. In this letter, we wish to give our views on the contribution which our two parties could make toward the solution of this problem.

As before, we hold to the position that, despite existing serious differences, there is an objective basis for the improvement of relations between the CPSU and the CPC and between our countries -- the basis being the common fundamental interests of our two peoples and our common tasks in the struggle for socialism and communism, the support of the revolutionary workers' movement and national liberation movement, and the struggle for peace against the aggressive schemes of the imperialists.

One cannot fail to see that, besides the questions over which differences have arisen, there are also positions on which we are fully united or at least very close in our views. We have, objectively, a common position on such basic questions as the class struggle, the struggle against imperialism for the victory of the working class and all the working people, and the dictatorship of the proletariat which is established, as is seen from the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, for the destruction of those forces which, after the victory of the proletarian revolution, offer resistance to the construction of socialism. Although our interpretations on these questions are not in all respects the same as yours, we are deeply convinced that a calm and unprejudiced understanding of our present discussion, and the elimination from it of everything that is non-essential and fortuitous, will reveal wide possibilities not only for the preservation of our cooperation along many lines but also for its growth and strengthening.

Now that the CPSU and the CPC, as well as other fraternal parties, have stated their views on the questions in dispute, it would be correct not to concentrate attention on the problems on which there are differences between us but to let them wait until the heat of passion has cooled, to let time do its work. We are certain that life will demonstrate the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist line. At the same time, we could develop our cooperation in those spheres where favorable possibilities exist. Such cooperation is in the interest not only of the Soviet Union and China but also of all the peoples of the socialist community.

The Central Committee of the CPSU anticipates that the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, on its part, will take concrete steps in this direction, particularly since the Premier of the State Council of the PRC, Comrade Chou En-lai, is reported in the press to have declared in recent talks with foreign personalities and journalists that China intends to develop contacts with the Soviet Union and other socialist states, that China is greatly interested in the development of trade and other economic contacts and that the PRC adheres to the five principles of peaceful co-existence. The Premier of the PRC said that China, on her part, will resist the efforts of the imperialists to use the existing differences for the aim of undermining the unity of the socialist community. Such a point of view coincides with the declarations which the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government, on their part, have frequently made.

The interests of both sides permit one to conclude that it would already be possible today to talk of concrete steps for setting things right in Soviet-Chinese cooperation.

Specifically, it would be possible to start in the immediate future to draw up jointly agreed preliminary plans for the exchange of goods between the PRC and the Soviet Union. In the course of the next few years the U.S.S.R. could increase its export to China of goods in which you are interested, and the import of goods from China into the U.S.S.R., which would be in the interest both of our economy and of yours.

As is known, the protocol of May 13, 1962 concluded by the government of our two countries provides for the renewal next year of negotiations concerning the delivery to the People's Republic of China of whole sets of equipment the manufacture of which was postponed for two years at the request of the Chinese side. If your side shows interest, it would be possible in our view to come to an understanding on the broadening of technical aid to the PRC in the building of industrial enterprises and specifically to discuss the possibility of aid in the development of the petroleum industry and the building of enterprises in the mining and other industries on terms beneficial to both our countries.

Once again we affirm our readiness to send Soviet specialists to the People's Republic of China should you consider it necessary.

The Soviet Union is now drawing up her Five-Year Plan for 1966-70. China too is drawing up her third Five-Year Plan. For this reason, now is a good time to discuss the possibilities of developing trade and other ties between our countries and to provide for corresponding measures in the plans for the national economies of both countries. Of course, it is never too late to start on the good work of strengthening cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the PRC, but it would be better to make a start now.

Both our countries would undoubtedly benefit from the broadening of scientific-technical cooperation and also from the development of cultural ties of many kinds. We consider that these questions could be the subject of mutual consultation and negotiation between the appropriate organs of the Soviet Union and the PRC. In making these proposals, we are naturally willing to consider attentively all your views as to the widening of the cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic in the economic, scientific-technical, cultural and other fields. We understand, of course, that such ties and cooperation can develop provided you consider

this beneficial to China. We on our part are convinced that it would be mutually beneficial to both China and the Soviet Union.

It is well known that economic ties are the type of cooperation in which all nations are particularly interested. Economic ties have great significance even in the relations between countries with different social systems. They create favorable conditions for implementing the principle of peaceful co-existence and help the improvement of relations among states. Extensive economic ties are all the more necessary among socialist countries, which are bound together by a common social system and common aims. Such ties are an important factor in the construction of socialism and communism and in utilizing the advantages of international socialist division of labor, and they help in strengthening the friendship among fraternal peoples, achieving new successes in the economic competition with capitalism and uniting all anti-imperialist revolutionary forces. The development of such cooperation would be a gain for China and the Soviet Union, for the socialist camp and the cause of world socialism.

We understand, of course, that each nation builds socialism and communism by relying mainly on its own forces because no one except the people of a given country will build socialism there. But it is also evident that cooperation among socialist countries facilitates and accelerates the construction of socialism by each nation. The restoration and strengthening of the economic cooperation between our countries will help not only to accelerate the growth of the national economies of the U.S.S.R. and China and the economy of the entire socialist system, but also to create favorable conditions for normalizing relations in other fields.

Highly favorable pre-conditions exist for the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and China. Our countries possess a variety of natural riches and have accumulated considerable experience in economic and scientific-technical cooperation. How beneficial was the influence of Soviet-Chinese economic cooperation on the course of socialist construction in the People's Republic of China and also on the economic growth of the Soviet Union, is well known. It is all the more to be regretted that economic cooperation and trade between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic has not only failed to grow in recent years but on the contrary has constantly shrunk.

Experience shows that the development of trading, economic and other ties improves the atmosphere in mutual relations and helps to straighten out other problems on which the relations between our countries depend. And such problems unfortunately do exist and demand solution.

You will probably agree that the situation which has arisen in recent years along different sections of the Soviet-Chinese border cannot be regarded as normal. The Soviet government has already proposed that friendly consultations take place to define accurately the boundary in different sections, considering that this will result in removal of the causes of the present misunderstanding. Recently you, too, spoke in favour of solving this question on the basis of mutual consultation. In this connection, we are transmitting to you a relevant document.

Statements have recently been made in China concerning the aggressive policy of the Czarist government and the unjust treaties imposed upon China. Naturally, we will not defend the Russian Czars who permitted arbitrariness in laying down the state boundaries with neighboring countries.

We are convinced that you, too, do not intend to defend the Chinese emperors who by force of arms seized not a few territories belonging to others. But while condemning the reactionary actions of the top-strata exploiters who held power in Russia and in China at that time, we cannot disregard the fact that historically-formed boundaries between states now exist. Any attempt to ignore this can become the source of misunderstandings and conflicts; at the same time, they will not lead to the solution of the problem. It would be simply unreasonable to create territorial problems artificially at the present time, when the working class is in power and when our common aim is communism, under which state borders will gradually lose their former significance. We have all the possibilities for fully eliminating border frictions of any kind, and thus showing the peoples an example of truly friendly relations between two socialist states.

We should also create conditions favorable to the improvement of relations on the Party level and avoid anything that might aggravate the difficulties that have arisen in the communist movement. That the overcoming of the differences in the communist movement is a complex matter, demanding time and serious effort, is something we are fully aware of. But what is important is to go step by step in this direction, to show Leninist concern for the strengthening of the unity of the world communist movement on a principled Marxist basis, to bar any acts whatsoever that might undermine unity and to repulse factionalists and splitters.

We are of the opinion that even in the present complex situation there is a possibility of preventing the polemics that have spread from getting out of control, and of directing matters toward the strengthening of unity and solidarity between the CPC and the CPSU and among all the fraternal parties. The Central Committee of the CPSU has more than once advocated the cessation of public polemics. We again repeated this proposal on October 25 and November 7, 1963. The Soviet press has ceased to publish materials of a polemical character. In this letter we call once more on the central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to do everything necessary for the cessation of public polemics and of other activities that harm the unity of the international communist movement and the unity of the socialist countries. We do not propose a general cessation of the exchange of views on questions of principle concerning world developments, but desire only that it should take place in the forms provided for by the statement of the fraternal parties in 1960 -- through mutual consultation, negotiations and exchanges of letters.

In making these proposals, the Central Committee of the CPSU bases itself on the consideration that they will help strengthen confidence and create more favorable conditions for the preparation of a world meeting of the communist and workers' parties. Recently, the CPSU and the CPC, like many other fraternal parties, have more than once advocated the convening of such a meeting. We now reaffirm this position of ours. At the same time, we underline yet again that it is the duty of all parties to help in the creation of a situation which will render such a meeting fruitful, so that it will lead not to a split in the world communist movement but to genuine unity and solidarity of all the fraternal parties and all the forces of peace and socialism.

These are some of our views on concrete measures that could be taken with the aim of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen.

Please understand us correctly -- our letter is dictated exclusively by concern for the strengthening of unity. We may differ in our understanding of this or that ideological problem, or in our estimates of specific phenomena of social development -- life will correct those who are mistaken. But one must never even for a minute, under any circumstances, forget about the highest duty of communists -- to build the unity of the socialist community and of the entire front of the struggle against capital. The peoples trust the communists. And we are called upon to justify their trust. Let us, by our common efforts, clear the way for the strengthening of cooperation, and take concrete measures to this end.

The CPSU and the Soviet people cherish friendly feelings for the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China and wish to strengthen the brotherhood built up in the struggle for socialism and communism. The Central Committee of the CPSU is filled with determination to do all it can to achieve a turn of events for the better, and to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement and the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples.

The CPSU guides itself unswervingly by the line of the world communist movement, and firmly defends the principles of the Declaration and the Statement of the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960. Our Leninist party is waging a historic struggle for the building of communism in the U.S.S.R., for peace, democracy, and the national independence of peoples, for the strengthening of the world socialist community and the entire anti-imperialist revolutionary front, for the proletarian revolution and the cause of international socialism, and this accords with the interests of all the peoples.

The Central Committee of the CPSU calls on the Central Committee of the CPC, on its part, to undertake practical steps for the strengthening of the unity of the fraternal parties on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in the struggle for the great cause of socialism.

First Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

N. Khrushchev (signed)

MEMORANDUM 95

*

Letter of the Central Committee of the CPC of February 29,
1964 to the Central Committee of the CPSU of
November 29, 1963

February 29, 1964

The Central Committee of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

This letter from the Central Committee of the Communist
Party of China is in reply to the letter of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated November 29, 1963.

The Chinese Communist Party has always regarded the safeguard-
ing and cementing of the unity of the international communist
movement as its sacred duty.

The unity of the communist of all countries is not that
of a club, it is the revolutionary unity of people guided by
a common theory and fighting for a common ideal. The unity of the
international communist movement can only be based on the revolutionary
teachings of Marx and Lenin. Without this basis there can be no
proletarian internationalist unity.

The differences between us and the leaders on the CPSU involve
a number of major problems of principle concerning Marxist-Leninist
theory and the whole international communist movement. These
problems of principle must be solved if our differences are to be
eliminated and the unity of the Chinese and Soviet parties is to be
strengthened.

The views we have expressed in our reply of June 14, 1963 to
the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, that is, our
proposal concerning the general line of the international communist
movement, and in our articles about the international communist
movement published both before and after that reply, are in full
accord with Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the
1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

In this letter we would like to state our views on a number
of questions raised in your letter.

1. The Question of the Sino-Soviet Boundary

The government of the People's Republic of China has consistent-
ly held that the question of the boundary between China and the Soviet

* American Consulate General, Current Background, No. 733,
Hongkong, May 13, 1964

Union, which is a legacy from the past, can be settled through negotiation between the two governments. It has also held that, pending such a settlement, the status quo on the border should be maintained. This is what we have done over the past ten years or more. Had the Soviet government taken the same attitude, both sides could have lived in amity along the border and preserved tranquillity there.

With the stepping up of anti-Chinese activities by the leaders of the CPSU in recent years, the Soviet side has made frequent breaches of the status quo on the border, occupied Chinese territory and provoked border incidents. Still more serious, the Soviet side has flagrantly carried out large-scale subversive activities in Chinese frontier areas, trying to sow discord among China's nationalities by means of the press and wireless, inciting China's minority nationalities to break away from their motherland, and inveigling and coercing tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union. Not only do all these acts violate the principles guiding relations between socialist countries, they are absolutely impermissible even in the relations between countries in general.

Among all our neighbors it is only the leaders of the CPSU and the reactionary nationalists of India who have deliberately created border disputes with China. The Chinese government has satisfactorily settled complicated boundary questions, which were legacies from the past, both with all its fraternal socialist neighbors except the Soviet Union, and with its nationalist neighbors such as Burma, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan, with the exception of India.

The delegations of our two governments started boundary negotiations in Peking on February 25, 1964. Although the old treaties relating to the Sino-Russian boundary are unequal treaties, the Chinese government is nevertheless willing to respect them and take them as the basis for a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question. Guided by proletarian internationalism and the principles governing relations between socialist countries, the Chinese government will conduct friendly negotiations with the Soviet government in the spirit of consultation on an equal footing and mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. If the Soviet side takes the same attitude as the Chinese government, the settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question, we believe, ought not to be difficult, and the Sino-Soviet boundary will truly become one of lasting friendship.

2. The Question of Aid

We have always had a proper appreciation of the friendly Soviet aid which began under Stalin's leadership. We have always considered that the Soviet people's friendly aid has played a beneficial role in helping China to lay the preliminary foundations for her socialist industrialization. For this the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people have expressed their gratitude on numerous occasions.

In recent years the leaders of the CPSU have habitually played the benefactor and frequently boasted of their "disinterested assistance." When commemorating the 14th anniversary of the signing of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance in February this year, Pravda, Izvestia and other Soviet propaganda media again beat the drum to the same tune. We have not yet made a systematic reply in the press, but we must point out that, so far from being gratis, Soviet aid to China was rendered mainly in the form of trade and that it was certainly not a one-way affair. China has paid and is paying the Soviet Union in goods, gold or convertible foreign exchange for all Soviet-supplied complete sets of equipment and other goods, including those made available on credit plus interest. It is necessary to add that the prices of many of the goods we imported from the Soviet Union were much higher than those on the world market.

While China has received aid from the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union on its part has also received corresponding aid from China. No one can say that China's aid to the Soviet Union has been insignificant and not worthy of mention. Here are some examples:

Up to the end of 1962 China had furnished the Soviet Union with 2,100 million new roubles' worth of grain, edible oils and other foodstuffs. Among the most important items were 5,760,000 tons of soya beans, 2,940,000 tons of rice, 1,090,000 tons of edible oils and 900,000 tons of meat.

Over the same period, China furnished the Soviet Union with more than 1,400 million new roubles' worth of mineral products and metals. Among the most important items were: 100,000 tons of lithium concentrates, 34,000 tons of beryllium concentrates, 51,000 tons of borax, 270,000 tons of wolfram concentrates, 32.9 tons of piezoelectric quartz, 7,730 tons of mercury, 39 tons of tantalum-niobium concentrates, 37,000 tons of molybdenum concentrates and 180,000 tons of tin. Many of these mineral products are raw materials which are indispensable for the development of the most advanced branches of science and for the manufacture of rockets and nuclear weapons.

As for the Soviet loans to China, it must be pointed out that China used them mostly for the purchase of war material from the Soviet Union, the greater part of which was used up in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea. In the war against U.S. aggression the Korean people carried by far the heaviest burden and sustained by far the greatest losses. The Chinese people, too, made great sacrifices and incurred vast military expenses. The Chinese Communist Party has always considered that this was the Chinese people's bounden internationalist duty and that it is nothing to boast of. For many years we have been paying the principal and interest on these Soviet loans, which account for a considerable part of our yearly exports to the Soviet Union. Thus even the war material supplied to China in the war to resist U.S. aggression and aid Korea has not been given gratis.

3. The Question of the Soviet Experts

The Soviet experts working in China were invariably made welcome, respected and trusted by the Chinese government and people. The overwhelming majority of them were hard-working and helpful to China's socialist construction. We have always highly appreciated their conscientious work, and still miss them to this day.

You will remember that when the leaders of the CPSU unilaterally decided to recall all the Soviet experts in China, we solemnly affirmed our desire to have them continue their work in China and expressed the hope that the leaders of the CPSU would reconsider and change their decision.

But in spite of our objections you turned your backs on the principles guiding international relations and unscrupulously withdrew the 1,390 Soviet experts working in China, tore up 343 contracts and supplementary contracts concerning experts, and scrapped 257 projects of scientific and technical cooperation, all within the short span of a month.

You were well aware that the Soviet experts were posted in over 250 enterprises and establishments in the economic field and the fields of national defense, culture, technical design, the construction of projects, the installation of equipment, trial production and scientific research. As a result of your peremptory orders to the Soviet experts to discontinue their work and return to the Soviet Union, many of our country's important designing and scientific research projects had to stop half way, some of the construction projects in progress had to be suspended, and some of the factories and mines which were conducting trial production could not go into production according to schedule. Your perfidious action

disrupted China's original national economic plan and inflicted enormous losses upon China's socialist construction.

You were going completely against communist ethics when you took advantage of China's serious natural disasters to adopt these grave measures.

Your action fully demonstrates that you violate the principle of mutual assistance between socialist countries and use the sending of experts as an instrument for exerting political pressure on fraternal countries, butting into their internal affairs and impeding and sabotaging their socialist construction.

Now you have again suggested sending experts to China. To be frank, the Chinese people cannot trust you. They have just healed the wounds caused by your withdrawal of experts. These events are still fresh in their memory. With the leaders of the CPSU pursuing an anti-Chinese policy, the Chinese people are unwilling to be duped.

In our opinion, all the countries in the socialist camp should handle the question of sending experts in accordance with the principles of genuine equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, mutual assistance and internationalism. It is absolutely impermissible for any country unilaterally to annul or scrap any agreement or contract concerning the sending of experts. Any country which violates such an agreement or contract should, in accordance with international practice, compensate the other side for the losses thus inflicted. Only thus can there be an interchange of experts on a basis of equality and mutual benefit between China and the Soviet Union and among countries in the socialist camp.

We would like to say in passing that, basing ourselves on the international principle of mutual assistance among countries in the socialist camp, we are very much concerned about the present economic situation in the Soviet Union. If you should feel the need for the help of Chinese experts in certain fields, we would be glad to send them.

4. The Question of Sino-Soviet Trade

Nobody is in a better position than you to know the real cause for the curtailment of Sino-Soviet trade over the last few years. This curtailment was precisely the result of your extending the differences from the field of ideology to that of State relations.

Your sudden withdrawal of all the Soviet experts working in China upset the schedules of construction and the production arrangements of many of our factories, mines and other enterprises and

establishments, and had a direct impact on our need for the import of complete sets of equipment. Such being the case, did you expect us to keep on buying them just for display?

Moreover, in pursuance of your policy of further imposing restrictions on and discriminating against China in the economic and commercial fields, since 1960 you have deliberately placed obstacles in the way of economic and trade negotiations between our two countries and held up or refused supplies of important goods which China needs. You have insisted on providing large amounts of goods which we do not really need or which we do not need at all, while holding back or supplying very few of the goods which we need badly. For several years you have used the trade between our two countries as an instrument for bringing political pressure to bear on China. How could this avoid cutting down the volume of Sino-Soviet trade?

From 1959 to 1961, our country suffered extraordinary natural disasters for three years in succession and could not supply you with as large quantities of agricultural produce and processed products as before. This was the result of factors beyond human control. It is utterly unreasonable for you to attack China on this account and blame her for this reduction in trade.

Indeed, but for China's efforts the volume of Sino-Soviet trade would have decreased even more. Take this year for example. China has already put forward a list of 220 million new roubles' worth of imports from the Soviet Union and 420 million new roubles' worth of exports to the Soviet Union. But you have been procrastinating unreasonably, continuing to hold back goods we need while trying to force on us goods we do not need. You say in your letter, "In the course of the next few years the U.S.S.R. could increase its export to China of goods in which you are interested..." But your deeds do not agree with your words.

You constantly accuse use of "going it alone" and claim that you stand for extensive economic ties and division of labor among the socialist countries. But what is your actual record in this respect?

You infringe the independence and sovereignty of fraternal countries and oppose their efforts to develop their economy on an independent basis in accordance with their own needs and potentialities.

You bully those fraternal countries whose economies are less advanced and oppose their policy of industrialization and try to force them to remain agricultural countries forever and serve as your sources of raw materials and as outlets for your goods.

You bully fraternal countries which are industrially more developed and insist that they stop manufacturing their traditional products and become accessory factories serving your industries.

Moreover, you have introduced the jungle law of the capitalist world into relations between socialist countries. You openly follow the example of the Common Market which was organized by monopoly capitalist groups.

All these actions of yours are wrong.

In the economic, scientific, technical and cultural spheres, we stand for relations of cooperation of a new type, based on genuine equality and mutual benefit, between China and the Soviet Union and among all the socialist countries.

We hold that it is necessary to transform the present Council of Mutual Economic Assistance of Socialist Countries to accord with the principle of proletarian internationalism and turn this organization, which is now solely controlled by the leaders of the CPSU, into one based on genuine equality and mutual benefit, which the fraternal countries of the socialist camp may join of their own free will. It is hoped that you will favorably respond to our suggestion.

5. The Question of Stopping Public Polemics

The public polemics were provoked by you. We maintained that differences in the international communist movement should be settled through inter-party discussions. But you insisted on bringing them into the open. Beginning with the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, you imposed public polemics on the entire international communist movement in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties as laid down in the 1960 Statement, and you asserted that to do so was to "act in Lenin's manner." What you did was a bad thing. You created difficulties for fraternal parties and rendered a service to the imperialists and reactionaries. Now, with the extensive unfolding of the public debate, the truth is becoming clearer and clearer and Marxism-Leninism is making more and more progress. What was a bad thing is becoming a good thing.

In the course of this great debate, the communists, proletarians, working people, revolutionary intellectuals, and other people who have an interest in opposing imperialism and reaction have become more discerning and increasingly awakened politically, and their revolutionary enthusiasm and theoretical level have been greatly enhanced. The effect of the public debate is the

opposite of what you intended. It leads more and more people away from the bad influence of the baton and makes them think over problems independently. Thus, as with the other debates in the history of the international communist movement, the present debate is undoubtedly the prelude to a new revolutionary upsurge.

When you wanted to start public polemics against the fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties, you said that such polemics represented "the only correct and genuinely Marxist-Leninist position of principle" and were "in the interests of the whole world communist movement." Yet now that the public polemics have more and more clearly exposed your revisionist features and placed you in an increasingly disadvantageous position, you declare that they "are doing great harm to the communist movement" and that it would be "most wise" and "in the interests of the solidarity of the world communist movement" to stop them. What truth or principle is to be found in you when you say one thing one day and another the next? Which of your statements do you expect others to believe? And which do you expect others to obey?

As to the proposal for stopping the public polemics, you seem to have forgotten that it was put forward by the Workers' Party of Vietnam as early as January 1962. Similar proposals were put forward by the Communist Parties of Indonesia and of New Zealand. They all won our immediate approval. But you turned a deaf ear to them and, far from stopping the public polemics, you kept extending them. Why must others accept your proposal the instant it is made?

You also seem to have forgotten that in our letter to you of March 9, 1963 we said, "On the suspension of public polemics, it is necessary that our two parties and the fraternal parties concerned should have some discussion and reach an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all." You ignored our proposal. On July 20, 1963 when the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties were drawing to a close, we proposed to write into the communique: "...Our two parties and the fraternal parties concerned should make joint efforts to seek a reasonable basis for achieving a fair agreement on the cessation of public polemics, which is acceptable to all." Once again you turned down our proposal.

In your letter you state that "it would be correct not to concentrate attention on the problems on which there are differences between us but to let them wait until the heat of passion has cooled, to let time do its work." Again, you seem to have forgotten that as far back as October 10, 1960 we pointed

out in our written statement at the drafting committee of the 26 fraternal parties that "as to the questions on which unanimity cannot be achieved for the time being, it would be better to leave them open than to reach a forced solution" and that "time will help us eliminate the differences." You then categorically rejected our proposal. In your letter of November 5, 1960 to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, which you circulated during the 1960 meeting of the fraternal parties, you declared, "To wait for the 'verdict of history' would be a grave error fraught with serious consequences for the entire communist movement..." But now you suddenly make a turn of 180 degrees on this question and say that we should let the differences wait. What are you up to? To put it plainly, you are merely resorting to this trick to deprive us of the right to reply, after you yourselves have heaped so much abuse on the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

While the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties were in progress in Moscow, despite our repeated sincere advice you published your open letter to Party organizations and all communists in the Soviet Union on July 14, 1963 in order to curry favor with U.S. imperialism and to reach an agreement with it on the monopoly of nuclear weapons. You then launched an anti-Chinese campaign on an unprecedented scale. According to incomplete statistics, between July 15 and the end of October 1963 the Soviet press carried nearly 2,000 anti-China articles and other items.

Meanwhile, under your influence the leaders of the fraternal parties of socialist countries -- the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party -- have also published a great number of articles and other items against China.

You say in your letter that "the differences and sharp polemics are doing great harm to the communist movement." If you really think so, don't you find you ought to reproach yourselves, to ask yourselves why you again and again insisted on attacking and slandering the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties in a big way?

You also say in your letter that the difficulties of other fraternal parties should be taken into account. We have always given full consideration to the difficulties of other fraternal parties. It was for this very reason that we repeatedly advised the leaders of the CPSU against bringing the controversy into the open. But following the leaders of the CPSU, the leaders of the

communist and workers' parties of many capitalist countries, for example, the parties of France, Italy, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Austria, West Germany, Greece, Portugal, Britain, the United States of America, Canada, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia, Ceylon, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Jordan and Algeria -- as well as the Dange clique, who are renegades from the Indian proletariat -- published many articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and some adopted resolutions, issued statements or open letters to Party members, or even unscrupulously attacked or expelled comrades adhering to the Marxist-Leninist stand. Did they ever take their own difficulties into account when they were doing all this? Did you ever take their difficulties into account when you were supporting them in all this?

These fraternal parties have attacked us in numerous articles and other items, but we have all along exercised great restraint. We have replied to none of them except to a part of the attacks of the communist parties of France, Italy and the U.S.A. We have merely reserved our right of reply. How was it possible for us to create difficulties for them when we have never disturbed them? If they have difficulties, these are of their own making.

Even after your letter of November 29, 1963 you and your followers did not stop your anti-Chinese propaganda. You attacked us by name in the Pravda article, "Why Mislead?" and "The Soviet-Chinese Treaty -- Fourteen Years," in the Izvestia article "An Important Document," in "The World in a Week" in the magazine Za Rubezhom, and in many other articles and items. In addition, you have recently published books against China, such as Talks

When the Indian reactionaries attack socialist China, should proletarian internationalism be observed and the Indian reactionaries' provocations be denounced, or should they be helped with arms to fight the brothers of the Soviet people?

Are the Titoites renegades or comrades? Are they a special detachment of U.S. imperialism or not? Is Yugoslavia a socialist country or not?

Is the socialist camp needed or not? On what principles is the unity of the socialist camp to be strengthened?

Should we actively support all the oppressed peoples and nations in their revolutionary and class struggles for emancipation, or should we forbid and oppose their revolutions?

Was Stalin a great Marxist-Leninist, or was he a murderer, a bandit and a gambler?

Should a socialist country maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat, or should it use the so-called state of the whole people and the so-called party of the entire people to pave the way for the restoration of capitalism?

These questions admit of no equivocation but must be thoroughly straightened out. How can issues of such magnitude be evaded? If they were, there would be no distinction between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and dogmatism, between Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism, between the communist and the social democratic parties, or between communism and capitalism.

You frequently threaten others with a "most resolute rebuff." In fact, people have had plenty of experience of your tactics, whether hard or soft, bitter or sweet. It was you who exerted military, economic and political pressure on Albania, severed diplomatic relations, tore up agreements and broke off trade relations with her. It was you too who scrapped contracts with China, withdrew experts, discontinued aid and carried out subversive activities against her. The Chinese Communist Party and all other parties adhering to Marxism-Leninism will never be misled by honeyed words or bow under pressure or barter away principles. If you are indeed ready to deliver a "most resolute rebuff" worthy of the term, "state our views openly," "publish documents and material," take "collective measures" or what not, well then, please do whatever you intend to do.

Despite the fact that the differences have grown to their present serious proportions, the Chinese Communist Party is willing to do its best for the restoration and strengthening of unity. In your letter of November 29 you merely cry for a halt to the public polemics without putting forward any concrete measures for solving the problem. We now propose to you the following concrete measures for the solution of the problem, and we hope you will consider them and give us an answer.

(1) For the cessation of the public polemics it is necessary for the Chinese and Soviet parties and other fraternal parties concerned to hold various bilateral and multilateral talks in order to find through consultation a fair and reasonable formula acceptable to all and to conclude a common agreement.

(2) The Chinese Communist Party consistently advocates and actively supports the convening of a meeting of representatives of

all communist and workers' parties. Prior to the meeting adequate preparations should be made, and difficulties and obstacles should be overcome. Together with the other fraternal parties, we will do everything possible to insure that this meeting will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

(3) The resumption of talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties is a necessary preparatory step for making the meeting of the fraternal parties a success. We propose that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties be resumed in Peking, from October 10 to 25, 1964.

(4) In order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal parties, we propose that the Sino-Soviet talks be followed by a meeting of representatives of 17 fraternal parties, namely, the parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Vietnam, and the parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

Unite under the banner of Marxism-Leninism!

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China.

ภาคผนวก ๑๑

การต่อสู้ของพรรคคอมมิวนิสต์สหภาพโซเวียต
เพื่อความเป็นเอกภาพของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์โลก
มติของที่ประชุมคราวองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช.
ในวโรว วันที่ ๑๕ กุมภาพันธ์ ค.ศ. ๑๙๖๔

หลังจากที่ไลฟิง และโลอิกไปรายรายงานของสหภาพ เอ็ม.เอ.ซูลลอฟ สมาชิกคณะเบ่งชีเกียม และเลขาธิการคณะกรรมการกลางพรรคคอมมิวนิสต์สหภาพโซเวียต (พ.ค.ส.ช.) เรื่อง "วลาวยการต่อสู้ของ พ.ค.ส.ช. เพื่อสามัคคีธรรมของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์ของโลก" แล้ว ที่ประชุมคราวองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. ก็แสดงความวิตกกังวลอย่างลึกซึ้งต่อพฤติกรรมแตกแยกของฝ่ายผู้นำของพรรคคอมมิวนิสต์จีน (พ.ค.จ.) ซึ่งทำความเสียหายอย่างใหญ่หลวงให้แก่ประชาคมชาติสังคมนิยม และแกขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์และชนชั้นคนงานของโลกทั้งมอง

ควบคุมระหนักถึงความสำคัญทางประวัติศาสตร์ของความเป็นเอกภาพและความเป็นน้ำหนึ่งใจเดียวกันของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์ พรรคคอมมิวนิสต์แห่งสหภาพโซเวียต ในระยะหลังๆ นี้ จึงโลกกำเนิดการก้าวใหม่ๆ เพื่อชักหรืออย่างน้อยในขั้นต้นๆ ก็ทำให้ความขัดแย้งกันต่างๆ ที่มีอยู่ระหว่างผู้นำของ พ.ค.จ. และ พ.ค.ส.ช. และพรรคอื่นอื่นๆ ลดน้อยลง และเพื่อกระชับความร่วมมือทางเศรษฐกิจและทางการเมืองระหว่าง ส.ส.ช.ส. และสาธารณรัฐประชาชนจีน (ส.ป.จ.) ในแผนแผนชั้น พรรคชาวมาร์กซ์ - ลัทธิเลนินอื่นๆ ก็ให้ความพยายามเพื่อยังมีให้ความขัดแย้งเหล่านั้นดำเนินไปสู่ความร้ายแรงยิ่งขึ้นเช่นกัน

ที่ประชุมคราวองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. รับทราบด้วยความเสียใจว่า ฝ่ายผู้นำของ พ.ค.จ. หวโลกตอบสนองความริเริ่มอันนี้ไม่ อีกทั้งยังหวโลกตอบจดหมายของ พ.ค.ส.ช. และหวโลกหยุดยั้งการทะเลาะโต้เถียงอย่างเปิดเผยไม่ หากตรงกันขาว กลับเร่งระดมการรณรงค์เป็นปฏิปักษ์ต่อแนวทั่วไปของ

* เอกสารโซเวียตของสำนักแดงชาวโซเวียต ประจำประเทศไทย

พ.ค.ส.ช. ในเรื่องการทำให้สัมพันธ์ระหว่างไซเวียต - จีนให้กลับสู่ปกติภาวะแล้ว
บรรดาผู้นำจีนก็เร่งมือใหม่การโฆษณา เป็นปฏิปักษ์แก่ไซเวียตในสาธารณรัฐประชาชน
จีนเป็นการใหญ่ และกำลังเข้ามาแทรกแซงในกิจการภายในของสหภาพไซเวียต
อย่างโจ่งๆ

ที่ประชุมครบองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. บัดนี้ถือว่า ผลประ
โยชน์อันสำคัญยิ่งชีวิตของระบบสังคมนิยมของโลก และของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์
และการป้องกันความบริสุทธิ์ของลัทธิมาร์กซ์ - ลัทธิเลนิน ทำให้ต้องมีการ เปิดโปง
ความอื้อฉาวการฉ้อโกงอัน เป็นปฏิปักษ์ของลัทธิเลนินของฝ่ายผู้นำ พ.ค.จ. และต้อง
ตอบโต้อย่าง เด็ด เลี้ยวต่อการกำหนดารแตกแยกของเขา

ควยความเห็นชอบอย่าง เต็มที่และ เป็นเอกฉันท์ตักการดำเนินงานทางด้าน
ปฏิบัติและทางการเมืองของคณะ เปรซี เดียวของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช.
และของสหาย เอ็ม.เอส. ครูสซอฟ เลขาธิการที่หนึ่งแห่งคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.
ค.ส.ช. ที่มุ่งสร้างสังคมนิยมขั้นใน ส.ส.ช.ส. มุ่งประกันชัยชนะของมูลธรรม
ของสันติภาพ ประชาธิปไตย ความเป็นเอกราชของชาติและสังคมนิยม และกระชับ
สามัคคีธรรมของพรรคชาวมาร์กซ์ - ชาวลินินให้แน่นแฟ้น ที่ประชุมครบองค์ของ
คณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. มีคำสั่งให้คณะ เปรซี เดียวของคณะกรรมการกลาง
ยึดมั่นเอาบางแนวแนลอยู่กับแนวทางทั่วไปของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์โลกต่อไป และทำ
งาน เพื่อให้เกิดความสามัคคีแข็งแกร่งยิ่งขึ้นในกำลังฝ่ายปฏิวัติทั้งหมดในปัจจุบัน

พรรคของเรากำลังกำหนดความ และจะคงกำหนดความหมายของเลนิน
ที่ได้มีการทดสอบต่อไปแล้ว จะไม่มีเกรงหันเห พ.ค.ส.ช. ไปเสียจากแนวทางอันนี้
คือแนวทางของสภาพรรคครั้งที่ ๒๐ และ ๒๒ เสียได้

แน่นอนเท็จจริงจะมีว่า บรรดาผู้นำจีนใจกำเริบการก่อให้เกิดความแตกแยก
ไปไกลแล้วก็ตาม ที่ประชุมครบองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. ซึ่งยึดมั่น
เหนือสิ่งใดอยู่กับประโยชน์แห่งความเป็นเอกราชของขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์โลก ขอ
แสดงความพร้อมพรักที่จะทำความพยายามต่อไป เพื่อความเป็นปกติในความสัมพันธ์

ระหว่าง พ.ค.ส.ช. และ พ.ค.จ. ถ้าหากว่าบรรดาผู้นำจีนมิได้สิ้นความตระหนก
ไปเสียที่เกี่ยวกับความรับผิดชอบของคนที่มีความซื่อสัตย์แล้วไซ้ เขาจะต้องตระหนัก
ในที่สุดว่า ภัยการกำเริบเป็นการแตกแยกของเขาเช่นนั้น เขากำลังหันเหกำลังและ
ความเอาใจใส่ของบรรดาพรรคคอมมิวนิสต์และพรรคแรงงานไปเสียจากการขบปัญหาค
อับริบควนในการก่อสร้างสังคมนิยม หน่วงเหนี่ยวการต่อสู้กับจักรวรรดินิยม และก่อ
ให้เกิดภัยร้ายแก่แนวที่เป็นปฏิปักษ์ต่อจักรวรรดินิยมทั้งหมด

ที่ประชุมครบองค์ของคณะกรรมการกลาง พ.ค.ส.ช. ขอแสดงความเชื่อ
มั่นว่า ขบวนการคอมมิวนิสต์โลก จะขามทนความยากลำบากทั้งหลายแหล่ที่มีอยู่ไปได้
และจะชุมนุมกำลังกันแน่นแฟ้นยิ่งขึ้นรอบๆ ธงชัยของมาร์กซ - แองเกลส์ - เลนิน
และจะบรรลุความสำเร็จใหม่ในการต่อสู้เพื่อบูรณธรรมอันยิ่งใหญ่ของชนชั้นคนงาน ใน
การต่อสู้เพื่อบูรณธรรมของสันติภาพ และความมั่นคงของประชาชาติทั้งหมด เพื่อชัยชนะ
ของลัทธิคอมมิวนิสต์.



Why Khrushchev Fell

Khrushchev has fallen.

This arch-schemer who usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and State, this No. 1 representative of modern revisionism, has finally been driven off the stage of history.

This is a very good thing and is advantageous to the revolutionary cause of the people of the world.

The collapse of Khrushchev is a great victory for the Marxist-Leninists of the world in their persistent struggle against revisionism. It marks the bankruptcy, the fiasco, of modern revisionism.

How was it that Khrushchev fell? Why couldn't he muddle on any longer?

This question has aroused different comments from different political groups all over the world.

The imperialists, the reactionaries, and the opportunists and revisionists of all shades, whether they sympathize with Khrushchev or have had conflicts of interest with him, have expressed varied views on the sudden collapse of this seemingly "strong man," Khrushchev.

Many Communist and Workers' Parties have also published articles or documents expressing their opinion on Khrushchev's downfall.

In the present article we, too, would like to discuss the question of Khrushchev's downfall.

For Marxist-Leninists, this downfall is not something which is hard to understand. Indeed, it may be said to have been fully expected. Marxist-Leninists had long foreseen that Khrushchev would come to such an end.

People may list hundreds or even thousands of charges against Khrushchev to account for his collapse. But the most important one of all is that he has vainly tried to obstruct the advance of history, flying in the face of the law of historical development as discovered by Marxism-Leninism and of the revolutionary will of the people of the Soviet Union and the whole world. Any obstacle on the people's road of advance must be removed. The people were sure to reject Khrushchev, whether he and his kind liked it or not. Khrushchev's downfall is the inevitable result of the antirevisionist struggle waged staunchly by the people of the Soviet Union and revolutionary people throughout the world.

Ours is an epoch in which world capitalism and imperialism are moving to their doom and socialism and communism are marching toward victory. The historic mission this epoch has placed on the people is to bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man through their own efforts and in the light of the concrete conditions of their respective countries. This is the inexorable trend of historical development and the common demand of the revolutionary people of the world. This historical trend is an objective law which operates independently of man's will, and it is irresistible. But Khrushchev, this buffoon on the contemporary political stage, chose to go against this trend in the vain hope of turning the

* American Consulate General, Hongkong, Selections from China Mainland Magazines, No. 445, November 30, 1964.

wheel of history back onto the old capitalist road and of thus prolonging the life of the moribund exploiting classes and their moribund system of exploitation.

Khrushchev collected all the anti-Marxist views of history's opportunists and revisionists and out of them knocked together a full-fledged revisionist line consisting of "peaceful co-existence," "peaceful competition," "peaceful transition," "the state of the whole people" and "the party of the entire people." He pursued a capitulationish line toward imperialism and used the theory of class conciliation to oppose and liquidate the people's revolutionary struggles. In the international communist movement, he enforced a divisive line, replacing proletarian internationalism with great-power chauvinism. In the Soviet Union he worked hard to disintegrate the dictatorship of the proletariat, attempting to replace the socialist system with the ideology, politics, economy and culture of the bourgeoisie, and to restore capitalism.

In the last eleven years, exploiting the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the first socialist country that had been built up under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev committed all the bad things he possibly could in contravention of the genuine will of the Soviet people. These bad things may be summed up as follows:

1. On the pretext of "combating the personality cult" and using the most scurrilous language, he railed at Stalin, the leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. In opposing Stalin, he opposed Marxism-Leninism. He tried at one stroke to write off all the great achievements of the Soviet people in the entire period under Stalin's leadership in order to defame the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist system, the great Soviet Communist Party, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. In so doing, Khrushchev provided the imperialists and the reactionaries of all countries with the dirtiest of weapons for their anti-Soviet and anti-communist activities.

2. In open violation of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, he sought "all-round cooperation" with U.S. imperialism and fallaciously maintained that the heads of the Soviet Union and the United States would "decide the fate of humanity," constantly praising the chieftains of U.S. imperialism as "having a sincere desire for peace." Pursuing an adventurist policy at one moment, he transported guided missiles to Cuba, and pursuing a capitulationish policy at another, he docilely withdrew the missiles and bombers from Cuba on the order of the U.S. pirates. He accepted inspection by the U.S. fleet and even tried to sell out Cuba's sovereignty by agreeing, behind the Cuban government's back, to the "inspection" of Cuba by the United Nations, which is under U.S. control. In so doing, Khrushchev brought a humiliating disgrace upon the great Soviet people unheard of in the forty years and more since the October Revolution.

3. To cater to the U.S. imperialist policy of nuclear blackmail and prevent socialist China from building up her own nuclear strength for self-defense, he did not hesitate to damage the defense capabilities of the Soviet Union itself and concluded the so-called partial nuclear test ban treaty in collusion with the two imperialist powers of the United States and Britain. Facts have shown that this treaty is a pure

swindle. In signing this treaty Khrushchev perversely tried to sell out the interests of the Soviet people, the people of all the socialist countries and all the peace-loving people of the world.

4. In the name of "peaceful transition" he tried by every means to obstruct the revolutionary movements of the people in the capitalist countries, demanding that they take the so-called legal, parliamentary road. This erroneous line paralyzes the revolutionary will of the proletariat and disarms the revolutionary people ideologically, causing serious setbacks to the cause of revolution in certain countries. It has made the Communist parties in a number of capitalist countries lifeless social-democratic parties of a new type and caused them degenerate into servile tools of the bourgeoisie.

5. Under the signboard of "peaceful co-existence" he did his utmost to oppose and sabotage the national liberation movement and went so far as to work hand in glove with U.S. imperialism in suppressing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations. He instructed the Soviet delegate at the United Nations to vote for the dispatch of forces of aggression to the Congo, which helped the U.S. imperialists to suppress the Congoese people, and he used Soviet transport facilities to move these so-called United Nations troops to the Congo. He actually opposed the revolutionary struggles of the Algerian people, describing the Algerian national liberation struggle as an "internal affair" of France. He had the audacity to "stand aloof" over the events in the gulf of Bac Bo engineered by U.S. imperialism against Vietnam, and cudgelled his brains for ways to help the U.S. provocateurs get out of their predicament and to whitewash the criminal aggression of the U.S. pirates.

6. In brazen violation of the statement of 1960, he spared no effort to reverse its verdict on the renegade Tito clique, describing Tito who had degenerated into a lackey of U.S. imperialism as a "Marxist-Leninist" and Yugoslavia which had degenerated into a capitalist country as a "socialist country." Time and again he declared that he and the Tito clique had "the same ideology" and were "guided by the same theory" and expressed his desire to learn modestly from this renegade who had betrayed the interests of the Yugoslav people and sabotaged the international communist movement.

7. He regarded Albania, a fraternal socialist country, as his sworn enemy, devising every possible means to injure and undermine it, and only wishing he could devour it in one gulp. He brazenly broke off all economic and diplomatic relations with Albania, arbitrarily deprived it of its legitimate rights as a member state in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and in the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance, and publicly called for the overthrow of its Party and state leadership.

8. He nourished an inveterate hatred for the Communist Party of China which upholds Marxism-Leninism and a revolutionary line, because the Chinese Communist Party was a great obstacle to his effort to press on with revisionism and capitulationism. He spread innumerable rumors and slanders against the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung and resorted to every kind of baseness in his futile attempt to subvert socialist China. He perfidiously tore up several hundred agreements and contracts and arbitrarily withdrew more than one thousand Soviet experts working in China. He engineered border disputes between China and the

Soviet Union and even conducted large-scale subversive activities in Sinkiang. He backed the reactionaries of India in their armed attacks on socialist China and, together with the United States, incited and helped them to perpetrate armed provocations against China by giving them military aid.

9. In flagrant violation of the principles guiding relations among the fraternal countries, he encroached upon their independence and sovereignty and wilfully interfered in their internal affairs. In the name of "mutual economic assistance," he opposed the independent development of the economies of fraternal countries and forced them to become a source of raw materials and an outlet for goods, thus reducing their industries to appendages. He bragged that these were all new theories and doctrines of his own invention, but in fact they were the jungle law of the capitalist world which he applied to relations among socialist countries, taking the common market of the monopoly capitalist blocs as his model.

10. In complete violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal parties, he resorted to all sorts of schemes to carry out subversive and disruptive activities against them. Not only did he use the sessions of the Central Committee and Congress of his own Party as well as the congresses of some fraternal parties to launch overt large-scale unbridled attacks on the fraternal parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism, but in the case of many fraternal parties he openly bought over political degenerates, renegades and turncoats to support his revisionist line, and attacked and even illegally expelled Marxist-Leninists from these parties, thus creating splits without considering the consequences.

11. He wantonly violated the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties and, playing the "patriarchal father party" role, he wilfully decided to convene an illegal international meeting of the fraternal parties. In the notice dated July 30, 1964, he ordered that a meeting of the so-called drafting committee of the twenty-six fraternal parties be held on December 15 this year, so as to create an open split in the international communist movement.

12. To cater to the needs of the imperialists and the domestic forces of capitalism, he pursued a series of revisionist policies leading back to capitalism. Under the signboard of the "State of the Whole People," he abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat; under the signboard of the "Party of the Entire People," he altered the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and divided the party into an "industrial" and an "agricultural" party in contravention of the Marxist-Leninist principle of party organization. Under the signboard of "full-scale communist construction" he tried in a thousand and one ways to switch back to the old path of capitalism the world's first socialist state which the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin had created by their sweat and blood. His blind direction of Soviet agriculture and industry wrought great havoc with the Soviet national economy and brought great difficulties to the life of the Soviet people.

Everything Khrushchev did over the last eleven years proves that the policy he pursued was one of alliance with imperialism against socialism, alliance with the United States against China, alliance with

the reactionaries everywhere against the national liberation movements and the people's revolutions, and alliance with the Tito clique and renegades of all descriptions against all Marxist-Leninist fraternal parties and all revolutionaries fighting imperialism. This policy of Khrushchev's has jeopardized the basic interests of the Soviet people, the people of the countries of the socialist camp and the revolutionary people all over the world.

Such are the so-called meritorious deeds of Khrushchev.

The downfall of a fellow like Khrushchev is certainly not due to old age or ill health, nor is it merely due to mistakes in his methods of work and style of leadership. Khrushchev's downfall is the result of the revisionist general line and the many erroneous policies he pursued at home and abroad.

Khrushchev considered the masses of the people as simply beneath his notice, thinking that he could manipulate the destiny of the Soviet people at his own sweet will and that the "heads" of the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States, could settle the destiny of the people of all countries. To him, the people were nothing but fools and he alone was the "hero" making history. He vainly tried to force the Soviet people and the people of other countries to prostrate themselves under his revisionist baton. Thus he placed himself in direct opposition to the Soviet people, to the people of the countries of the socialist camp and to the proletariat and revolutionary people of the whole world, and got himself into an impasse -- he was deserted by his own followers and could not extricate himself from internal and external difficulties. He put the noose around his own neck -- dug his own grave.

History has witnessed many buffoons who cherished the idle hope of turning back the tide of history, but they all came to an ignominious end. Countless instances have demonstrated that the evil-doer who goes counter to the needs of social development and the will of the people can only end up as a ridiculous good-for-nothing, no matter what kind of "hero" he may have been, and no matter how arrogant. To start with aim of doing harm to others only to end up by ruining oneself -- such is the general law governing these people.

"Personages" such as Bakunin in the period of the first international were arrogant anti-Marxist "heroes" like Bernstein and Kautsky in the period of the second international were once "formidable giants" entrenched in leading positions, but in the end history wrote them down as notorious renegades. Trotsky, the ringleader of the opposition faction, decked himself out as a "hero" after Lenin's death, but facts confirmed the correctness of Stalin's remarks: "... he resembles an actor rather than a hero; and an actor should not be confused with a hero under any circumstances."

"But progress is the eternal law of man's world". History has taught us that whoever wants to stop the wheel of history will be ground to dust. As Comrade Mao Tsetung has repeatedly pointed out, imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers, and the revisionists are, too. However rampant and overbearing they may be, "heroes" representing reactionary classes and reactionary forces are actually paper tigers, powerful only in appearance; they are only fleeting transients soon to be overwhelmed by the surging waves of history. Khrushchev is no exception.

Just think of his inordinate arrogance in the days when he viciously attacked Stalin and Marxism-Leninism at the 20th and 22nd Congresses, and when at the Bucharest meeting he launched his surprise attack on the Chinese Communist Party which upholds Marxism-Leninism. But it did not take long for this anti-Soviet, anti-Soviet, anti-Communist and anti-Chinese "hero" to meet the same fate as his revisionist predecessors. However much people reasoned with him and asked him to return to the fold, he paid not the slightest heed and finally plunged to his doom.

Khrushchev has fallen and the revisionist line he enthusiastically pursued is discredited, but Marxism-Leninism will continue to overcome the revisionist trend and forge ahead, and the revolutionary movement of the people of all countries will continue to sweep away the obstacles in its path and surge forward.

Nevertheless, the course of history will continue to be tortuous. Although Khrushchev has fallen, his supporters -- the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries and the modern revisionists -- will not resign themselves to this failure. These hobgoblins are continuing to pray for Khrushchev and are trying to "resurrect" him with their incantations, vociferously proclaiming his "contributions" and "meritorious deeds" in the hope that events will develop along the lines prescribed by Khrushchev, so that "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev" may prevail. It can be asserted categorically that theirs is a blind alley.

Different ideological trends and their representatives invariably strive to take the stage and perform. It is entirely up to them to decide which direction they will take. But there is one point on which we have not the slightest doubt. History will develop in accordance with the laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism; it will march forward along the road of the October revolution. Beyond all doubt, the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the great Soviet people, with their revolutionary traditions, are fully capable of making new contributions in safeguarding the great socialist achievements, the lofty prestige of the first socialist power founded by Lenin, the purity of Marxism-Leninism and the victorious advance of the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

Let the international communist movement unite on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism!

LENIN'S TESTAMENT *



By the stability of the Central Committee, of which I spoke before, I mean measures to prevent a split, so far as such measures can be taken. For, of course, the White Guard in Russkaya Mysl (I think it was S.E. Oldenburg) was right when, in the first place, in his play against Soviet Russia he banked on the hope of a split in our party, and when, in the second place, he banked for that split on serious disagreements in our party.

Our party rests upon two classes, and for that reason its stability is possible, and if there cannot exist an agreement between those classes its fall is inevitable. In such an event it would be useless to take any measures or in general to discuss the stability of our Central Committee, In such an event no measures would prove capable of preventing a split, But I trust that is too remote a future, and too improbable an event, to talk about.

I have in mind stability as a guarantee against a split in the near future, and I intended to examine here a series of considerations of a purely personal character.

I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability -- from this point of view -- is such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky. The relation between them constitutes, in my opinion, a big half of the danger of that split, which might be avoided, and the avoidance of which might be promote, in my opinion, by raising the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred.

Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, had concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand, Comrade Trotsky, was proved by his struggle against the Central Committee in connection with the question of the People's Commissariat of Ways and Communications, is distinguished not only by his exceptional abilities -- personally he is, to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee -- but also by his too far-reaching self-confidence and a disposition to be too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs.

These two qualities of the two most able leaders of the present Central Committee might, quite innocently, lead to a split; if our party does not take measures to prevent it, a split might arise unexpectedly.

I will not further characterize the other members of the Central Committee as to their personal qualities. I will only remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev was not, of course, accidental, but that it ought as little to be used against them personally as the non-Bolshevism of Trotsky.

* -----, the New Leader, U.S.A., pp. s66-s67

Of the younger members of the Central Committee, I went to say a few words about Bukharin and Pyatakov. they are in my opinion, the most able forces (among the youngest) and in regard to them it is necessary to bear in mind the following: Bukharin is not only the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the party, but also legitimately be considered the favorite of the whole party; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully marxist, for there is something scholastic in him (he never has learned, and I think never has fully understood, the dialectic). And then Pyatakov -- a man undoubtedly distinguished in will and ability, but too much given over to administration and the administrative side of things to be relied on in a serious political question.

Of course, both these remarks are made by me merely with a view to the present time, or supposing that these two able and loyal workers may not find an occasion to supplement their knowledge and correct one-sidedness.

December 25, 1922

Postscript: Stalin is too rude, and his fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, become insupportable in the office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority -- namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc. This circumstance may seem an insignificant trifle, but I think that from the point of view of preventing a split and from the point of view of the relation between Stalin and Trotsky which I discussed above, it is not a trifle, or it is such a trifle as may acquire a decisive significance.

January 4, 1923

LENIN

บรรณานุกรม



ภาษาไทย

- เอกสารสำนักงานแถลงข่าวไซเวียต ฉบับที่ ๑๔๐/๑๕๕๗ วันที่ ๑ มิถุนายน ๑๙๖๔
เอกสารสำนักงานแถลงข่าวไซเวียต ฉบับที่ ๑๐/๕๕๗ วันที่ ๑ มิถุนายน ๑๙๖๔
เอกสารสำนักงานแถลงข่าวไซเวียต ฉบับที่ ๑/๐๘/๑๐๐๓ มกราคม ๑๙๖๕

ภาษาจีน

- นิตยสาร, เหตุการณ์บนแผ่นดินใหญ่, ไทเป, ไทวัน, ฉบับที่ ๑ - ๔ ปี ๑๙๖๓
หนังสือพิมพ์ กับ เจียง คาง ลุย, ประวัติศาสตร์สากล, ไทเป, ไทวัน, ๑๙๖๐
หวัง คาง โฮว, ประวัติศาสตร์สมัยใหม่ของจีน, ไทเป, ไทวัน, ๑๙๕๕

ภาษาอังกฤษ

- American Consulate General, Selections from China Mainland Magazines,
No. 445, Hongkong, Nov. 30, 1964
-----, Current Background, No. 742, Hongkong,
Sept. 22, 1964
-----, Current Background, No. 733, Hongkong,
May 13, 1964
Boorman, & other, Moscow-Peking Axis, Harper, 1957
Chin Szu-kai, Communist China's Relations with Soviet Union 1949-1957,
Communist Chinese problem research series, Hongkong, 1962
Churchill W.S., Second world War, Taiwan edition, 1959
Crankshaw E., The New Cold War, Penquin Books, 1963
Dallin, Diversity in International Communism, Columbia University press,
1963
Ebenstein, Today's ism, Pentrice-Hall, 1964
Government Information Office, China Yearbook 1963-1964, China
Publishing Co. Taiwan, 1964

Government Information Office, China Yearbook 1962-1963, China Publishing Co. 1963

Griffith, Albania and Sino-Soviet Rift, M.I.T. press, 1963

-----, Sino-Soviet Rift, George Allen and Unwin Co., London, 1964

Hunt C, The Theory and Practice of Communism, Geoffery Bless, 1962

Kaplan A.M. , System and Process in International Politics, Wiley, U.S., 1957

Khrushchev N., The crimes of the stalin era, The New Leader, U.S. 1956

Kulski, Peaceful Co-existence, Regnery, 1955

Organski, World Politics, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961

Pentony, Red world in tumult, Chandler, U.S. 1962

Peter M. , Sino-Soviet Relations since the death of Stalin, Communist Chinese problem research series, Hongkong, 1962

Schuman, International Politics, MacGraw-Hill, 1958

Zargoria, The Sino-Soviet conflict 1956-1961, Princeton press, 1962

วารสารภาษาอังกฤษ

The China Quarterly, The Sino - Soviet Dispute, Special issue, 1961

Keessing's

1. Mao Tse-tung resignation, Jan. 17-24, 1959, p.16599
2. Liu Shoa-chi, election as Chairman of the Republic, Jan.20-27, 1959, p. 16863
3. Soviet on Sino-India dispute, Nov. 21-24, 1959, p. 17123
4. Co-existence withoutwar: Sino-Soviet Controversy, July 30-Aug. 6, 1960, p. 17558
5. Soviet-Albania beach: Chinese criticism of Soviet attack, Dec. 9-16,1961, p. 18043

6. Co-existence without war: Sino-Soviet Controversy, Jan. 28-
Feb. 4, 1961, p. 17897
7. Chinese support Albania, Jan. 6-13, 1962, p. 18528
8. Chou en-lai speech, Dec. 9-16, 1962 p. 18475
9. China attacks on Soviet-Yugoslav rapprochement, Nov. 17-24, 1962,
p. 19085
10. Chinese disapproval of Soviet withdrawal of missile base from Cuba,
Nov. 17-24, 1962, p. 19093

- | | |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Jul. 15, 1957 | 2. Nov. 25, 1963 |
| 3. Dec. 2, 1963 | 4. Apr. 27, 1964 |

Times Magazine

- | | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Nov. 9, 1962 | 2. Sept. 13, 1963 |
| 3. Nov. 12, 1962 | 4. Feb. 24, 1964 |
| 5. Apr. 24, 1964 | |

USIS, Problem of Communism, Vo. XII, No. 1 - 6 1963 & 1964

* * * * *

