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THE WEEK

Among the major events of the week:

- The editorial departments of Renmin Ribao and Hongqi published "On Khrushchev's Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World"—their ninth commentary on the July 14, 1963 open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.

- Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Premier Chen Yi paid a friendly visit to Burma on July 10-11.

- The third anniversary of the signing of the Sino-Korean Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance was celebrated in China.

- The Chinese people and their armed forces throughout the land celebrated the shooting down of the third U.S.-made U-2 plane of the Chiang Kai-shek gang.

- From July 13 to 20 China observes a week of common struggle in support of the Vietnamese people's fight against U.S. aggression.

- The Chinese press published:

  - a news report of the recent plenary session of the Central Committee of the Albanian Party of Labour, at which First Secretary Enver Hoxha spoke on certain basic questions in the Party's ideological work.
  - an article from the Albanian paper Zeri i Popullit exposing the ulterior motives of the Khrushchev group in combating the "personality cult."

- the speech of D.N. Aidit, Chairman of the Indonesian Communist Party, at the recent plenary session of the Party's Central Committee, calling on all Party members to be good students of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

- the opening speech by Sazou Nosaka, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Japanese Communist Party, at a Tokyo rally on July 9 celebrating the 42nd anniversary of the founding of the Party. He called on the whole Party to work for a membership of hundreds of thousands.

- the report by Kenji Miyamoto, General Secretary of the Japanese Communist Party's Central Committee. He denounced the renegades Yoshio Shiga and Ichizo Suzuki for trying to make the Japanese Communist Party toe the line of the C.P. of a certain foreign country.

Chairman Mao Receives Asian Seminar Guests

Chairman Mao Tse-tung met on July 9 with foreign friends who were visiting Peking after attending the Second Asian Economic Seminar held recently in Pyongyang, Korea. Among them were delegates from Viet Nam, Japan, Indonesia, Ceylon, Mali, the Sudan and other Asian and African countries. They had a friendly talk.

On July 7 the Chinese People's Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and five other mass organizations gave a reception in honour of the visiting delegates. Chu Tu-nan, President of the Association, welcomed the guests on behalf of the host organizations and congratulated them on their contributions to the success of the seminar. Stressing the great importance of the seminar in the political and economic life of the Asian people, he said: "The holding of the seminar and its achievements fully reflect the firm determination and the great strength of the people of Asia and Africa to unite in the
Training Heirs to the Revolution

The training of young revolutionaries is coming in for a great deal of attention at the moment. Press and radio are devoting considerable space to this issue. Many reports are being sent in from people's communes and factories, government organizations and schools.

A frontpage story in Renmin Ribao on July 8 told how the Communist Party branch of a production brigade of the Taiyangsheng People's Commune in Liaoning Province, northeast China, worked out concrete plans to train its younger generation during the course of the 10-year economic development programme it was drawing up. It regarded the training of heirs to the revolution as an urgent task in view of the fact that class enemies were doing everything possible to win over the youth. The day before, the paper published another story describing how the 28-year-old secretary of the Communist Party branch of a production brigade in a rural people's commune in Shanxi Province was trained for his responsible post with the help of the Party branch committee, and especially of its former Party secretary.

In its editor's note that day, Renmin Ribao wrote: "The training of those who will carry on the proletarian revolution is a matter of great historic significance raised by Comrade Mao Tse-tung. It is a matter of guaranteeing that the revolutionary cause started by the older generation of Marxist-Leninists will be carried forward by the younger generation, and that the future destiny of our Party and country will remain in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries. It is also a matter of guaranteeing that future generations will continue to march forward along the correct road of Marxism-Leninism. This is an important issue concerning the long-term development of the cause of socialism and communism, not only a hundred years hence, but a thousand and even ten thousand years hence."

Vice-Premier Ho Lung, in his speech, highly appraised the Sino-Korean treaty. "In the past three years," he said, "the Governments and people of China and Korea have faithfully fulfilled their sacred duties under the treaty, upheld the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, strengthened their friendly co-operation in all fields, and gained tremendous victories in their common struggle to build socialism, oppose imperialism and safeguard Asian and world peace."

Sino-Korean Friendship Treaty Anniversary


In Peking that evening, Korean Ambassador Pak Se Chang gave a banquet which was attended by Vice-Premiers Ho Lung and Tan Chen-lin and other government officials. The Ambassador spoke warmly of the unbreakable friendship between the two fraternal peoples. This friendship, he said, forged in the flames of hard and prolonged revolutionary struggles, had been strengthened and developed in the common struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism. "Holding high the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism," the Ambassador declared, "the Korean people will, as they have done in the past, fight shoulder to shoulder with the Chinese people and march forward with them through thick and thin."

Vice-Premier Ho Lung, in his speech, highly appraised the Sino-Korean treaty. "In the past three years," he said, "the Governments and people of China and Korea have faithfully fulfilled their sacred duties under the treaty, upheld the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, strengthened their friendly co-operation in all fields, and gained tremendous victories in their common struggle to build socialism, oppose imperialism and safeguard Asian and world peace."

Condemning U.S. imperialism for its continued occupation of China's Taiwan Province and the southern part of Korea and its war of aggression in Indo-China, the Vice-Premier urged all peace-loving countries and peoples throughout the world to sharpen their vigilance and resolutely smash the U.S. imperialist plot to expand the war.

Albanian Army Day

The heroic Albanian People's Army celebrated its 21st anniversary on July 10. Marshal Lin Piao, Vice-Premier and Minister of National Defence, sent a message of greetings to General B. Balluku, First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of Defence of Albania.

Peking celebrated the anniversary with a meeting sponsored by the General Political Department of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Albanian Ambassador Nesti Nase attended. Lieutenant-General Hsu Li-ching, deputy director of the department, in his speech paid tribute to the glorious role the Albanian People's Army had played under the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour and Comrade Enver Hoxha in smashing the subversive, sabotaging and provocative activities of the imperialists, the reactionaries of various countries and modern revisionists. "This has set a brilliant example for all revolutionary peoples," said General Hsu.

Speaking of the militant friendship between the Chinese and Albanian peoples and their armies, he pledged that the Chinese people and their army would stand together with the heroic Albanian people and their army, learn from and support each other, sweep away all difficulties and march forward together to final victory.

Colonel Ferik Heda, military attaché of the Albanian Embassy, took the floor amidst applause. Recalling the glorious history of the Albanian People's Army, he said that
the achievements of the army were due to the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labour. "Our Party has taught us to hold the spade in one hand and the rifle in the other, and under this slogan our people have overcome various difficulties in building our new life," said the colonel. Warmly acclaiming Sino-Albanian friendship, he said that it had grown in strength in the common struggle against imperialism and its lackeys——the modern revisionists represented by Khrushchev and Tito. Colonel Idris declared that the Albanian people and their armed forces were ready at all times to fulfill their internationalist duties in the common struggle against imperialism and in defense of the fruits of victory gained by the people of the socialist countries.

French and Iraqi National Day Receptions

French Ambassador Lucien Paye and Iraqi Ambassador Abdul Mutalib Ameen gave two separate receptions in Peking to celebrate their respective July 14 National Day. Premier Chou En-lai, Vice-Premiers Chen Yi and Li Hsien-nien and many other government leaders attended.

Speaking at the French Ambassador's reception on the evening of July 14, Vice-Premier Chen Yi greeted the French nation as "a great nation with a glorious revolutionary tradition." He recalled the traditional friendship between the Chinese and French peoples and expressed satisfaction that diplomatic relations had finally been restored after a period of interruption. Said the Vice-Premier: "At a time when the United States is intensifying its plot of creating 'two Chinas' and when certain countries are offering advice on this plot, the French Government has demonstrated to the whole world that there is only one China in the world and that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal government representing the entire Chinese people. This action is courageous, realistic and of great significance." Chen Yi also expressed the conviction that the establishment and development of diplomatic relations between the two countries not only conformed to the aspirations of the two peoples but was helpful to the realization of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems and the defence of world peace.

At the Iraqi Ambassador's reception marking the sixth anniversary of the revolution in Iraq, Vice-Premier Chen Yi hailed the Iraqi people's achievements in opposing imperialism, safeguarding national independence and carrying out national construction. Referring to relations between the people of China and the Arab countries, the Vice-Premier said: "The vigorous development of the Arab national-liberation movement is hitting hard at and weakening the imperialist forces; this constitutes a tremendous support and encouragement to the Chinese people." Chen Yi reiterated the Chinese Government's policy and support for the people of the Arab countries in their struggle to oppose imperialism and new and old colonialism and to win and safeguard national independence. He reassured those present that the Chinese people would always remain the reliable friends of the Arab people in the common cause of Asian-African solidarity against imperialism.

Condolences on Thorez's Death

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on July 13 sent a message of condolences to the Central Committee of the French Communist Party on the death of its Chairman, Maurice Thorez. It reads:

"We are shocked to learn the news of the unfortunate death of Comrade Maurice Thorez, Chairman of the French Communist Party. We extend to you our deep condolences and our sympathy to his family."

Protest Against Indian Intrusions

The situation on the Sino-Indian border has long been eased as a result of the initiative taken by China in effecting the ceasefire and withdrawing its frontier guards along the entire border. But intrusions by Indian troops and aircraft into China's territory and air space have never ceased. The latest estimate has it that, in the first six months of 1964, there were as many as 23 intrusions into China's territory by Indian military personnel crossing the line of actual control as it existed on November 7, 1959. Indian troops which crossed the Nathu La on the China-Sikkim border remain entrenched in Chinese territory. During the same period, there were 26 sorties by Indian aircraft over Sinkiang and Tibet. Some intruded as deep as 230 kilometres for prolonged reconnaissance.

The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs lodged a strong protest against these intrusions in a note sent on July 7 to the Indian Embassy in Peking for transmission to the Indian Government. The note recalled that, in the past year and more, despite the fact that the Indian side had ceaselessly engaged in intrusions and harassing activities, the Chinese Government had all along scrupulously abided by its pronouncement and refrained from sending frontier guards into the 20-kilometre zone on the Chinese side of the line of actual control, in the hope that after China's patient reasoning and solemn protest the Indian side might stop its intrusions. "It is to be regretted," said the note, "that the Indian Government, while refusing to take any corresponding measures to ease the situation and trying to renew tension on the border, has in its replies to the Chinese notes of protest claimed many places intruded into by the Indian side to be within India and slanderously counter-charged China with 'occupying' Indian territory. This peremptory and unreasonable attitude shows that the Indian Government has not yet given up its expansionist ambitions concerning China's territory, but persists in its refusal to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question through peaceful negotiations."

The note demanded that the Indian side stop its intrusions and act sincerely in accordance with its own repeated promise of not to cross the 1959 line of actual control between China and India, so as to preserve the present eased situation on the Sino-Indian border.

July 17, 1964
Premier Chou En-lai’s Visit to Burma

PREFIEMIER Chou En-lai and Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister Chen Yi visited Burma on July 10-11. Arriving by special plane in Rangoon on the morning of July 10, they were warmly greeted at the airport by General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma, Foreign Minister U Thi Han and other Burmese leaders.

Leaving Rangoon for home by plane early on July 12, the Chinese guests were seen off by General Ne Win, Foreign Minister U Thi Han and other high-ranking Burmese officers and officials.

Premier Chou En-lai and Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister Chen Yi returned to Peking on July 14.

During his visit Premier Chou En-lai held friendly and cordial talks with General Ne Win, and a joint China-Burma communiqué was issued on July 11 in Rangoon. The communiqué reads:

“His Excellency Mr. Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China, and Marshal Chen Yi, Vice-Premier of the State Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, paid a friendly visit to the Union of Burma from July 10 to July 11, 1964.

“General Ne Win and Premier Chou En-lai availed themselves of the opportunity provided by the visit to exchange views on matters of common interest to the two countries as well as on current international problems, particularly those pertaining to Southeast Asia.

“The two leaders expressed their deep concern over the deteriorating situation in Southeast Asia, particularly in south Viet Nam and Laos, affirmed their determination to continue to seek a peaceful settlement of the situation and agreed that a conference on the Laotian problem of the 14 Geneva Agreement Powers should be convened.

“The two leaders reviewed the progress made by the two countries in the development of their economic and technical co-operation and trade relations. Such friendly co-operation, being fully in accordance with the spirit of equality and mutual benefit, of supplementing each other’s wants and rendering assistance to each other, is beneficial to the cause of national construction of the two countries. In order to further strengthen this co-operation, the two sides agreed to take necessary measures to speed up the implementation of the Sino-Burmese Agreement on Economic and Technical Co-operation and to further expand the trade between the two countries.

“The two leaders expressed their satisfaction with the continued development of the friendly relations between the two countries on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

“The two leaders also took occasion to reaffirm their respective undertaking contained in Article 3 of the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Non-Aggression concluded between the two countries.

“The talks were held in an atmosphere of friendliness and cordiality and have further contributed to the mutual understanding between the two countries.”

Vice-Premier Chen Yi on Tension in Indo-China

* U.S. armed intervention in Laos and spreading the war in south Viet Nam condemned.
* The use of force against revolutionary people will bring the U.S. more disastrous defeats.
* The 14-nation conference will have to meet sooner or later, better early than late.

THE grave concern of all peace-loving peoples and countries has been aroused by the present tension in Indo-China," declared Vice-Premier Chen Yi at the French Ambassador’s National Day celebration in Peking on July 14. "The United States has carried out undisguised direct military intervention in Laos and is intent on expanding its war of aggression against south Viet Nam," he said.

Vice-Premier Chen also declared: "There is danger that the U.S.-kindled flames of war in Laos and south Viet Nam may spread to the whole of Indo-China, and even the whole of Southeast Asia. As participants in the two Geneva conferences, both China and France have affirmed that the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 must be observed and stand for the calling of a conference of the 14 signatories of the 1962 Geneva agreements to discuss the Laotian question. But the United States, which behaves lawlessly in the international arena, obstinately puts blind faith in force of arms and has thus far disagreed to the convening of a 14-nation conference. We would like to offer the United States some counsel: the use of force against revolutionary people will never succeed and will only bring the user ever more disastrous defeats; the 14-nation conference will have to be held sooner or later, and an early convening is better than a belated one. It is our hope that, together with all other countries upholding the Geneva agreements, China and France will make positive contributions to the restoration and stabilization of peace in Indo-China.”
On Khrushchov’s Phoney Communism and Its Historical Lessons for the World

Comment on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (9)

by the Editorial Departments of “Renmin Ribao” and “Hongqi”


The theories of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat are the quintessence of Marxism-Leninism. The questions of whether revolution should be upheld or opposed and whether the dictatorship of the proletariat should be upheld or opposed have always been the focus of struggle between Marxism-Leninism and all brands of revisionism and are now the focus of struggle between Marxist-Leninists the world over and the revisionist Khrushchov clique.

At the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., the revisionist Khrushchov clique developed their revisionism into a complete system not only by rounding off their anti-revolutionary theories of “peaceful coexistence,” “peaceful competition” and “peaceful transition” but also by declaring that the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary in the Soviet Union and advancing the absurd theories of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the entire people.”

The Programme put forward by the revisionist Khrushchov clique at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. is a programme of phoney communism, a revisionist programme against proletarian revolution and for the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the proletarian party.

The revisionist Khrushchov clique abolish the dictatorship of the proletariat behind the camouflage of the “state of the whole people,” change the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union behind the camouflage of the “party of the entire people” and pave the way for the restoration of capitalism behind that of “full-scale communist construction.”

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China pointed out that it is most absurd in theory and extremely harmful in practice to substitute the “state of the whole people” for the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the “party of the entire people” for the vanguard party of the proletariat. This substitution is a great historical retrogression which makes any transition to communism impossible and helps only to restore capitalism.

The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the press of the Soviet Union resort to sophistry in self-justification and charge that our criticisms of the “state of the whole people” and the “party of the entire people” are allegations “far removed from Marxism,” betray “isolation from the life of the Soviet people” and are a demand that they “return to the past.”

Well, let us ascertain who is actually far removed from Marxism-Leninism, what Soviet life is actually like and who actually wants the Soviet Union to return to the past.

Socialist Society and the Dictatorship Of the Proletariat

What is the correct conception of socialist society? Do classes and class struggle exist throughout the stage of socialism? Should the dictatorship of the proletariat be maintained and the socialist revolution be carried through to the end? Or should the dictatorship of the proletariat be abolished so as to pave the way for capitalist restoration? These questions must be answered correctly according to the basic theory of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat.
The replacement of capitalist society by socialist society is a great leap in the historical development of human society. Socialist society covers the important historical period of transition from class to classless society. It is by going through socialist society that mankind will enter communist society.

The socialist system is incomparably superior to the capitalist system. In socialist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat replaces bourgeois dictatorship and the public ownership of the means of production replaces private ownership. The proletariat, from being an oppressed and exploited class, turns into the ruling class and a fundamental change takes place in the social position of the working people. Exercising dictatorship over a few exploiters only, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat practises the broadest democracy among the masses of the working people, a democracy which is impossible in capitalist society. The nationalization of industry and collectivization of agriculture open wide vistas for the vigorous development of the social productive forces, ensuring a rate of growth incomparably greater than that in any older society.

However, one cannot but see that socialist society is a society born out of capitalist society and is only the first phase of communist society. It is not yet a fully mature communist society in the economic and other fields. It is inevitably stamped with the birth marks of capitalist society. When defining socialist society Marx said:

What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations, but, on the contrary, just as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birth marks of the old society from whose womb it emerges. 1

Lenin also pointed out that in socialist society, which is the first phase of communism, “Communism cannot as yet be fully ripe economically and entirely free from traditions or traces of capitalism.” 2

In socialist society, the differences between workers and peasants, between town and country, and between manual and mental labourers still remain. Bourgeois rights are not yet completely abolished, it is not possible "at once to eliminate the other injustice, which consists in the distribution of articles of consumption 'according to the amount of labour performed' (and not according to needs)." 3 and therefore differences in wealth still exist. The disappearance of these differences, phenomena and bourgeois rights can only be gradual and long drawn-out. As Marx said, only after these differences have vanished and bourgeois rights have completely disappeared, will it be possible to realize full communism with its principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the Soviet Union, China and other socialist countries all teach us that socialist society covers a very, very long historical stage. Throughout this stage, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat goes on and the question of “who will win” between the roads of capitalism and socialism remains, as does the danger of the restoration of capitalism.

In its Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement dated June 14, 1963, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party states:

For a very long historical period after the proletariat takes power, class struggle continues as an objective law independent of man’s will, differing only in form from what it was before the taking of power.

After the October Revolution, Lenin pointed out a number of times that:

a) The overthrown exploiters always try in a thousand and one ways to recover the “paradise” they have been deprived of.

b) New elements of capitalism are constantly and spontaneously generated in the petty-bourgeois atmosphere.

c) Political degenerates and new bourgeois elements may emerge in the ranks of the working class and among government functionaries as a result of bourgeois influence and the pervasive, corrupting atmosphere of the petty bourgeoisie.

d) The external conditions for the continuance of class struggle within a socialist country are encirclement by international capitalism, the imperialists’ threat of armed intervention and their subversive activities to accomplish peaceful disintegration.

Life has confirmed these conclusions of Lenin’s.

In socialist society, the overthrown bourgeoisie and other reactionary classes remain strong for quite a long time, and indeed in certain respects are quite powerful. They have a thousand and one links with the international bourgeoisie. They are not reconciled to their defeat and stubbornly continue to engage in trials of strength with the proletariat. They conduct open and hidden struggles against the proletariat in every field. Constantly parading such signboards as support for socialism, the Soviet system, the Communist Party and Marxism-Leninism, they work to undermine socialism and restore capitalism. Politically, they persist for a long time as a force antagonistic to the proletariat and constantly attempt to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat. They sneak into the government organs, public organizations, economic departments and cultural and educational institutions so as to resist or usurp the leadership of the proletariat. Economically, they employ every means to damage socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership and to develop the forces of capitalism. In the ideological, cultural and educational fields, they counterpose the bourgeois world outlook to the proletarian world outlook and try to corrupt the proletariat and other working people with bourgeois ideology.
The collectivization of agriculture turns individual into collective farmers and provides favourable conditions for the thorough remoulding of the peasants. However, until collective ownership advances to ownership by the whole people and until the remnants of private economy disappear completely, the peasants inevitably retain some of the inherent characteristics of small producers. In these circumstances spontaneous capitalist tendencies are inevitable, the soil for the growth of new rich peasants still exists and polarization among the peasants may still occur.

The activities of the bourgeoisie as described above, its corrupting effects in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields, the existence of spontaneous capitalist tendencies among urban and rural small producers, and the influence of the remaining bourgeois rights and the force of habit of the old society all constantly breed political degenerates in the ranks of the working class and Party and government organizations, new bourgeois elements and embalmers and grafters in state enterprises owned by the whole people and new bourgeois intellectuals in the cultural and educational institutions and intellectual circles. These new bourgeois elements and these political degenerates attack socialism in collusion with the old bourgeois elements and elements of other exploiting classes which have been overthrown but not eradicated. The political degenerates entrenched in the leading organs are particularly dangerous, for they support and shield the bourgeois elements in organs at lower levels.

As long as imperialism exists, the proletariat in the socialist countries will have to struggle both against the bourgeoisie at home and against international imperialism. Imperialism will seize every opportunity and try to undertake armed intervention against the socialist countries or to bring about their peaceful disintegration. It will do its utmost to destroy the socialist countries or to make them degenerate into capitalist countries. The international class struggle will inevitably find its reflection within the socialist countries.

Lenin said:

"The transition from capitalism to Communism represents an entire historical epoch. Until this epoch has terminated, the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope is converted into attempts at restoration." 4.

He also pointed out:

"The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn class struggle, which after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not disappear (as the vulgar representatives of the old Socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes more fierce." 5

Throughout the stage of socialism the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the political, economic, ideological and cultural and educational fields cannot be stopped. It is a protracted, repeated, tortuous and complex struggle. Like the waves of the sea it sometimes rises high and sometimes subsides, is now fairly calm and now very turbulent. It is a struggle that decides the fate of a socialist society. Whether a socialist society will advance to communism or revert to capitalism depends upon the outcome of this protracted struggle.

The class struggle in socialist society is inevitably reflected in the Communist Party. The bourgeoisie and international imperialism both understand that in order to make a socialist country degenerate into a capitalist country, it is first necessary to make the Communist Party degenerate into a revisionist party. The old and new bourgeois elements, the old and new rich peasants and the degenerate elements of all sorts constitute the social basis of revisionism, and they use every possible means to find agents within the Communist Party. The existence of bourgeois influence is the internal source of revisionism and surrender to imperialist pressure the external source. Throughout the stage of socialism, there is inevitable struggle between Marxism-Leninism and various kinds of opportunism—mainly revisionism—in the Communist Parties of socialist countries. The characteristic of this revisionism is that, denying the existence of classes and class struggle, it sides with the bourgeoisie in attacking the proletariat and turns the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In the light of the experience of the international working-class movement and in accordance with the objective law of class struggle, the founders of Marxism pointed out that the transition from capitalism to communism, from class to classless society, must depend on the dictatorship of the proletariat and that there is no other road.

Marx said that "the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat." 6 He also said:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." 7

The development of socialist society is a process of uninterrupted revolution. In explaining revolutionary socialism Marx said:

"This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations." 8

In his struggle against the opportunism of the Second International, Lenin creatively expounded and developed Marx's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He pointed out:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle but its continuation in new forms."
dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle waged by a proletariat which has been victorious and has taken political power in its hands against a bourgeoisie that has been defeated but not destroyed, a bourgeoisie that has not vanished, not ceased to offer resistance, but that has intensified its resistance. He also said:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society.

In his celebrated work On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People and in other works, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, basing himself on the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, gives a comprehensive and systematic analysis of classes and class struggle in socialist society, and creatively develops the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung examines the objective laws of socialist society from the viewpoint of materialist dialectics. He points out that the universal law of the unity and struggle of opposites operating both in the natural world and in human society is applicable to socialist society, too. In socialist society, class contradictions still remain and class struggle does not die out after the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production. The struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism runs through the entire stage of socialism. To ensure the success of socialist construction and to prevent the restoration of capitalism, it is necessary to carry the socialist revolution through to the end on the political, economic, ideological and cultural fronts. The complete victory of socialism cannot be brought about in one or two generations; to resolve this question thoroughly requires five or ten generations or even longer.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung stresses the fact that two types of social contradictions exist in socialist society, namely, contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy, and that the former are very numerous. Only by distinguishing between the two types of contradictions, which are different in nature, and by adopting different measures to handle them correctly is it possible to unite the people, who constitute more than 90 per cent of the population, defeat their enemies, who constitute only a few per cent, and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic guarantee for the consolidation and development of socialism, for the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and of socialism in the struggle between the two roads.

Only by emancipating all mankind can the proletariat ultimately emancipate itself. The historical task of the dictatorship of the proletariat has two aspects, one internal and the other international. The internal task consists mainly of completely abolishing all the exploiting classes, developing socialist economy to the maximum, enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses, abolishing the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual labourers, eliminating any possibility of the re-emergence of classes and the restoration of capitalism and providing conditions for the realization of a communist society with its principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” The international task consists mainly of preventing attacks by international imperialism (including armed intervention and disintegration by peaceful means) and of giving support to the world revolution until the people of all countries finally abolish imperialism, capitalism and the system of exploitation. Before the fulfilment of both tasks and before the advent of a full communist society, the dictatorship of the proletariat is absolutely necessary.

Judging from the actual situation today, the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are still far from accomplished in any of the socialist countries. In all socialist countries without exception, there are classes and class struggle, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist roads, the question of carrying the socialist revolution through to the end and the question of preventing the restoration of capitalism. All the socialist countries still have a very long way to go before the differences between ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, between workers and peasants, between town and country and between mental and manual labourers are eliminated, before all classes and class differences are abolished and a communist society with its principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is realized. Therefore, it is necessary for all the socialist countries to uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In these circumstances, the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the revisionist Khroushchov clique is nothing but the betrayal of socialism and communism.

**Anagonistic Classes and Class Struggle Exist in The Soviet Union**

In announcing the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, the revisionist Khroushchov clique base themselves mainly on the argument that antagonistic classes have been eliminated and that class struggle no longer exists.

But what is the actual situation in the Soviet Union? Are there really no antagonistic classes and no class struggle there?

Following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat was established in the Soviet Union, capitalist private ownership was destroyed and socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collective ownership were established through the nationalization of in-
industry and the collectivization of agriculture, and great achievements in socialist construction were scored during several decades. All this constituted an indelible victory of tremendous historic significance won by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin.

However, the old bourgeoisie and other exploiting classes which had been overthrown in the Soviet Union were not eradicated and survived after industry was nationalized and agriculture collectivized. The political and ideological influence of the bourgeoisie remained. Spontaneous capitalist tendencies continued to exist both in the city and in the countryside. New bourgeois elements and kulaks were still incessantly generated. Throughout the long intervening period, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads have continued in the political, economic and ideological spheres.

As the Soviet Union was the first, and at the time the only country to build socialism and had no foreign experience to go by, and as Stalin departed from Marxist-Leninist dialectics in his understanding of the laws of class struggle in socialist society, he prematurely declared after agriculture was basically collectivized that there were “no longer antagonistic classes” in the Soviet Union and that it was “free of class conflicts,” one-sidedly stressed the internal homogeneity of socialist society and overlooked its contradictions, failed to rely upon the working class and the masses in the struggle against the forces of capitalism and regarded the possibility of the restoration of capitalism as associated only with armed attack by international imperialism. This was wrong both in theory and in practice. Nevertheless, Stalin remained a great Marxist-Leninist. As long as he led the Soviet Party and state, he held fast to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist course, pursued a Marxist-Leninist line and ensured the Soviet Union’s victorious advance along the road of socialism.

Ever since Khrushchev seized the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, he has pushed through a whole series of revisionist policies which have greatly hastened the growth of the forces of capitalism and again sharpened the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the struggle between the roads of socialism and capitalism in the Soviet Union.

Scanning the reports in Soviet newspapers over the last few years, one finds numerous examples demonstrating not only the presence of many elements of the old exploiting classes in Soviet society, but also the generation of new bourgeois elements on a large scale and the acceleration of class polarization.

Let us first look at the activities of the various bourgeois elements in the Soviet enterprises owned by the whole people.

Leading functionaries of some state-owned factories and their gangs abuse their positions and amass large fortunes by using the equipment and materials of the factories to set up “underground workshops” for private production, selling the products illicitly and dividing the spoils. Here are some examples.

In a Leningrad plant producing military items, the leading functionaries placed their own men in “all key posts” and “turned the state enterprise into a private one.” They illicitly engaged in the production of non-military goods and from the sale of fountain pens alone embezzled 1,500,000 rubles in three years. Among these people was a man who “was a Neprman... in the 1920’s and had been a “lifelong thief.”

In a silk-weaving mill in Uzbekistan, the manager ganged up with the chief engineer, the chief accountant, the chief of the supply and marketing section, heads of workshops and others, and they all became “newborn entrepreneurs.” They purchased more than ten tons of artificial and pure silk through various illegal channels in order to manufacture goods which “did not pass through the accounts.” They employed workers without going through the proper procedures and enforced “a twelve-hour working day.”

The manager of a furniture factory in Kharkov set up an “illegal knitwear workshop” and carried on secret operations inside the factory. This man “had several wives, several cars, several houses, 176 neckties, about a hundred shirts and dozens of suits.” He was also a big gambler at the horse-races.

Such people do not operate all by themselves. They invariably work hand in glove with functionaries in the state departments in charge of supplies and in the commercial and other departments. They have their own men in the police and judicial departments who protect them and act as their agents. Even high-ranking officials in the state organs support and shield them. Here are a few examples.

The chief of the workshops affiliated to a Moscow psychiatric hospital and his gang set up an “underground enterprise,” and by bribery “obtained 52 knitting machines” and a large amount of raw material. They entered into business relations with “52 factories, handicraft co-operatives and collective farms” and made 3 million rubles in a few years. They bribed functionaries of the Department for Combating Theft of Socialist Property and Speculation, controllers, inspectors, instructors and others.

The manager of a machinery plant in the Russian Federation, together with the deputy manager of a second machinery plant and other functionaries, or 43 persons in all, stole more than 900 looms and sold them to factories in Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Caucasus and other places, whose leading functionaries used them for illicit production.

In the Kirghiz S.S.R., a gang of over forty embezzlers and grafters, having gained control of two
factories, organized underground production and plundered more than 30 million rubles’ worth of state property. This gang included the chairman of the planning commission of the republic, a vice-minister of commerce, seven bureau chiefs and division chiefs of the republic’s council of ministers, national economic council and state control commission, as well as “a big kulak who had fled from exile.”

These examples show that the factories which have fallen into the clutches of such degenerates are socialist enterprises only in name, that in fact they have become capitalist enterprises by which these persons enrich themselves. The relationship of such persons to the workers has turned into one between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. Are not such degenerates who possess and make use of means of production to exploit the labour of others out-and-out bourgeois elements? Are not their accomplices in government organizations, who work hand in glove with them, participate in many types of exploitation, engage in embezzlement, accept bribes, and share the spoils, also out-and-out bourgeois elements?

Obviously all these people belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat — they belong to the bourgeoisie. Their activities against socialism are definitely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat.

Now let us look at the activities of various kulak elements on the collective farms.

Some leading collective-farm functionaries and their gangs steal and speculate at will, freely squander public money and fleece the collective farmers. Here are some examples.

The chairman of a collective farm in Uzbekistan “held the whole village in terror.” All the important positions on this farm “were occupied by his in-laws and other relatives and friends.” He squandered “over 122,000 rubles of the collective farm for his personal needs.” He had a car, two motor-cycles and three wives, each with “a house of her own.”

The chairman of a collective farm in the Kurgan Region regarded the farm as his “hereditary estate.” He conspired with his accountant, cashier, chief warehouse-keeper, agronomist, general-store manager and others. Shielding each other, they “fleeced the collective farmers” and pocketed more than a hundred thousand rubles in a few years.

The chairman of a collective farm in the Ukraine made over 50,000 rubles at its expense by forging purchase certificates and cash-account orders in collusion with its woman accountant, who had been praised for keeping “model accounts” and whose deeds had been displayed at the Moscow Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy.

The chairman of a collective farm in the Alma-Ata Region specialized in commercial speculation. He bought “fruit juice in the Ukraine or Uzbekistan, and sugar and alcohol from Djambul,” processed them and then sold the wine at very high prices in many localities. In this farm a winery was created with a capacity of over a million litres a year, its speculative commercial network spread throughout the Kazakhstan S.S.R., and commercial speculation became one of the farm’s main sources of income.

The chairman of a collective farm in Byelorussia considered himself “a feudal prince on the farm” and acted “personally” in all matters. He lived not on the farm but in the city or in his own splendid villa, and was always busy with “various commercial machinations” and “illegal deals.” He bought cattle from the outside, represented them as the products of his collective farm and falsified output figures. And yet “not a few commendatory newspaper reports” had been published about him and he had been called a “model leader.”

These examples show that collective farms under the control of such functionaries virtually become their private property. Such men turn socialist collective economic enterprises into economic enterprises of new kulaks. There are often people in their superior organizations who protect them. Their relationship to the collective farmers has likewise become that of oppressors to oppressed, of exploiters to exploited. Are not such neo-exploiters who ride on the backs of the collective farmers one hundred-per-cent neo-kulaks?

Obviously, they all belong to a class that is antagonistic to the proletariat and the labouring farmers, belong to the kulak or rural bourgeois class. Their anti-socialist activities are precisely class struggle with the bourgeoisie attacking the proletariat and the labouring farmers.

Apart from the bourgeois elements in state enterprises and collective farms, there are many others in both town and country in the Soviet Union.

Some of them set up private enterprises for private production and sale; others organize contractor teams and openly undertake construction jobs for state or co-operative enterprises; still others open private hotels. A “Soviet woman capitalist” in Leningrad hired workers to make nylon blouses for sale, and her “daily income amounted to 700 new rubles.” The owner of a workshop in the Kurgan Region made felt boots for sale at speculative prices. He had in his possession 500 pairs of felt boots, 8 kilogrammes of gold coins, 3,000 metres of high-grade textiles, 20 carpets, 1,200 kilogrammes of wool and many other valuables. A private entrepreneur in the Gomel Region “hired workers and artisans” and in the course of two years secured contracts for the construction and overhauling of furnaces in 12 factories at a high price. In the Orenburg Region there are “ hundreds of private hotels and trans-shipment points,” and “the money of the collective farms and the state is continuously streaming into the pockets of the hostelry owners.”
Some engage in commercial speculation, making tremendous profits through buying cheap and selling dear or bringing goods from far away. In Moscow there are a great many speculators engaged in the resale of agricultural produce. They “bring to Moscow tons of citrus fruit, apples and vegetables and resell them at speculative prices.” These profit-grabbers are provided with every facility, with market inns, store-rooms and other services at their disposal. In the Krasnodar Territory, a speculator set up her own agency and “employed 12 salesmen and two stevedores.” She transported “thousands of hogs, hundreds of quintals of grain and hundreds of tons of fruit” from the rural areas to the Don Basin and moved “great quantities of stolen slag bricks, whole wagons of glass” and other building materials from the city to the villages. She reaped huge profits out of such resale.

Others specialize as brokers and middlemen. They have wide contacts and through them one can get anything in return for a bribe. There was a broker in Leningrad who “though he is not the Minister of Trade, controls all the stocks,” and “though he holds no post on the railway, disposes of wagons.” He could obtain “the stocks of which are strictly controlled from outside the stocks.” “All the store-houses in Leningrad are at his service.” For delivering goods, he received huge “bonuses” — 700,000 rubles from one timber combine in 1960 alone. In Leningrad, there is “a whole group” of such brokers.

These private entrepreneurs and speculators are engaged in the most naked capitalist exploitation. Isn’t it clear that they belong to the bourgeoisie, the class antagonistic to the proletariat?

Actually the Soviet press itself calls these people “Soviet capitalists,” “newborn entrepreneurs,” “private entrepreneurs,” “newly emerged kulaks,” “speculators,” “exploiters,” etc. Aren’t the revisionist Khrushchov clique contradicting themselves when they assert that antagonistic classes do not exist in the Soviet Union?

The facts cited above are only a part of those published in the Soviet press. They are enough to shock people, but there are many more which have not been published, many bigger and more serious cases which are covered up and shielded. We have quoted the above data in order to answer the question whether there are antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union. These data are readily available and even the revisionist Khrushchov clique are unable to deny them.

These data suffice to show that the unbridled activities of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat are widespread in the Soviet Union, in the city as well as the countryside, in industry as well as agriculture, in the sphere of production as well as the sphere of circulation, all the way from the economic departments to Party and government organizations, and from the grass-roots to the higher leading bodies. These anti-socialist activities are nothing if not the sharp class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

It is not strange that attacks on socialism should be made in a socialist country by old and new bourgeois elements. There is nothing terrifying about this so long as the leadership of the Party and state remains a Marxist-Leninist one. But in the Soviet Union today, the gravity of the situation lies in the fact that the revisionist Khrushchov clique have usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state and that a privileged bourgeois stratum has emerged in Soviet society.

We shall deal with this problem in the following section.

The Soviet Privileged Stratum and the Revisionist Khrushchov Clique

The privileged stratum in contemporary Soviet society is composed of degenerate elements from among the leading cadres of Party and government organizations, enterprises and farms as well as bourgeois intellectuals: it stands in opposition to the workers, the peasants and the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals and cadres of the Soviet Union.

Lenin pointed out soon after the October Revolution that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies and force of habit were encroaching and influencing the proletariat from all directions and were corrupting certain of its sections. This circumstance led to the emergence from among the Soviet officials and functionaries both of bureaucrats alienated from the masses and of new bourgeois elements. Lenin also pointed out that although the high salaries paid to the bourgeois technical specialists staying on to work for the Soviet regime were necessary, they were having a corrupting influence on it.

Therefore, Lenin laid great stress on waging persistent struggles against the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies, on arousing the broad masses to take part in government work, on ceaselessly exposing and purging bureaucrats and new bourgeois elements in the Soviet organs, and on creating conditions that would bar the existence and reproduction of the bourgeoisie. Lenin pointed out sharply that “without a systematic and determined struggle to improve the apparatus, we shall perish before the basis of socialism is created.”

At the same time, he laid great stress on adherence to the principle of the Paris Commune in wage policy, that is all public servants were to be paid wages corresponding to those of the workers and only bourgeois specialists were to be paid high salaries. From the October Revolution to the period of Soviet economic rehabilitation, Lenin’s directives were in the main observed: the leading personnel of the Party and government organizations and enterprises and Party members among the specialists received salaries roughly equivalent to the wages of workers.
At that time, the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union adopted a number of measures in the sphere of politics and ideology and in the system of distribution to prevent leading cadres in any department from abusing their powers or degenerating morally or politically.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Stalin adhered to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the road of socialism and waged a staunch struggle against the forces of capitalism. Stalin’s struggles against the Trotskyites, Zinovievites and Bukharinities were in essence a reflection within the Party of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and of the struggle between the two roads of socialism and capitalism. Victory in these struggles smashed the vain plot of the bourgeoisie to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union.

It cannot be denied that before Stalin’s death high salaries were already being paid to certain groups and that some cadres had already degenerated and become bourgeois elements. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. pointed out in its report to the 19th Party Congress in October 1952 that degeneration and corruption had appeared in certain Party organizations. The leaders of these organizations had turned them into small communities composed exclusively of their own people, “setting their group interests higher than the interests of the Party and the state.” Some executives of industrial enterprises “forget that the enterprises entrusted to their charge are state enterprises, and try to turn them into their own private domain.” “Instead of safeguarding the common husbandry of the collective farms,” some Party and Soviet functionaries and some cadres in agricultural departments “engage in filching collective-farm property.” In the cultural, artistic and scientific fields, too, works attacking and smearing the socialist system had appeared and a monopolistic “Arakcheev regime” had emerged among the scientists.

Since Khrushchev usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, there has been a fundamental change in the state of the class struggle in the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev has carried out a series of revisionist policies serving the interests of the bourgeoisie and rapidly swelling the forces of capitalism in the Soviet Union.

On the pretext of “combating the personality cult,” Khrushchev has defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system and thus in fact paved the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. In completely negating Stalin, he has in fact negated Marxism-Leninism which was upheld by Stalin and opened the floodgates for the revisionist deluge.

Khrushchev has substituted “material incentive” for the socialist principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work.” He has widened, and not narrowed, the gap between the incomes of a small minority and those of the workers, peasants and ordinary intellectuals. He has supported the degenerates in leading positions, encouraging them to become even more unscrupulous in abusing their powers and to appropriate the fruits of labour of the Soviet people. Thus he has accelerated the polarization of classes in Soviet society.

Khrushchev sabotages the socialist planned economy, applies the capitalist principle of profit, develops capitalist free competition and undermines socialist ownership by the whole people.

Khrushchev attacks the system of socialist agricultural planning, describing it as “bureaucratic” and “unnecessary.” Eager to learn from the big proprietors of American farms, he is encouraging capitalist management, fostering a kulak economy and undermining the socialist collective economy.

Khrushchev is peddling bourgeois ideology, bourgeois liberty, equality, fraternity and humanism, inculcating bourgeois idealism and metaphysics and the reactionary ideas of bourgeois individualism, humanism and pacifism among the Soviet people, and debasing socialist morality. The rotten bourgeois culture of the West is now fashionable in the Soviet Union, and socialist culture is ostracized and attacked.

Under the signboard of “peaceful coexistence,” Khrushchev has been colluding with U.S. imperialism, wrecking the socialist camp and the international communist movement, opposing the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and nations, practising great-power chauvinism and national egoism and betraying proletarian internationalism. All this is being done for the protection of the vested interests of a handful of people, which he places above the fundamental interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the socialist camp and the whole world.

The line Khrushchev pursues is a revisionist line through and through. Guided by this line, not only have the old bourgeois elements run wild but new bourgeois elements have appeared in large numbers among the leading cadres of the Soviet Party and Government, the chiefs of state enterprises and collective farms, and the higher intellectuals in the fields of culture, art, science and technology.

In the Soviet Union at present, not only have the new bourgeois elements increased in number as never before, but their social status has fundamentally changed. Before Khrushchev came to power, they did not occupy the ruling position in Soviet society. Their activities were restricted in many ways and they were subject to attack. But since Khrushchev took over, usurping the leadership of the Party and the state step by step, the new bourgeois elements have gradually risen to the ruling position in the Party and Government and in the economic, cultural and other departments, and formed a privileged stratum in Soviet society.

This privileged stratum is the principal component of the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union today and the main social basis of the revisionist Khrushchev clique.
The revisionist Khrushchev clique are the political representatives of the Soviet bourgeoisie, and particularly of its privileged stratum.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique have carried out one purge after another and replaced one group of cadres after another throughout the country, from the central to the local bodies, from leading Party and government organizations to economic and cultural and educational departments, dismissing those they do not trust and planting their proteges in leading posts.

Take the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. as an example. The statistics show that nearly 70 per cent of the Members of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. who were elected at its 19th Congress in 1952 were purged in the course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses held respectively in 1956 and 1961. And nearly 90 per cent of the Members of the Central Committee who were elected at the 20th Congress were purged at the time of the 22nd Congress.

Or take the local organizations. On the eve of the 22nd Congress, on the pretext of “renewing the cadres,” the revisionist Khrushchev clique, according to incomplete statistics, removed from office 45 per cent of the members of the Party Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the Party committees of the territories and regions, and 40 per cent of the members of the municipal and district Party committees. In 1963, on the pretext of dividing the Party into “industrial” and “agricultural” Party committees, they further replaced more than half the members of the Central Committees of the Union Republics and of the Regional Party Committees.

Through this series of changes the Soviet privileged stratum has gained control of the Party, the government and other important organizations.

The members of this privileged stratum have converted the function of serving the masses into the privilege of dominating them. They are abusing their powers over the means of production and of livelihood for the private benefit of their small clique.

The members of this privileged stratum appropriate the fruits of the Soviet people’s labour and pocket incomes that are dozens or even a hundred times those of the average Soviet worker and peasant. They not only secure high incomes in the form of high salaries, high awards, high royalties and a great variety of personal subsidies, but also use their privileged position to appropriate public property by graft and bribery. Completely divorced from the working people of the Soviet Union, they live the parasitical and decadent life of the bourgeoisie.

The members of this privileged stratum have become utterly degenerate ideologically, have completely departed from the revolutionary traditions of the Bolshevist Party and discarded the lofty ideals of the Soviet working class. They are opposed to Marxism-Leninism and socialism. They betray the revolution and forbid others to make revolution. Their sole concern is to consolidate their economic position and political rule. All their activities revolve around the private interests of their own privileged stratum.

Having usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, the Khrushchev clique are turning the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of the Soviet Union with its glorious revolutionary history into a revisionist party; they are turning the Soviet state under the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state under the dictatorship of the revisionist Khrushchev clique; and, step by step, they are turning socialist ownership by the whole people and socialist collectivization into ownership by the privileged stratum.

People have seen how in Yugoslavia, although the Tito clique still displays the banner of “socialism,” a bureaucratic bourgeoisie opposed to the Yugoslav people has gradually come into being since the Tito clique took the road of revisionism, transforming the Yugoslav state from a dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and its socialist public economy into state capitalism. Now people see the Khrushchev clique taking the road already travelled by the Tito clique. Khrushchev looks to Belgrade as his Mecca, saying again and again that he will learn from the Tito clique’s experience and declaring that he and the Tito clique “belong to one and the same idea and are guided by the same theory.” This is not at all surprising.

As a result of Khrushchev’s revisionism, the first socialist country in the world built by the great Soviet people with their blood and sweat is now facing an unprecedented danger of capitalist restoration.

The Khrushchev clique are spreading the tale that “there are no longer antagonistic classes and class struggle in the Soviet Union” in order to cover up the facts about their own ruthless class struggle against the Soviet people.

The Soviet privileged stratum represented by the revisionist Khrushchev clique constitutes only a few per cent of the Soviet population. Among the Soviet cadres its numbers are also small. It stands diametrically opposed to the Soviet people, who constitute more than 90 per cent of the total population, and to the great majority of the Soviet cadres and Communists. The contradiction between the Soviet people and this privileged stratum is now the principal contradiction inside the Soviet Union, and it is an irreconcilable and antagonistic class contradiction.

The glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was built by Lenin, and the great Soviet people displayed epoch-making revolutionary initiative in the October Socialist Revolution, they showed their heroism and stamina in defeating the White Guards and the armed intervention by more than a dozen imperialist countries, they scored unprecedentedly brilliant achievements in the struggle for industrialization and agricultural collectivization, and they won a tremendous victory in the Patriotic War against the German Pas-
cists and saved all mankind. Even under the rule of the Khrushchov clique, the mass of the members of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet people are carrying on the glorious revolutionary traditions nurtured by Lenin and Stalin, and they still uphold socialism and aspire to communism.

The broad masses of the Soviet workers, collective farmers and intellectuals are seething with discontent against the oppression and exploitation practiced by the privileged stratum. They have come to see ever more clearly the revisionist feature of the Khrushchov clique which is betraying socialism and restoring capitalism. Among the ranks of the Soviet cadres, there are many who still persist in the revolutionary stand of the proletariat, adhere to the road of socialism and firmly oppose Khrushchov’s revisionism. The broad masses of the Soviet people, of Communists and cadres are using various means to resist and oppose the revisionist line of the Khrushchov clique, so that the revisionist Khrushchov clique cannot so easily bring about the restoration of capitalism. The great Soviet people are fighting to defend the glorious traditions of the Great October Revolution, to preserve the great gains of socialism and to smash the plot for the restoration of capitalism.

Rebuttal of the So-Called State of the Whole People

At the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. Khrushchov openly raised the banner of opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat, announcing the replacement of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the “state of the whole people.” It is written in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. that the dictatorship of the proletariat “has ceased to be indispensable in the U.S.S.R.” and that “the state, which arose as a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has, in the new contemporary stage, become a state of the entire people.”

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of the state is a class concept. Lenin pointed out that “the distinguishing feature of the state is the existence of a separate class of people in whose hands power is concentrated.” The state is a weapon of class struggle, a machine by means of which one class represses another. Every state is the dictatorship of a definite class. So long as the state exists, it cannot possibly stand above class or belong to the whole people.

The proletariat and its political party have never concealed their views; they say explicitly that the very aim of the proletarian socialist revolution is to overthrow bourgeois rule and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. After the victory of the socialist revolution, the proletariat and its party must strive unceasingly to fulfill the historical tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat and eliminate classes and class differences, so that the state will wither away. It is only the bourgeoisie and its parties which in their attempt to hoodwink the masses try by every means to cover up the class nature of state power and describe the state machinery under their control as being “of the whole people” and “above class.”

The fact that Khrushchov has announced the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and advanced the thesis of the “state of the whole people” demonstrates that he has replaced the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state by bourgeois falsehoods.

When Marxist-Leninists criticized their fallacies, the revisionist Khrushchov clique hastily defended themselves and tried hard to invent a so-called theoretical basis for the “state of the whole people.” They now assert that the historical period of the dictatorship of the proletariat mentioned by Marx and Lenin refers only to the transition from capitalism to the first stage of communism and not to its higher stage. They further assert that “the dictatorship of the proletariat will cease to be necessary before the state withers away” and that after the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there is yet another stage, the “state of the whole people.”

These are out-and-out sophistries.

In his Critique of the Gotha Programme, Marx advanced the well-known axiom that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the state of the period of transition from capitalism to communism. Lenin gave a clear explanation of this Marxist axiom.

He said:

In his Critique of the Gotha Programme Marx wrote:

“Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.”

Up to now this axiom has never been disputed by Socialists, and yet it implies the recognition of the existence of the state right up to the time when victorious socialism has grown into complete communism.

Lenin further said:

The essence of Marx’s teaching on the state has been mastered only by those who understand that the dictatorship of a single class is necessary not only for every class society in general, not only for the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie, but also for the entire historical period which separates capitalism from “classless society,” from Communism.

It is perfectly clear that according to Marx and Lenin, the historical period throughout which the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat exists, is not merely the period of transition from capitalism to the first stage of communism, as alleged by the revisionist Khrushchov clique, but the entire period of transition from capitalism to “complete communism,” to the time when all class differences will have been eliminated and “classless society” realized, that is to say, to the higher stage of communism.
It is equally clear that the state in the transition period referred to by Marx and Lenin is the dictatorship of the proletariat and not anything else. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the form of the state in the entire period of transition from capitalism to the higher stage of communism, and also the last form of the state in human history. The withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat will mean the withering away of the state. Lenin said:

Marx deduced from the whole history of Socialism and the political struggle that the state was bound to disappear, and that the transitional form of its disappearance (the transition from state to nonstate) would be the “proletariat organized as the ruling class.”

Historically the dictatorship of the proletariat may take different forms from one country to another and from one period to another, but in essence it will remain the same. Lenin said:

The transition from capitalism to Communism certainly cannot but yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It can thus be seen that it is absolutely not the view of Marx and Lenin but an invention of the revisionist Khrushchev that the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat will precede the withering away of the state and will be followed by yet another stage, “the state of the whole people.”

In arguing for their anti-Marxist-Leninist views, the revisionist Khrushchev clique have taken great pains to find a sentence from Marx and distorted it by quoting it out of context. They have arbitrarily described the future nature of the state [Staatswesen in German] of communist society referred to by Marx in his Critique of the Gotha Programme as “the state of communist society,” [государственность коммунистического общества in Russian] which is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat.  They gleefully announced that the Chinese would not dare to quote this from Marx. Apparently the revisionist Khrushchev clique think it is very helpful to them.

As it happens, Lenin seems to have foreseen that revisionists would make use of this phrase to distort Marxism. In his Marxism on the State, Lenin gave an excellent explanation of it. He said, “... the dictatorship of the proletariat is a ‘political transition period’... But Marx goes on to speak of the ‘future nature of the state’ [государственность in Russian, Staatswesen in German] of communist society!!! Thus, there will be a state even in ‘communist society’!!! Is there not a contradiction in this?” Lenin answered, “No.” He then tabulated the three stages in the process of development from the bourgeois state to the withering away of the state:

The first stage—in capitalist society, the state is needed by the bourgeoisie—the bourgeois state.

The second stage—in the period of transition from capitalism to communism, the state is needed by the proletariat—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The third stage—in communist society, the state is not necessary, it withers away.

He concluded: “Complete consistency and clarity!!”

In Lenin’s tabulation, only the bourgeois state, the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering away of the state are to be found. By precisely this tabulation Lenin made it clear that when communism is reached the state withers away and becomes non-existent.

Ironically enough, the revisionist Khrushchev clique also quoted this very passage from Lenin’s Marxism on the State in the course of defending their error. And then they proceeded to make the following idiotic statement:

In our country the first two periods referred to by Lenin in the opinion quoted already belong to history. In the Soviet Union a state of the whole people—a communist state system, the state of the first phase of communism, has arisen and is developing.

If the first two periods referred to by Lenin have already become a thing of the past in the Soviet Union, then the state should be withering away, and where could a “state of the whole people” come from? If the state is not yet withering away, then it ought to be the dictatorship of the proletariat and under absolutely no circumstances a “state of the whole people.”

In arguing for their “state of the whole people,” the revisionist Khrushchev clique exert themselves to vitilify the dictatorship of the proletariat as undemocratic. They assert that only by replacing the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the “state of the whole people” can democracy be further developed and turned into “genuine democracy for the whole people.” Khrushchev has pretentiously said that the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat exemplifies “a line of energetically developing democracy” and that “proletarian democracy is becoming socialist democracy of the whole people.”

These utterances can only show that their authors either are completely ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the state or are maliciously distorting them.

Anyone with a little knowledge of Marxism-Leninism knows that the concept of democracy as a form of the state, like that of dictatorship, is a class one. There can only be class democracy, there cannot be “democracy for the whole people.”

Lenin said:

Democracy for the vast majority of the people, and suppression by force, i.e., exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the change democracy undergoes during the transition from capitalism to Communism.

Dictatorship over the exploiting classes and democracy among the working people—these are the two aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is only under
the dictatorship of the proletariat that democracy for the masses of the working people can be developed and expanded to an unprecedented extent. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat there can be no genuine democracy for the working people.

Where there is bourgeois democracy there is no proletarian democracy, and where there is proletarian democracy there is no bourgeois democracy. The one excludes the other. This is inevitable and admits of no compromise. The more thoroughly bourgeois democracy is eliminated, the more will proletarian democracy flourish. In the eyes of the bourgeoisie, any country where this occurs is lacking in democracy. But actually this is the promotion of proletarian democracy and the elimination of bourgeois democracy. As proletarian democracy develops, bourgeois democracy is eliminated.

This fundamental Marxist-Leninist thesis is opposed by the revisionist Khrushchev clique. In fact, they hold that so long as enemies are subjected to dictatorship there is no democracy and that the only way to develop democracy is to abolish the dictatorship over enemies, stop suppressing them and institute “democracy for the whole people.”

Their view is cast from the same mould as the renegade Kautsky’s concept of “pure democracy.”

In criticizing Kautsky Lenin said:

...“pure democracy” is not only an ignorant phrase, revealing a lack of understanding both of the class struggle and of the nature of the state, but also a threethirds-empty phrase, since in communist society democracy will wither away in the process of changing and becoming a habit, but will never be “pure” democracy.42

He also pointed out:

The dialectics (course) of the development is as follows: from absolutism to bourgeois democracy; from bourgeois to proletarian democracy; from proletarian democracy to none.44

That is to say, in the higher stage of communism proletarian democracy will wither away along with the elimination of classes and the withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To speak plainly, as with the “state of the whole people,” the “democracy for the whole people” proclaimed by Khrushchev is a hoax. In thus retrieving the tattered garments of the bourgeoisie and the old-line revisionists, patching them up and adding a label of his own, Khrushchev’s sole purpose is to deceive the Soviet people and the revolutionary people of the world and cover up his betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat and his opposition to socialism.

What is the essence of Khrushchev’s “state of the whole people”?

Khrushchev has abolished the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and established a dictatorship of the revisionist clique headed by himself, that is, a dictatorship of a privileged stratum of the Soviet bourgeoisie. Actually his “state of the whole people” is not a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat but a state in which his small revisionist clique wield their dictatorship over the masses of the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary intellectuals. Under the rule of the Khrushchev clique, there is no democracy for the Soviet working people, there is democracy only for the handful of people belonging to the revisionist Khrushchev clique, for the privileged stratum and for the bourgeois elements, old and new. Khrushchev’s “democracy for the whole people” is nothing but out and out bourgeois democracy, i.e., a despotic dictatorship of the Khrushchev clique over the Soviet people.

In the Soviet Union today, anyone who persists in the proletarian stand, upholds Marxism-Leninism and has the courage to speak out, to resist or to fight is watched, followed, summoned, and even arrested, imprisoned or diagnosed as “mentally ill” and sent to “mental hospitals.” Recently the Soviet press has declared that it is necessary to “fight” against those who show even the slightest dissatisfaction, and called for “relentless battle” against the “rotten jokers”45 who are so bold as to make sarcastic remarks about Khrushchev’s agricultural policy. It is particularly astonishing that the revisionist Khrushchev clique should have on more than one occasion bloodily suppressed striking workers and the masses who put up resistance.

The formula of abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat while keeping a state of the whole people reveals the secret of the revisionist Khrushchev clique; that is, they are firmly opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat but will not give up state power till their doom. The revisionist Khrushchev clique know the paramount importance of controlling state power. They need the state machinery for repressing the Soviet working people and the Marxist-Leninists. They need it for clearing the way for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. These are Khrushchev’s real aims in raising the banners of the “state of the whole people” and “democracy for the whole people.”

Refutation of the So-Called Party of the Entire People

At the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. Khrushchev openly raised another banner, the alteration of the proletarian character of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He announced the replacement of the party of the proletariat by a “party of the entire people.” The Programme of the C.P.S.U. states, “As a result of the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the consolidation of the unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, a party of the entire people.” The open letter of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. says that the C.P.S.U. “has become a political organization of the entire people.”

How absurd!

Elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that, like the state, a political party is an instrument of class struggle. Every political party has a class character. Party spirit is the concentrated expression
of class character. There is no such thing as a non-class or supra-class political party and there never has been, nor is there such a thing as a “party of the entire people” that does not represent the interests of a particular class.

The party of the proletariat is built in accordance with the revolutionary theory and revolutionary style of Marxism-Leninism; it is the party formed by the advanced elements who are boundlessly faithful to the historical mission of the proletariat, it is the organized vanguard of the proletariat and the highest form of its organization. The party of the proletariat represents the interests of the proletariat and the concentration of its will.

Moreover, the party of the proletariat is the only party able to represent the interests of the people, who constitute over 90 per cent of the total population. The reason is that the interests of the proletariat are identical with those of the working masses, that the proletarian party can approach problems in the light of the historical role of the proletariat and in terms of the present and future interests of the proletariat and the working masses and of the best interests of the overwhelming majority of the people, and that it can give correct leadership in accordance with Marxism-Leninism.

In addition to its members of working-class origin, the party of the proletariat has members of other class origins. But the latter do not join the Party as representatives of other classes. From the very day they join the Party they must abandon their former class stand and take the stand of the proletariat. Marx and Engels said:

If people of this kind from other classes join the proletarian movement, the first condition must be that they should not bring any remnants of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, etc., prejudices with them but should wholeheartedly adopt the proletarian outlook.16

The basic principles concerning the character of the proletarian party were in long ago elucidated by Marxism-Leninism. But in the opinion of the revisionist Khruushchov clique these principles are “stereotyped formulas,” while their “party of the entire people” conforms to the “actual dialectics of the development of the Communist Party.”167

The revisionist Khruushchov clique have cudgelled their brains to think up arguments justifying their “party of the entire people.” They have argued during the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties in July 1963 and in the Soviet press that they have changed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union into a “party of the entire people” because:

1. The C.P.S.U. expresses the interests of the whole people.

2. The entire people have accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook of the working class, and the aim of the working class—the building of communism—has become the aim of the entire people.


4. The democratic method used in the Party’s activities is also in accord with its character as the party of the entire people.

It is obvious even at a glance that none of these arguments adduced by the revisionist Khruushchov clique shows a serious approach to a serious problem.

When Lenin was fighting the opportunist muddleheads, he remarked:

Can people obviously incapable of taking serious problems seriously, themselves be taken seriously? It is difficult to do so, comrades, very difficult! But the question which certain people cannot treat seriously is in itself so serious that it will do no harm to examine even patently frivolous replies to it.168

Today, too, it will do no harm to examine the patently frivolous replies given by the revisionist Khruushchov clique to so serious a question as that of the party of the proletariat.

According to the revisionist Khruushchov clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because it expresses the interests of the entire people. Does it not then follow that from the very beginning it should have been a “party of the entire people” instead of a party of the proletariat?

According to the revisionist Khruushchov clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because “the entire people have accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook of the working class.” But how can it be said that everyone has accepted the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in Soviet society where sharp class polarization and class struggle are taking place? Can it be said that the tens of thousands of old and new bourgeois elements in your country are all Marxist-Leninists? If Marxism-Leninism has really become the world outlook of the entire people, as you allege, does it not then follow that there is no difference in your society between Party and non-Party and no need whatsoever for the Party to exist? What difference does it make if there is a “party of the entire people” or not?

According to the revisionist Khruushchov clique, the Communist Party should become a “party of the entire people” because its membership consists of workers, peasants and intellectuals and all nationalities and peoples. Does this mean then that before the idea of the “party of the entire people” was put forward at its 22nd Congress none of the members of the C.P.S.U. came from classes other than the working class? Does it mean that formerly the members of the Party all came from just one nationality, to the exclusion of other?
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nationalities and peoples? If the character of a party is determined by the social background of its membership, does it not then follow that the numerous political parties in the world whose members also come from various classes, nationalities and peoples are all “parties of the entire people”?

According to the revisionist Khrushchov clique, the Party should be a “party of the entire people” because the methods it uses in its activities are democratic. But from its outset, a Communist Party is built on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism and should always adopt the mass line and the democratic method of persuasion and education in working among the people. Does it not then follow that a Communist Party is a “party of the entire people” from the first day of its founding?

Briefly, none of the arguments listed by the revisionist Khrushchov clique holds water.

Besides making a great fuss about a “party of the entire people,” Khrushchov has also divided the Party into an “industrial party” and an “agricultural party” on the pretext of “building the Party organs on the production principle.”

The revisionist Khrushchov clique say that they have done so because of “the primacy of economics under socialism” and because they want to place “the economic and production problems, which have been pushed to the forefront by the entire course of the communist construction, at the centre of the activities of the Party organizations” and make them “the cornerstone of all their work.” Khrushchov said, “We say bluntly that the main thing in the work of the Party organs is production.” And what is more, they have foisted these views on Lenin, claiming that they are acting in accordance with his principles.

However, anyone at all acquainted with the history of the C.P.S.U. knows that, far from being Lenin’s views, they are anti-Leninist views and that they were views held by Trotsky. On this question, too, Khrushchov is a worthy disciple of Trotsky.

In criticizing Trotsky and Bukharin, Lenin said:

“Politics are the concentrated expression of economics... Politics cannot but have precedence over economics. To argue differently means forgetting the A B C of Marxism.”

He continued:

... without a proper political approach to the subject the given class cannot maintain its rule, and consequently cannot solve its own production problems.

The facts are crystal clear: the real purpose of the revisionist Khrushchov clique in proposing a “party of the entire people” was completely to alter the proletarian character of the C.P.S.U. and transform the Marxist-Leninist party into a revisionist party.

The great Communist Party of the Soviet Union is confronted with the grave danger of degenerating from a party of the proletariat into a party of the bourgeoisie and from a Marxist-Leninist into a revisionist party.

Lenin said:

“A party that wants to exist cannot allow the slightest wavering on the question of its existence or any agreement with those who may bury it.”

At present, the revisionist Khrushchov clique is again confronting the broad membership of the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union with precisely this serious question.

Khrushchov’s Phoney Communism

At the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., Khrushchov announced that the Soviet Union had already entered the period of the extensive building of communist society. He also declared that “we shall, in the main, have built a communist society within twenty years.” This is pure fraud.

How can there be talk of building communism when the revisionist Khrushchov clique are leading the Soviet Union on to the path of the restoration of capitalism and when the Soviet people are in grave danger of losing the fruits of socialism?

In putting up the signboard of “building communism” Khrushchov’s real aim is to conceal the true face of his revisionism. But it is not hard to expose this trick. Just as the eyeball of a fish cannot be allowed to pass as a pearl, so revisionism cannot be allowed to pass itself off as communism.

Scientific communism has a precise and definite meaning. According to Marxism-Leninism, communist society is a society in which classes and class differences are completely eliminated. The entire people have a high level of communist consciousness and morality as well as boundless enthusiasm for and initiative in labour, there is a great abundance of social products and the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is applied, and in which the state has withered away.

Marx declared:

In the higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life’s prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

According to Marxist-Leninist theory, the purpose of upholding the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period of socialism is precisely to ensure that society develops in the direction of communism. Lenin said that “forward development, i.e., towards Communism,
proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and cannot do otherwise.” Since the revisionist Khrushchov clique have abandoned the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, it is going backward and not forward, going backward to capitalism and not forward to communism.

Going forward to communism means moving towards the abolition of all classes and class differences. A communist society which preserves any classes at all, let alone exploiting classes, is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchov is fostering a new bourgeoisie, restoring and extending the system of exploitation and accelerating class polarization in the Soviet Union. A privileged bourgeois stratum opposed to the Soviet people now occupies the ruling position in the Party and Government and in the economic, cultural and other departments. Can one find an iota of communism in all this?

Going forward to communism means moving towards a unitary system of the ownership of the means of production by the whole people. A communist society in which several kinds of ownership of the means of production coexist is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchov is creating a situation in which enterprises owned by the whole people are gradually degenerating into capitalist enterprises and farms under the system of collective ownership are gradually degenerating into units of a kulak economy. Again, can one find an iota of communism in all this?

Going forward to communism means moving towards a great abundance of social products and the realization of the principle of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” A communist society built on the enrichment of a handful of persons and the impoverishment of the masses is inconceivable. Under the socialist system the great Soviet people developed the social productive forces at unprecedented speed. But the evils of Khrushchov’s revisionism are creating havoc in the Soviet socialist economy. Constantly beset with innumerable contradictions, Khrushchov makes frequent changes in his economic policies and often goes back on his own words, thus throwing the Soviet national economy into a state of chaos. Khrushchov is truly an incorrigible wastrel. He has squandered the grain reserves built up under Stalin and brought great difficulties into the lives of the Soviet people. He has distorted and violated the socialist principle of distribution of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work,” and enabled a handful of persons to appropriate the fruits of the labour of the broad masses of the Soviet people. These points alone are sufficient to prove that the road taken by Khrushchov leads away from communism.

Going forward to communism means moving towards enhancing the communist consciousness of the masses. A communist society with bourgeois ideas running rampant is inconceivable. Yet Khrushchov is zealously reviving bourgeois ideology in the Soviet Union and serving as a missionary for the decadent American culture. By propagating material incentive, he is turning all human relations into money relations and encouraging individualism and selfishness. Because of him, manual labour is again considered sordid and love of pleasure at the expense of other people’s labour is again considered honourable. Certainly, the social ethics and atmosphere promoted by Khrushchov are far removed from communism, as far as far can be.

Going forward to communism means moving towards the withering away of the state. A communist society with a state apparatus for oppressing the people is inconceivable. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually no longer a state in its original sense, because it is no longer a machine used by the exploiting few to oppress the overwhelming majority of the people but a machine for exercising dictatorship over a very small number of exploiters, while democracy is practised among the overwhelming majority of the people. Khrushchov is altering the character of Soviet state power and changing the dictatorship of the proletariat back into an instrument whereby a handful of privileged bourgeois elements exercise dictatorship over the mass of the Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals. He is continuously strengthening his dictatorial state apparatus and intensifying his repression of the Soviet people. It is indeed a great mockery to talk about communism in these circumstances.

A comparison of all this with the principles of scientific communism readily reveals that in every respect the revisionist Khrushchov clique are leading the Soviet Union away from the path of socialism and on to the path of capitalism and, as a consequence, further and further away from, instead of closer to, the communist goal of “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.”

Khrushchov has ulterior motives when he puts up the signboard of communism. He is using it to fool the Soviet people and cover up his effort to restore capitalism. He is using it to deceive the international proletariat and the revolutionary people the world over and betray proletarian internationalism. Under this signboard, the Khrushchov clique has itself abandoned proletarian internationalism and is seeking a partnership with U.S. imperialism for the partition of the world; moreover, it wants the fraternal socialist countries to serve its own private interests and not to oppose imperialism or to support the revolutions of the oppressed peoples and nations, and it wants them to accept its political, economic and military control and be its virtual dependencies and colonies. Furthermore, the Khrushchov clique wants all the oppressed peoples and nations to serve its private interests and abandon their revolutionary struggles, so as not to disturb its sweet dream of partnership with imperialism for the division of the world, and instead submit to enslavement and oppression by imperialism and its lackeys.

In short, Khrushchov’s slogan of basically “building a communist society within 20 years” in the Soviet Union is not only false but also reactionary.
The revisionist Khrushchev clique say that the Chinese "go to the length of questioning the very right of our Party and our people to build communism." This is a despicable attempt to fool the Soviet people and poison the friendship of the Chinese and Soviet people. We have never had any doubt that the great Soviet people will eventually enter into communist society. But right now the revisionist Khrushchev clique are damaging the socialist fruits of the Soviet people and taking away their right to go forward to communism. In the circumstances, the issue confronting the Soviet people is not how to build communism but rather how to resist and oppose Khrushchev's effort to restore capitalism.

The revisionist Khrushchev clique also say that "the C.P.C. leaders hint that, since our Party has made its aim a better life for the people, Soviet society is being 'bourgeoisified,'" is 'degenerate.' This trick of deflecting the Soviet people's dissatisfaction with the Khrushchev clique is deplorable as well as stupid. We sincerely wish the Soviet people an increasingly better life. But Khrushchev's boasts of "concern for the well-being of the people" and of "a better life for every man" are utterly false and demagogic. For the masses of the Soviet people life is already bad enough at Khrushchev's hands. The Khrushchev clique seek a "better life" only for the members of the privileged stratum and the bourgeois elements, old and new, in the Soviet Union. These people are appropriating the fruits of the Soviet people's labour and living the life of bourgeois lords. They have indeed become thoroughly bourgeoisified.

Khrushchev's "communism" is in essence a variant of bourgeois socialism. He does not regard communism as completely abolishing classes and class differences but describes it as "a bowl accessible to all and brimming with the products of physical and mental labour." He does not regard the struggle of the working class for communism as a struggle for the thorough emancipation of all mankind as well as itself but describes it as a struggle for "a good dish of goulash." There is not an iota of scientific communism in his head but only the image of a society of bourgeois philistines.

Khrushchev's "communism" takes the United States for its model. Imitation of the methods of management of U.S. capitalism and the bourgeois way of life has been raised by Khrushchev to the level of state policy. He says that he "always think highly" of the achievements of the United States. He "rejoices in these achievements, is a little envious at times." He extols to the sky a letter by Roswell Garst, a big U.S. farmer, which propagates the capitalist system, actually he has taken it as his agricultural programme. He wants to copy the United States in the sphere of industry as well as that of agriculture and, in particular, to imitate the profit motive of U.S. capitalist enterprises. He shows great admiration for the American way of life, asserting that the American people "do not live badly" under the rule and enslavement of monopoly capital. Going further, Khrushchev is hopeful of building communism with loans from U.S. imperialism. During his visits to the United States and Hungary, he expressed on more than one occasion his readiness "to take credits from the devil himself."

Thus it can be seen that Khrushchev's "communism" is indeed "goulash communism," the "communism of the American way of life" and "communism seeking credits from the devil." No wonder he often tells representatives of Western monopoly capital that once such "communism" is realized in the Soviet Union, "you will go forward to communism without any call from me."

There is nothing new about such "communism." It is simply another name for capitalism. It is only a bourgeois label, sign or advertisement. In ridiculing the old-line revisionist parties which set up the signboard of Marxism, Lenin said:

Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, this political tendency, this "bourgeois labour party," will swear by the name of Marx. It cannot be prohibited from doing this, just as a trading firm cannot be prohibited from using any particular label, sign, or advertisement.

It is thus easily understandable why Khrushchev's "communism" is appreciated by imperialism and monopoly capital. The U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said:

... to the extent that goulash and the second pair of trousers and questions of that sort become more important in the Soviet Union, I think to that extent a moderating influence has come into the present scene.

And the British Prime Minister Douglas-Home has said:

Mr. Khrushchev said that the Russian brand of communism puts education and goulash first. That is good; goulash-communism is better than war-communism, and I am glad to have this confirmation of our view that fat and comfortable Communists are better than lean and hungry Communists.

Khrushchev's revisionism entirely caters to the policy of "peaceful evolution" which U.S. imperialism is pursuing with regard to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. John Foster Dulles said:

... there was evidence within the Soviet Union of forces toward greater liberalism which, if they persisted, could bring about a basic change within the Soviet Union.

The liberal forces Dulles talked about are capitalist forces. The basic change Dulles hoped for is the degeneration of socialism into capitalism. Khrushchev is effecting exactly the "basic change" Dulles dreamed of.

How the imperialists are hoping for the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union! How they are rejoicing!

We would advise the imperialist lords not to be happy too soon. Notwithstanding all the services of the
revisionist Khrushchev clique, nothing can save imperialism from its doom. The revisionist ruling clique suffer from the same kind of disease as the imperialist ruling clique; they are extremely antagonistic to the masses of the people who comprise over 90 per cent of the world’s population, and therefore they, too, are weak and powerless and are paper tigers. Like the clay Buddha that tried to wade across the river, the revisionist Khrushchev clique cannot even save themselves, so how can they endow imperialism with long life?

**Historical Lessons of the Dictatorship of The Proletariat**

Khrushchev’s revisionism has inflicted heavy damage on the international communist movement, but at the same time it has educated the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people throughout the world by negative example.

If it may be said that the Great October Revolution provided Marxist-Leninists in all countries with the most important positive experience and opened up the road for the proletarian seizure of political power, then on its part Khrushchev’s revisionism may be said to have provided them with the most important negative experience, enabling Marxist-Leninists in all countries to draw the appropriate lessons for preventing the degeneration of the proletarian party and the socialist state.

Historically all revolutions have had their reverses and their twists and turns. Lenin once asked:

...if we take the matter in its essence, has it ever happened in history that a new mode of production took root immediately, without a long succession of setbacks, blunders and relapses?

The international proletarian revolution has a history of less than a century counting from 1871 when the proletariat of the Paris Commune made the first heroic attempt at the seizure of political power, or barely half a century counting from the October Revolution. The proletarian revolution, the greatest revolution in human history, replaces capitalism by socialism and private ownership by public ownership and uproots all the systems of exploitation and all the exploiting classes. It is all the more natural that so earth-shaking a revolution should have to go through serious and fierce class struggles, inevitably traverse a long and tortuous course beset with reverses.

History furnishes a number of examples in which proletarian rule suffered defeat as a result of armed suppression by the bourgeoisie, for instance, the Paris Commune and the Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919. In contemporary times, too, there was the counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary in 1956, when the rule of the proletariat was almost overthrown. People can easily perceive this form of capitalist restoration and are more alert and watchful against it.

However, they cannot easily perceive and are often off their guard or not vigilant against another form of capitalist restoration, which therefore presents a greater danger. The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat takes the road of revisionism or the road of “peaceful evolution” as a result of the degeneration of the leadership of the Party and the state. A lesson of this kind was provided some years ago by the revisionist Tito clique who brought about the degeneration of socialist Yugoslavia into a capitalist country. But the Yugoslav lesson alone has not sufficed to arouse people’s attention fully. Some may say that perhaps it was an accident.

But now the revisionist Khrushchev clique have usurped the leadership of the Party and the state, and there is grave danger of a restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union, the land of the Great October Revolution with its history of several decades in building socialism. And this sounds the alarm for all socialist countries, including China, and for all the Communist and Workers’ Parties, including the Communist Party of China. Inevitably it arouses very great attention and forces Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people the world over to ponder deeply and sharpen their vigilance.

The emergence of Khrushchev’s revisionism is a bad thing, and it is also a good thing. So long as the countries where socialism has been achieved and also those that will later embark on the socialist road seriously study the lessons of the “peaceful evolution” promoted by the revisionist Khrushchev clique and take the appropriate measures, they will be able to prevent this kind of “peaceful evolution” as well as crush the enemy’s armed attacks. Thus, the victory of the world proletarian revolution will be more certain.

The Communist Party of China has a history of 43 years. During its protracted revolutionary struggle, our Party combated both Right and "Left" opportunist errors and the Marxist-Leninist leadership of the Central Committee headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung was established. Closely integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution and construction in China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung has led the Chinese people from victory to victory. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung have taught us to wage unremitting struggle in the theoretical, political and organizational fields, as well as in practical work, so as to combat revisionism and prevent a restoration of capitalism. The Chinese people have gone through protracted revolutionary armed struggles and possess a glorious revolutionary tradition. The Chinese People’s Liberation Army is armed with Mao Tse-tung’s thinking and inseparably linked to the masses. The numerous cadres of the Chinese Communist Party have been educated and tempered in rectification movements and sharp class struggles. All these factors make it very difficult to restore capitalism in our country.
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But let us look at the facts. Is our society today thoroughly clean? No, it is not. Classes and class struggle still remain, the activities of the overthrown reactionary classes plotting a comeback still continue, and we still have speculative activities by old and new bourgeois elements and desperate forays by embezzlers, grafters and degenerates. There are also cases of degeneration in a few primary organizations; what is more, these degenerates do their utmost to find protectors and agents in the higher leading bodies. We should not in the least slacken our vigilance against such phenomena but must keep fully alert.

The struggle in the socialist countries between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism — between the forces of capitalism attempting a comeback and the forces opposing it — is unavoidable. But the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries and their degeneration into capitalist countries are certainly not unavoidable. We can prevent the restoration of capitalism so long as there is a correct leadership and a correct understanding of the problem, so long as we adhere to the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line, take the appropriate measures and wage a prolonged, unremitting struggle. The struggle between the socialist and capitalist roads can become a driving force for social advance.

How can the restoration of capitalism be prevented? On this question Comrade Mao Tse-tung has formulated a set of theories and policies, after summing up the practical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat in China and studying the positive and negative experience of other countries, mainly of the Soviet Union, in accordance with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, and has thus enriched and developed the Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The main contents of the theories and policies advanced by Comrade Mao Tse-tung in this connection are as follows:

FIRST, it is necessary to apply the Marxist-Leninist law of the unity of opposites to the study of socialist society. The law of contradiction in all things, i.e., the law of the unity of opposites, is the fundamental law of materialist dialectics. It operates everywhere, whether in the natural world, in human society, or in human thought. The opposites in a contradiction both unite and struggle with each other, and it is this that forces things to move and change. Socialist society is no exception. In socialist society there are two kinds of social contradictions, namely, the contradictions among the people and those between ourselves and the enemy. These two kinds of social contradictions are entirely different in their essence, and the methods for handling them should be different, too. Their correct handling will result in the increasing consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the further strengthening and development of socialist society. Many people acknowledge the law of the unity of opposites but are unable to apply it in studying and handling questions in socialist society. They refuse to admit that there are contradictions in socialist society — that there are not only contradictions between ourselves and the enemy but also contradictions among the people — and they do not know how to distinguish between these two kinds of social contradictions and how to handle them correctly, and are therefore unable to deal correctly with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

SECOND, socialist society covers a very long historical period. Classes and class struggle continue to exist in this society, and the struggle still goes on between the road of socialism and the road of capitalism. The socialist revolution on the economic front (in the ownership of the means of production) is insufficient by itself and cannot be consolidated. There must also be a thorough socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts. Here a very long period of time is needed to decide “who will win” in the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Several decades won’t do it; success requires anywhere from one to several centuries. On the question of duration, it is better to prepare for a longer rather than a shorter period of time. On the question of effort, it is better to regard the task as difficult rather than easy. It will be more advantageous and less harmful to think and act in this way. Anyone who fails to see this or to appreciate it fully will make tremendous mistakes. During the historical period of socialism it is necessary to maintain the dictatorship of the proletariat and carry the socialist revolution through to the end if the restoration of capitalism is to be prevented, socialist construction carried forward and the conditions created for the transition to communism.

THIRD, the dictatorship of the proletariat is led by the working class, with the worker-peasant alliance as its basis. This means the exercise of dictatorship by the working class and by the people under its leadership over the reactionary classes and individuals and those elements who oppose socialist transformation and socialist construction. Within the ranks of the people democratic centralism is practised. Ours is the broadest democracy beyond the bounds of possibility for any bourgeois state.

FOURTH, in both socialist revolution and socialist construction it is necessary to adhere to the mass line, boldly to arouse the masses and to unfold mass movements on a large scale. The mass line of “from the masses, to the masses” is the basic line in all the work of our Party. It is necessary to have firm confidence in the majority of the people and, above all, in the majority of the worker-peasant masses. We must be good at consulting the masses in our work and under no circumstances alienate ourselves from them. Both commandism and the attitude of one dispensing favours have to be fought. The full and frank expression of views and great debates are important forms of revolutionary struggle which have been created by the people of our country in the course of their long revolutionary fight, forms of struggle which rely on the
masses for resolving contradictions among the people and contradictions between ourselves and the enemy.

FIFTH, whether in socialist revolution or in socialist construction, it is necessary to solve the question of whom to rely on, whom to win over and whom to oppose. The proletariat and its vanguard must make a class analysis of socialist society, rely on the truly dependable forces that firmly take the socialist road, win over all allies that can be won over, and unite with the masses of the people, who constitute more than 95 per cent of the population, in a common struggle against the enemies of socialism. In the rural areas, after the collectivization of agriculture it is necessary to rely on the poor and lower-middle peasants in order to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and the worker-peasant alliance, defeat the spontaneous capitalist tendencies and constantly strengthen and extend the positions of socialism.

SIXTH, it is necessary to conduct extensive socialist-education movements repeatedly in the cities and the countryside. In these continuous movements for educating the people we must be good at organizing the revolutionary class forces, enhancing their class consciousness, correctly handling contradictions among the people and uniting all those who can be united. In these movements it is necessary to wage a sharp, tit-for-tat struggle against the anti-socialist, capitalist and feudal forces—the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries and bourgeois Rightists, and the embezzlers, grafters and degenerates—in order to smash the attacks they unleash against socialism and to remould the majority of them into new men.

SEVENTH, one of the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat is actively to expand the socialist economy. It is necessary to achieve the modernization of industry, agriculture, science and technology, and national defence step by step under the guidance of the general policy of developing the national economy with agriculture as the foundation and industry as the leading factor. On the basis of the growth of production, it is necessary to raise the living standards of the people gradually and on a broad scale.

EIGHTH, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership are the two forms of socialist economy. The transition from collective ownership to ownership by the whole people, from two kinds of ownership to a unitary ownership by the whole people, is a rather long process. Collective ownership itself develops from lower to higher levels and from smaller to larger scale. The people’s commune which the Chinese people have created is a suitable form of organization for the solution of the question of this transition.

NINTH, “Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend” is a policy for stimulating the growth of the arts and the progress of science and for promoting a flourishing socialist culture. Education must serve proletarian politics and must be combined with productive labour. The working people should master knowledge and the intellectuals should become habituated to manual labour. Among those engaged in science, culture, the arts and education, the struggle to promote proletarian ideology and destroy bourgeois ideology is a protracted and fierce class struggle. It is necessary to build up a large detachment of working-class intellectuals who serve socialism and who are both “red and expert,” i.e., who are both politically conscious and professionally competent, by means of the cultural revolution, and revolutionary practice in class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment.

TENTH, it is necessary to maintain the system of cadre participation in collective productive labour. The cadres of our Party and state are ordinary workers and not overlords sitting on the backs of the people. By taking part in collective productive labour, the cadres maintain extensive, constant and close ties with the working people. This is a major measure of fundamental importance for a socialist system; it helps to overcome bureaucracy and to prevent revisionism and dogmatism.

ELEVENTH, the system of high salaries for a small number of people should never be applied. The gap between the incomes of the working personnel of the Party, the Government, the enterprises and the people’s communes, on the one hand, and the incomes of the mass of the people, on the other, should be rationally and gradually narrowed and not widened. All working personnel must be prevented from abusing their power and enjoying special privileges.

TWELFTH, it is always necessary for the people’s armed forces of a socialist country to be under the leadership of the party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the masses, and they must always maintain the glorious tradition of a people’s army, with unity between the army and the people and between officers and men. It is necessary to keep the system under which officers serve as common soldiers at regular intervals. It is necessary to practise military democracy, political democracy and economic democracy. Moreover, militia units should be organized and trained all over the country, so as to make everybody a soldier. The guns must for ever be in the hands of the Party and the people and must never be allowed to become the instruments of careerists.

THIRTEENTH, the people’s public security organs must always be under the leadership of the party of the proletariat and under the supervision of the mass of the people. In the struggle to defend the fruits of socialism and the people’s interests, the policy must be applied of relying on the combined efforts of the broad masses and the security organs, so that not a single bad person escapes or a single good person is wronged. Counter-revolutionaries must be suppressed whenever found, and mistakes must be corrected whenever discovered.
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FOURTEENTH, in foreign policy, it is necessary to uphold proletarian internationalism and oppose great-power chauvinism and national egoism. The socialist camp is the product of the struggle of the international proletariat and working people. It belongs to the proletariat and working people of the whole world as well as to the people of the socialist countries. We must truly put into effect the fighting slogans, “Workers of all countries, unite!” and “Workers and oppressed nations of the world, unite!” resolutely combat the anti-communist, anti-popular and counter-revolutionary policies of imperialism and reaction and support the revolutionary struggles of all the oppressed classes and oppressed nations. Relations among socialist countries should be based on the principles of independence, complete equality and the proletarian internationalist principle of mutual support and mutual assistance. Every socialist country should rely mainly on itself for its construction. If any socialist country practices national egoism in its foreign policy, or, worse yet, eagerly works in partnership with imperialism for the partition of the world, such conduct is degenerate and a betrayal of proletarian internationalism.

FIFTEENTH, as the vanguard of the proletariat, the Communist Party must exist as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists. The Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the proletariat. The leading role of the proletariat is realized through the leadership of the Communist Party. The system of Party committees exercising leadership must be put into effect in all departments. During the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the proletarian party must maintain and strengthen its close ties with the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people, maintain and develop its vigorous revolutionary style, uphold the principle of integrating the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of its own country, and persist in the struggle against revisionism, dogmatism and opportunism of every kind.

In the light of the historical lessons of the dictatorship of the proletariat Comrade Mao Tse-tung has stated:

Class struggle, the struggle for production and scientific experiment are the three great revolutionary movements for building a mighty socialist country. These movements are a sure guarantee that Communists will be free from bureaucracy and immune against revisionism and dogmatism, and will forever remain invincible. They are a reliable guarantee that the proletariat will be able to unite with the broad working masses and realize a democratic dictatorship. If, in the absence of these movements, the landlords, rich peasants, counter-revolutionaries, bad elements and ogres of all kinds were allowed to crawl out, while our cadres were to shut their eyes to all this and in many cases fail even to differentiate between the enemy and ourselves but were to collaborate with the enemy and become corrupted and demoralized, if our cadres were thus dragged into the enemy camp or the enemy were able to sneak into our ranks, and if many of our workers, peasants, and intellectuals were left defenseless against both the soft and the hard tactics of the enemy, then it would not take long, perhaps only several years or a decade, or several decades at least, before a counter-revolutionary restoration on a national scale inevitably occurred, the Marxist-Leninist party would undoubtedly become a revisionist party or a fascist party, and the whole of China would change its colour.10

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that in order to guarantee that our Party and country do not change their colour, we must not only have a correct line and correct policies but must train and bring up millions of successors who will carry on the cause of proletarian revolution.

In the final analysis, the question of training successors for the revolutionary cause of the proletariat is one of whether or not there will be people who can carry on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary cause started by the older generation of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not the leadership of our Party and state will remain in the hands of proletarian revolutionaries, whether or not our successors will continue to march along the correct road laid down by Marxism-Leninism, or, in other words, whether or not we can successfully prevent the emergence of Khrushchevite revisionism in China. In short, it is an extremely important question, a matter of life and death for our Party and our country. It is a question of fundamental importance to the proletarian revolutionary cause for a hundred, a thousand, may ten thousand years. Basing themselves on the changes in the Soviet Union, the imperialist prophets are pinning their hopes of “peaceful evolution” on the third or fourth generation of the Chinese Party. We must shatter these imperialist prophecies. From our highest organizations down to the grass-roots, we must everywhere give constant attention to the training and upbringing of successors to the revolutionary cause.

What are the requirements for worthy successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat?

They must be genuine Marxist-Leninists and not revisionists like Khrushchev wearing the cloak of Marxism-Leninism.

They must be revolutionaries who wholeheartedly serve the majority of the people of China and the whole world, and must not be like Khrushchev who serves both the interests of the handful of members of the privileged bourgeois stratum in his own country and those of foreign imperialism and reaction.

They must be proletarian statesmen capable of uniting and working together with the overwhelming majority. Not only must they unite with those who agree with them, they must also be good at uniting with those who disagree and even with those who formerly opposed them and have since been proved wrong. But they must especially watch out for careerists and conspirators like Khrushchev and pre-
vent such bad elements from usurping the leadership of the Party and Government at any level.

They must be models in applying the Party's democratic centralism, must master the method of leadership based on the principle of "from the masses, to the masses," and must cultivate a democratic style and be good at listening to the masses. They must not be despotic like Khrushchev and violate the Party's democratic centralism, make surprise attacks on comrades or act arbitrarily and dictatorially.

They must be modest and prudent and guard against arrogance and impetuosity; they must be imbued with the spirit of self-criticism and have the courage to correct mistakes and shortcomings in their work. They must not cover up their errors like Khrushchev, and claim all the credit for themselves and shift all the blame on others.

Successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat come forward in mass struggles and are tempered in the great storms of revolution. It is essential to test and know cadres and choose and train successors in the long course of mass struggle.

The above series of principles advanced by Comrade Mao Tse-tung are creative developments of Marxism-Leninism, to the theoretical arsenal of which they add new weapons of decisive importance for us in preventing the restoration of capitalism. So long as we follow these principles, we can consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, ensure that our Party and state will never change colour, successfully conduct the socialist revolution and socialist construction, help all peoples' revolutionary movements for the overthrow of imperialism and its lackeys, and guarantee the future transition from socialism to communism.

---

Regarding the emergence of the revisionist Khrushchev clique in the Soviet Union, our attitude as Marxist-Leninists is the same as our attitude towards any "disturbance"—first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it.

We did not wish it and are opposed to it, but since the revisionist Khrushchev clique have already emerged, there is nothing terrifying about them, and there is no need for alarm. The earth will continue to revolve, history will continue to move forward, the people of the world will, as always, make revolutions and the imperialists and their lackeys will inevitably meet their doom.

The historic contributions of the great Soviet people will remain for ever glorious; they can never be tarnished by the revisionist Khrushchev clique's betrayal. The broad masses of the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals and Communists of the Soviet Union will eventually surmount all the obstacles in their path and march towards communism.

The Soviet people, the people of all the socialist countries and the revolutionary people the world over will certainly learn lessons from the revisionist Khrushchev clique's betrayal. In the struggle against Khrushchev's revisionism, the international communist movement has grown and will continue to grow mightier than ever before.

Marxist-Leninists have always had an attitude of revolutionary optimism towards the future of the cause of the proletarian revolution. We are profoundly convinced that the brilliant light of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of socialism and of Marxism-Leninism will shine forth over the Soviet land. The proletariat is sure to win the whole world and communism is sure to achieve complete and final victory on earth.
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The Khrushchov Clique’s Anti-China Statements

Excerpts from the most representative of recent anti-China statements and articles by leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Soviet newspapers and periodicals, which covered four pages in Renuin Ribao, were published on July 13 by that paper under a banner headline: “The Revisionist Khrushchov Clique’s Recent Anti-China Statements.”

Renuin Ribao prefaced the excerpts with an editor’s note which reads:

“Since the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. this year, the revisionist Khrushchov clique have launched still more unbridled attacks on the Communist Party of China which adheres to Marxism-Leninism, on the great leader of the Chinese people Comrade Mao Tse-tung and on other leaders of our country. They have ceaselessly made and circulated anti-China statements through speeches, articles and other forms. Incomplete figures for April, May and June this year show that the national newspapers of the Soviet Union and the Union Republic newspapers have published more than 1,300 articles and other items attacking China. These attacks, or to be exact, slanders and fabrications, are as before, lengthy and offensive in smell, and extremely preposterous. Apart from repeating the hackneyed slanders that the Communist Party of China is engaged in divisive activities and that China wants a nuclear world war to advance revolution, etc., they have also assailed China’s state system, economic construction, political life, culture and arts, and the intra-Party life of the C.P.C.

“As we have done in the past, in addition to publishing the full texts of these statements and articles in volumes of ‘Anti-China Material From the Soviet Press’ by our publishing house, we are printing here extracts from the most representative of these anti-China slanders. We have added subheads and used bold type in some places for easier reading.”

Among the anti-China material published by Renuin Ribao this time were extracts from the anti-China speeches of Khrushchov and Suslov, the 20 anti-China articles published recently in Pravda, Communist, Party Life and Izvestia.

Speaking at a Soviet-German friendship rally in Moscow on June 12, Khrushchov, First Secretary of the C.P.S.U. and Chairman of the Council of Ministers, wantonly distorted and attacked the Marxist-Leninist stand of the C.P.C. on war and peace and other questions.

He said: “We do not have to seek adventurist paths. Only a person who sees no prospects in life, shoots, drowns himself, or wants to begin a world war.”

He alleged, “Our critics recall the facts of history... and draw the conclusion that for socialist revolution to win in other countries the working class should now start a new world war. . . .

“I believe that the most honest thing is to advise such people to consult a psychiatrist.”

Accusing the Chinese Communist Party of carrying on splitting activities, Khrushchov said:

“In the last few years the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, far from showing concern for the strengthening of the socialist system, have been shaking the unity of the socialist states step by step and creating difficulties in the way of implementing our common policy in the international arena. The efforts of the Chinese leaders to undermine the ideological and political foundations of the socialist community at all costs and to weaken the economic, military and cultural contacts among the socialist countries are daily becoming increasingly evident.”

Khrushchov said, “Ideological differences, through no fault of ours, have been extended to inter-state relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People’s Republic,” thus blaming China for what his clique had done.

Speaking at the 17th Congress of the French Communist Party on May 15, Mikhail Suslov, Member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and leader of the C.P.S.U. delegation to the congress, said, “The Chinese leaders work for the separation, the disunity of the principal revolutionary forces of our time — the world system of socialism, the international working class and the national-liberation movement — and this threatens to slow down the development of the world revolutionary process as a whole.

“The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party have only contempt for the struggle for peace, and, in effect, spur on the nuclear arms race, carry through a line which can lead to nuclear war... . .

“The Chinese leaders undermine the unity of the communist movement and democratic organizations, try to establish factions, pseudo-Marxist ‘parties,’ and seek to split the international communist movement and its national detachments.”

A lengthy article, “On Certain Aspects of the Party Life of the Chinese Communist Party,” printed in Pravda on April 28 and 29, levelled violent attacks on the intra-Party life and the Three Red Banners of the C.P.C. — the general line for building socialism, the great leap forward and the people’s commune. It alleged that in pursuing a new line in connection with the international communist movement and foreign and domestic policies, the Chinese leadership failed to consult the Party and ran counter to the resolutions adopted by the previous congresses of the Party.
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It said that the opposition of the "Chinese bosses" to close co-operation among the socialist countries had its roots in their "animosity towards the Soviet Union." It slandered the Chinese leadership as having put forward an "illusive" and "adventurist" economic policy. It alleged that "the neo-Trotskyite tendency in the leaders of the C.P.C. is marked by petty-bourgeois anarchism and nationalism, revisionism from the Left towards the resolutions of the congresses of their own Party and the decisions of the two Moscow meetings of the Communist Parties, and the defilement of the individual," and that "the gravest 'peculiarity' of the C.P.C. is that, at the will of its leaders, it actually has no party programme."

On May 10, 11 and 12, Pravda published three successive anti-China articles by its editorial department. It vitilified the leaders of the C.P.C. as "posing as supreme judges on questions of theory and politics," intent on "establishing the Chinese theoreticians' monopoly over Marxism-Leninism" and wishing to "usurp" the position of "head" of the communist movement. It alleged that the Chinese leaders were bogged down in "theoretical inactivity" and resorted to "idle talk." It slandered China as "making violence a fetish in every possible way, cultivate a regime of the personality cult." Pravda said the Chinese leadership conceived the ideal of "socialism" in its own way, which is "without developed industries, without democracy, law or respect for the right of the individual, and is perpetuating the poverty and destitution of the working people." When the Chinese leaders' pretensions to hegemony met with obstacles, it said, they laid their stake on a split of the communist movement.

The same paper, in an article on May 27, abused China on the question of Hongkong, saying that "in Hongkong capital from the Chinese People's Republic peacefully co-operates with British and American capital in jointly exploiting the working people."

In an article in Pravda of June 21, Yuri Zhukov maligned the Chinese leaders as having erected between China and the Soviet Union "a political and spiritual barrier, heavy and gloomy [than the Chinese Great Wall], against the interests of both countries."

In its issues Nos 7, 8 and 9 the Soviet journal, Communist, published three articles by its editorial department, one in each issue. In No. 7, it maligned the C.P.C. as engaged in "interference" in the internal affairs of fraternal Parties and other socialist countries and undertaking to "knock together groupings from among renegades, turncoats and adventurers."

Issue No. 9 directed its vituperative attack on the C.P.C.'s line and policy in culture and art, saying that the Chinese leaders followed "a peculiar course, alien to true revolutionary theory," that "it is marked by dogmatism and sectarianism." It scurrilously declared that the line "let a hundred flowers blossom, and a hundred schools of thought contend" is a "deviation from Leninist principles" and is "repeating the capitulationist slogans of Trotsky and Bukharin." It added that "as for the call for struggle with 'poisonous grass,' this means a peculiar justification of the repression of the intellectuals in literature and art," and that "the propaganda of mass songs now prevailing in China is completely steeped in nationalism and a militarist spirit."

Culminating the Chinese slogan, "learn from Comrade Lei Feng," it said, "Lei Feng is not a human being, but a 'screw of Mao Tse-tung's' which mechanically fulfills the will of others."

The article added, "in works of literature and art, Mao Tse-tung appears as a certain god who delivers the people from all misfortune."

The Soviet journal, Party Life, published in its issue No. 7 an article by its editorial department attacking China's general line for building socialism: the great leap forward and the people's commune. It also slandered the Chinese leaders for carrying on activities "for the creation of factional groupings" in the world communist movement. It accused the C.P.C. of "endeavouring to spread the personality cult of Mao Tse-tung to the entire world communist movement," and said that Mao Tse-tung, "like a god, rises above the Marxist-Leninist parties."

Another editorial in issue No. 11 of the same journal once again vilified the C.P.C. as trying to "rig up a special 'international bloc.'" It said that the C.P.C., out of its ambitions for hegemony, and in league with renegades, Trotskyites and adventurers of all descriptions carried on factional activities in opposition to the world communist movement.

Between May 17 and June 6, the Soviet newspaper, Izvestia, carried five anti-China articles by its editorial department alleging that "the Chinese leaders obstinately look for non-existent exploited classes or bourgeois strata and for class struggle in a socialist society."

It said: "In China the dictatorship of the proletariat in the absence of state and intra-Party democracy, turns into a dictatorship of a group of leaders. This practice... is consummated in and crowned with the cult of Mao Tse-tung."

The paper blamed China for what the Khrushchov clique had done—"severing not only political, but economic relations with fraternal countries." It accused China of "opposing the principle of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance" by "creating a special bloc of those socialist countries which lag behind in their economic development."

On June 30, the same paper published an article by V.A. Zorin, Vice-Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, attacking the Chinese leaders for opposing the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear arms. In so doing, Zorin wrote, "The Chinese leaders have actually found themselves in the same company as the most aggressive imperialist circles that are hindering the entire process of the easing of international tensions and the consolidation of universal peace."

Zorin said: "The very idea of the necessity of acquiring their own nuclear weapons... may arise only when they harbour certain peculiar aims and interests which the socialist camp cannot support with its military might."
Chinese People Ready to Smash U.S. Provocations

by OUR CORRESPONDENT

All over the country, our people are hailing the shooting down from the east China sky of another U.S.-made Chiang Kai-shek U-2 spy plane. After the recent downing of a U.S.-Chiang P2V plane above north China and the annihilation of group after group of Chiang Kai-shek armed agents who tried to land along the coast, the July 7 victory scored by the Air Force of the People's Liberation Army was another body blow at U.S. imperialism which is stepping up its aggressive schemes against the peoples of China and all East and Southeast Asia.

Sworn Enemy of the Chinese People. The U-2 intrusion is one more reminder to the Chinese people that U.S. imperialism is their sworn enemy. The American aggressors are still lording it over our Taiwan. The U.S. 7th Fleet still flaunts itself in the Taiwan Straits. Despite China's repeated warnings, U.S. aircraft and warships have not stopped intruding into our air space and territorial waters. Washington is giving continuing support to the traitor Chiang to harass our mainland and even prepare for "an invasion." As U.S. imperialism intensifies its aggression in south Viet Nam and Laos, State Department officials and Pentagon brasshats are mouthing threats to extend the war to the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam and to China. In the face of such threats, the Chinese people cannot remain unprepared.

U.S. Lie Exposed. The downing of the U-2 plane shows up the utter hypocrisy of U.S. imperialism. When the first U-2 was brought down on a spy mission over the mainland in September 1962, the State Department announced that it had been purchased by the Chiang gang from the U.S. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and that only two U-2s were so sold. Kennedy then declared that Chiang was not allowed to buy more planes of this type. Now that a third U-2 has been bagged, the State Department has lost the power of speech but the press in the United States is clamouing for the supply of more U-2s to Chiang.

Washington is however indulging in day-dreams if it thinks that it can coerce the Chinese people by armed threats. As the rallies, public speeches and press comments in all parts of China during the past few days show, the Chinese people are ever ready to smash all U.S. aggression and war provocations. And this determination was well expressed by the militant mass rally held in Peking on July 14.

650 Million People Will Not Be Bullied. Vice-Chairman of the Chinese Peace Committee Liao Cheng-chih declared at the rally: "No armed force in the world can cow the 650 million Chinese people. The army and the people of our country will continue to maintain keen vigilance, and be ready at all times to hit hard the enemies who venture to attack. The Chinese people will liberate our territory of Taiwan without fail. Together with the peoples of Asia and the rest of the world, the Chinese people will strive to the end to smash the U.S. imperialist policy of war and aggression and to defend world peace."

A Warning to Washington. President of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions Liu Ning-I stated: "The Chinese people are a staunch people with high political consciousness and great courage who have had numerous trials of strength with imperialism. We once again give a stern warning to U.S. imperialism: the sacred territory of China is inviolable. We will certainly not tolerate U.S. imperialism spreading the flames of war to our side. We will settle accounts with the U.S. imperialists for their every provocation and crime and punish them most severely. Should U.S. imperialism dare embark on the adventure of extending the war, it will end up in the same way it did in its war of aggression in Korea."

Tsai Ting-kai, Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Committee of the Kuomingtang, supported the Chinese Government's stand on the situation in Southeast Asia and said on behalf of the democratic parties and the All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce: "The Chinese people absolutely will not stand by idly while the Geneva agreements are torn up and the flames of war are spread to their side. We cannot be expected to look on with folded arms at any aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam."

Don't Play With Fire! P.L.A. combat hero Air Force Colonel Liu Yu-ji warned the U.S. imperialists: "Should you dare play with fire and stage any adventure against the Chinese people, you will meet with a resolute rebuff. Armed with the thinking of Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese people and Chinese People's Liberation Army have the determination, the confidence, the strength and the ability to smash all provocations."
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Struggle Against U.S. Imperialism

Unity of Chinese and Japanese Peoples Strengthened

by OUR CORRESPONDENT

Thirty friends from the Japanese Socialist Party arrived in China early this month at the invitation of the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs. Friendly co-operation between the Chinese and Japanese peoples, for which a good foundation had already been laid by three previous Japanese Socialist Party delegations to China, will be strengthened by this latest friendly visit.


Five years ago in 1959, during his second visit to China, Inejiro Asanuma, late Chairman of the Japanese Socialist Party, made the famous statement that U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the Japanese and Chinese peoples. This epitomized the common understanding of the two peoples and is the foundation for the development of their militant friendship.

Development of Asanuma Spirit

Development of the Asanuma spirit and constant strengthening of militant friendship between the Chinese and Japanese peoples were keynoted in the speeches by speakers at the July 10 reception given by eight Chinese people’s organizations in honour of the Japanese guests.

Chang Hsi-jo, President of the Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs, pointed out in his speech that the Chinese and Japanese peoples were the direct victims of the U.S. imperialist policy of war and aggression. The U.S. imperialists have trampled on Japan’s sovereignty, occupied its territory Okinawa and Ogashawara, used the “Japan-U.S. Security Treaty” to exercise control and engage in intervention in Japan, thus undermining Japan’s independence and endangering its security. The U.S. imperialists also have occupied the Chinese territory of Taiwan, pushed forward the reactionary policy of “containing” China and opened hostility to the Chinese people. “This is eloquent proof that the famous statement that ‘U.S. imperialism is the common enemy of the Japanese and Chinese peoples’ made five years ago by Inejiro Asanuma is an incontrovertible truth. It has always been an eloquent reflection of the fact that the Chinese and Japanese peoples are waging a common struggle against U.S. imperialism.”

Hisao Kuroda, Socialist member of the Japanese House of Representatives, said: “This statement has become a common, fundamental spirit and lives among us in our struggle to smash the military rule of U.S. imperialism and recover our occupied territory and in China’s struggle to liberate Taiwan. We are convinced that the Japanese and Chinese peoples will certainly triumph in their struggle.”

Tetsuo Ara, head of the amity delegation of the Hokkaido Socialist Party Headquarters, said: “The Asanuma spirit adopted by our Party has always been the basic policy of our struggle against U.S. imperialism. As members of the Socialist Party we are prepared to make the greatest efforts to carry out this Party decision.”

Yuji Soga, head of the delegation of the Socialist Research Institute of Japan, emphasized the need to develop the Asanuma statement. He said that in the present situation, in order to strengthen and develop the present struggle of the Japanese people, it was necessary to learn from the Asanuma statement and the experience of the struggle against the “Japan-U.S. Security Treaty” which embodied the spirit of that statement. “The Asanuma statement is a truth which will neither perish today, nor tomorrow.”

Opposing the “Two Chinas” Scheme—A Torrential Tide

Demanding the restoration of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations and opposing the “two Chinas” scheme have become a torrential tide. This was stressed by Nan Han-chen, President of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade. He said that the biggest obstacle to the normalization of Sino-Japanese relations was U.S. imperialism. For many years, U.S. imperialism, disregarding the opposition of the Japanese people, has tried every means to obstruct and interfere with the normalization of Sino-Japanese relations, and pushed its “two Chinas” scheme in an attempt to legalize its occupation of Taiwan. Recently it has been clamouring about “one China, one Taiwan,” which in essence is a refurbished version of the “two Chinas” scheme.

“The Chinese people resolutely oppose the U.S. ‘two Chinas’ scheme and are determined to liberate
their territory of Taiwan. In whatever form, the ‘two Chinas’ scheme is doomed to failure,” Nan Han-chen said.

He noted that the friends from the Japanese Socialist Party present at the reception had always cherished justice in firm opposition to the “two Chinas” scheme. “It is clearly stated in the official documents of the Japanese Socialist Party that it recognizes only one China, that is, the People’s Republic of China, that it refuses to recognize the existence of ‘two Chinas,’ and that the liberation of Taiwan is China’s internal affair.”

Nan Han-chen also stated: “This shows that the demand for early restoration of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations and opposition to ‘two Chinas’ has become a powerful and irresistible current. This is an important feature of present Sino-Japanese relations and the mass movement in Japan.”

Kozo Sasaki, Socialist Member of the Japanese House of Representatives, expressed the conviction that only through the struggle against U.S. imperialism and striving for an independent, peaceful, neutral and democratic Japan, could the genuine friendship between the two peoples be strengthened and diplomatic relations between the two countries restored.

Hisao Kuroda pointed out that a powerful mass movement against the U.S. imperialist policy of containing China was under way in Japan. The Japanese people were launching a campaign to collect 30 million signatures calling for early restoration of diplomatic relations between China and Japan, and they had brought forth a series of slogans demanding the smashing of the “Japan-Chiang Treaty,” restoration of China’s rights in the United Nations and against the “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan” scheme.

Speaking of the Tenth World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs soon to be convened in Japan, Chang Hsi-jo said that the Chinese people would give it positive support. “Like the people of Japan, the Chinese people are firmly opposed to all forms of nuclear blackmail and U.S. imperialism’s nuclear war preparations.” He reaffirmed the determination of the Chinese Government and people in opposing the tripartite partial nuclear test ban treaty signed in Moscow last July, which was a big fraud jointly plotted by the two big nuclear powers, the United States and the Soviet Union.

Although it was known that the Japanese Socialist Party held views different from ours on this question, so long as friends from the Japanese Socialist Party stood firm for the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and the establishment of a nuclear free zone in Asia and the Pacific Region, something in common could still be found among us and we could still join hands in the common struggle against U.S. imperialist nuclear monopoly, nuclear blackmail and policy of nuclear war preparations. Chang Hsi-jo said.

The 30 friends from the Japanese Socialist Party were given a warm welcome in China. Chairman Mao Tse-tung received them on July 10 and had a cordial and friendly talk with them. Previously, on July 2, Premier Chou En-lai met Kozo Sasaki and five other Socialist Party members, and had an amiable talk with them.

By mid-July some of the Japanese guests had left for home while others were continuing their tour of China.

Conspiracy Against the Congo (L)

Following is a slightly abridged translation of an article by “Renmin Ribao’s” Commentator (July 12) entitled “No Chance of Horses in the Congo (L) Can Save the U.S. From Defeat.” Subheads are ours.—Ed.

U.S. IMPERIALISM has staged the farce of changing horses in the Congo (Leopoldville). Tshombe whose hands are stained with the blood of the Congo’s national hero Lumumba, now replaces Adoula as prime minister of the puppet government. This is the beginning of a great conspiracy, made by U.S. imperialism with the old colonialists, to suppress the revolutionary armed struggle of the Congolese people and save itself from defeat in its aggression against the Congo.

Under cover of the U.N. flag, U.S. imperialism made inroads on the Congo by means of the so-called “U.N. force,” suppressed the Congolese people’s struggle to preserve their independence and turned the country into its colony. But, contrary to its wish, armed suppression by U.S. imperialism has forced the Congolese people to take up arms and fight for their liberation. The flames of the Congolese people’s patriotic armed struggle have swept the western, southern and eastern parts of the country, and continued to spread. An excellent revolutionary situation now prevails there. U.S. imperialism tries hard to put down the armed struggle of the Congolese people, but under the pressure of world public opinion, the United States can no longer use the “U.N. force” as its instrument for aggression in the Congo, while the puppet Congolese troops, trained and equipped by imperialism, are hopelessly demoralized and always flee in panic when confronted by the Congolese patriotic armed forces. In the Congo, under the rule of the United States and the Adoula group, prices soared sky high, unemployment increased and the life of the people was miserable. It was admitted by the U.S. press that Adoula was “weak... and without grass-roots support” and “resentment against him runs deep even in Leopoldville.” The Adoula group thus had lost its use-
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fulness as a running dog. The Washington Daily News noted that "developments have proved the futility of both U.S. and U.N. policy in the Congo. It is late, but perhaps not too late, to about-face and give Mr. Tshombe a chance." This implies that by kicking Adoula out and placing Tshombe in power, U.S. imperialism hopes to prevent its defeat in its aggression in the Congo.

Why Does the U.S. Pick Tshombe?

As is well known, Moïse Tshombe formerly was the agent of the old colonialists, namely, Belgium and Britain, in Katanga. To seize Katanga, the United States used the "U.N. force" to attack that province three times and finally succeeded in throwing Tshombe out and seizing control there. But Tshombe remains very influential in Katanga. In addition, he still keeps an army in Angola trained and commanded by white officers, ready to strike when opportunity comes. By placing Tshombe in power, U.S. imperialism hopes temporarily to ease its contradictions with old colonialism so that both may join forces against the patriotic Congolese armed forces.

U.S. imperialism realizes that the old colonialists are not reconciled to their ouster in the Congo. During his visit there at the end of March this year, Averell Hartman, U.S. Under Secretary of State, openly admitted the "possible danger" of Tshombe's comeback with the backing of old colonialism. Moreover, in the present circumstances where the revolutionary situation in the Congo is daily progressing, it would be most disadvantageous to U.S. imperialism if the old and new colonialists renewed armed clashes over control of Katanga. Furthermore, after its seizure of the Congo, as reported in the U.S. press, the United States has surveyed the country's resources and found that, besides Katanga, other provinces also have rich resources, even richer than Katanga in timber, agriculture and hydroelectric power. U.S. monopoly capital finds ample room to manoeuvre in the Congo. Thus, Washington has decided to water down its contradictions with the old colonialists temporarily to make the suppression of the Congolese people a common task, thus avoiding a repetition of its predicament in south Viet Nam where it has to go all alone. U.S. support for Tshombe symbolizes the collusion of old and new colonialism in the Congo.

Commenting on Tshombe's return to the Congo, the London Times said that the reason why the United States had entrusted Tshombe with the job of carrying out the "national reconciliation" scheme was that "with his record of co-operation with capitalism in Katanga, combined with an anti-Americanism derived from United States support for the campaigns against him, Mr. Tshombe could well emerge as a generally accepted 'neutral leader.'" In other words, U.S. imperialism believes that lap-dog Tshombe is not only in a position to reconcile the contradictions among the various puppet groups because he has the backing of all imperialist and colonial powers but he also can dupe the Congolese people by making political capital of his once having been ousted by the United States. In this way it is hoped to shatter the patriotic forces in the Congo and win over the wavering elements among them and so undermine the Congolese people's revolutionary struggle. Such is the truth about so-called "national reconciliation" sponsored by U.S. imperialism.

In addition, U.S. imperialism also hopes to make use of Tshombe to intensify suppression of the Congolese people after unifying various groups of the Congolese reactionary forces. Thanks to the materialization of so-called "national reconciliation," it is now possible to send the several thousand puppet soldiers stationed in Katanga to attack the patriotic armed forces. To suppress the Congolese people Tshombe will also move his troops outside the country—trained and commanded by mercenary officers — back to the Congo and restore in Katanga his huge armed forces which had been put to rout. Tshombe has clamoured that he will launch a "pacification campaign" against the Congolese people's armed forces. Puppet Congolese president Kasavubu also declared that any uprising would be stamped out rapidly and rigorously. These are clear indications of their criminal intentions. Besides, the United States will also instruct Tshombe to ask other African countries to send troops to the Congo in support of the repressive measures of this puppet regime — a sinister plot to make Africans fight Africans. Describing the founding of a government headed by Tshombe as "a good beginning," the New York Herald Tribune openly called on the African countries to "do their part" by giving the puppet regime direct military and economic support. All these call for the high vigilance of the people of the Congo and the whole of Africa and all peace-loving people of the world.

The People Will Win

The new running dog Tshombe has now assumed office. But Tshombe, like Nguyen Khanh in south Viet Nam, can never save U.S. imperialism from its defeat. The Congolese people will not be taken in by Tshombe, the man whose hands are stained with the blood of Lumumba. They see clearly that both Adoula and Tshombe are mere tools of imperialism in its aggression against their country; that both are traitors to the Congolese nation. The political clurtrap of U.S. imperialism in making use of Tshombe will eventually prove bankrupt. The military repression of the Congolese people by the old and new colonialists will also meet ignominious failures. U.S. imperialist aggression against the Congo in the past four years has failed to shake the determination of the people there to fight for liberation. Nor will the addition of several old colonialist powers and the putting up of a new stooge forestall their defeat. The destiny of the Congo can only be determined by the Congolese people themselves. No outside forces, no imperialist intrigues can lead the Congolese people away from their chosen path. So long as they heighten their vigilance, strengthen their unity, and keep to the correct road of armed struggle, we believe that the patriotic Congolese forces will certainly smash all intrigues of U.S. imperialism and its stooges and attain the great victory of national liberation.
Malawi and the "Two Chinas" Scheme

Beware of the Imperialist Trap

Following is a translation of an article by "Renmin Ribao's" Commentator (July 9) under the title “Don't Fall Into the Imperialist Trap.” — Ed.

HASTINGS K. Banda, Prime Minister of newly independent Malawi (Nyasaland) in Central Africa, at his country's independence celebrations dinner on July 5, once again openly advocated "two Chinas." He declared that the fact that he had "invited two Chinas" showed that he was "for the whole world" and was "not going to be entangled in cold war." Announcing the arrival in Malawi of the Chiang Kai-shek bandit gang's representative, Banda even blamed the Government of the People's Republic of China for not sending its representative to the celebrations. He said, "Stay away if you don't want to come." These statements of the Malawi Prime Minister must be taken as a very unfriendly attitude towards the Chinese people.

We are willing to believe that the Malawi Prime Minister's statements were made out of ignorance. However, we must point out that these utterances openly supporting the U.S. scheme of creating "two Chinas" constitute not only entanglement in imperialist cold war but also undisguised meddling in China's internal affairs. It is not indifference in China's internal affairs to declare, in consonance with the imperialists, a province of China as an "independent state"? How would the Malawi Government react if its country should be treated like this by another?

The Malawi Government cannot be unaware of the Chinese Government's resolute stand against "two Chinas." Before Malawi's independence, a representative sent to Malawi by the Chinese Government had clearly explained to the Malawi Government the serious nature of the imperialists' plot to create "two Chinas" and made known in unequivocal terms the attitude of the Chinese Government, that is, in no circumstances would it tolerate a situation of "two Chinas" in any form. We pointed out that if the Malawi Government "invited" the representative of the Chiang Kai-shek bandit gang to the independence celebrations, no representative of the Chinese Government would be sent. This was a completely friendly attitude on the part of the Chinese Government, based on its sincere desire to promote Sino-Malawi friendly relations. But the Malawi Government not only insisted on "inviting" the representative of the Chiang Kai-shek gang which cannot in any way represent the Chinese people, it has also time and again repeated the absurdities jointly given out by the U.S. and British imperialists about "two Chinas" in an attempt to create a "two Chinas" situation at its independence celebrations. Under these circumstances, the Chinese Government of course could not send any representa-
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South Viet Nam

The Thousand and Second Way

Whatever "D" stands for — distress, doom or disaster, it is a bad omen for Maxwell Taylor, the new U.S. "ambassador" to the puppet south Viet Nam regime. On his arrival in Saigon on July 7 the local press splashed the news that the "D-War Area" on the outer fringes of Saigon had fallen to the people's forces. Ba Da, the last bastion held by the U.S. aggressors and the Nguyen Khanh troops, had been captured.

The "D-War Area," with the Ty River on the east, the No. 13 Highway on the west and the Dong Nai River on the south, is strategically placed. Several important supply lines pass along its borders. It was a resistance base against the French before the Geneva conference. When the Americans moved in after 1954 they built strong fortifications there.

For a year starting from May 1963 the people's forces had been storming this "D-War Area." In operations which ended in the middle of May they liberated the greater part of it and forced the Americans and the Khanh troops to withdraw from everywhere except Ba Da. Then in the middle of June they mounted an attack on this last stronghold. The garrison and the regiment sent to cover its retreat were routed. The capture of the entire "D-War Area" in the face of beefed-up American military measures is an important victory for the south Vietnamese people in their war of liberation.

In fact, they have done well throughout the first six months of this year. In 14,000 attacks and sorties they have put 42,000 enemy troops out of action. The casualties included 511 American servicemen killed and 315 wounded. Available statistics show that in 1962, twenty-two Americans were killed or wounded every month. The figure went up to 71 in 1963 and further to 137 in the first half of this year.

During this period the people's forces shot down 171 enemy aircraft and damaged 327, four times the figure for 1962 and 80 per cent of last year's total, and captured large amounts of weapons. To date, the liberated area embraces three-fourths of the territory of south Viet Nam with a population of eight million now freed from the shackles of U.S.-propped Khanh rule.

This is the situation that confronts the man on whom President Johnson now pins his hopes. As one who knew firsthand something of the tight spot in which the United States has landed itself, Taylor could do no more than call for "redoubled efforts" on the part of all American servicemen and officials in south Viet Nam. In a circular letter quoting Secretary of State Dean Rusk who said "We are already aiding the Vietnamese in a thousand and one ways," he wrote: "but let us not be satisfied with the performance when it might prove that the thousand and second way is the decisive one."

"The thousand and one ways" already tried include the discredited "Staley-Taylor Plan." For ten years U.S. imperialism has been trying to conquer the people of south Viet Nam by multifarious ways, not excluding the use of napalms and toxic chemicals. Taylor cannot hope to succeed with his "thousand and second way" where he and others have already failed.

Algeria

Nation On Guard

Vigilance is the watchword. This was stressed in all the celebrations held throughout Algeria on July 5 to mark the second anniversary of independence. In the rally in Algiers, the capital, President Ben Bella called on the nation to stand guard over the republic's independence and defend the fruits of the revolution against the activities of hostile elements working for the moneyed and oil interests.

Action became necessary because the counter-revolutionaries had been operating in an aggressively open way. On July 2 the National Assembly passed a bill introducing capital punishment. On the eve of Independence Day the Central Committee of the F.L.N. (National Liberation Front), of which Ben Bella is the General Secretary, expelled ten members including Mohammed Boudiaf, Ait Ahmed, Mohammed Chabani, Mohammed Khider, and Hassani Moussa.

President Ben Bella denounced the schemings of these enemies of the Algerian revolution. He said Ait Ahmed (a minister of state in the former Provisional Government) had tried to create a hostile force in the Kabylie region with the help of money supplied from abroad and by the big feudalists at home. Boudiaf (Vice-Premier of the former Provisional Government) had been his accomplice. The President accused Mohammed Khider of withholding large sums that belong to the F.L.N. and campaigning against the Government abroad. He condemned Mohammed Chabani, commander of the 4th Military Region until his expulsion, for his treasonable attempts to set up a sultanate of Sahara to restore the feudal system.

President Ben Bella said that confronted with such counter-revolutionary activities the Government was compelled to act. Troops were sent to the Sahara town of Biskra to put down the rebellion started by Chabani who was himself captured. The swift and successful campaign against Chabani who was deserted by the men under him is a demonstration of Algeria's revolutionary strength. "Those who kill," Ben Bella warns, "will be killed."

CORRECTION: In the article "For the Revolutionization of Our Youth!", a report by Hu Yao-pang in our last issue (No. 28), the word "antitheses" should read "differences" in the translation of the phrase: "the antitheses between workers and peasants;..." and in other places.
PEKING OPERA

Festival Activities Continue

By July 12, all 30-odd Peking opera productions entered in the festival of Peking opera on contemporary themes had been shown. The 26 troupes which performed and other troupes from all over the country which came to watch have now entered a busy period of learning the best productions, swapping experience, and intensive study and discussion on various aspects of Peking opera on contemporary themes. Each troupe is determined to make the best of this last period of the festival and return to its home city the richer by as many new operas as it can learn.

Beginning July 15, the festival operas are being given public performances in the capital. Opera fans old and new, will have ample opportunity to catch up on what they have missed.

The last group of 13 new plays presented up to July 12 yielded many more successes. Audiences also got the great satisfaction of seeing some of the biggest names in Peking opera act in these new modern-theme operas, side by side with the younger generation of stars. To mention one instance, Ma Lien-liang and Ma Fu-lu, both veterans of the stage, collaborated with well-known younger artists such as Chiu Sheng-jung and Chao Yen-hsi, as well as teenage students of the Peking Opera School. In Tuchuan Mountain, they brought to life on the stage a group of peasants who, driven to take up arms against brutal landlord exploitation and oppression, became a well-organized detachment of the Red Army when they eventually got Communist Party leadership.

Originally scheduled to end on July 9, the festival has been extended to the end of the month.

SPORTS

Indonesian Sportsmen in China

The Indonesian sportsmen who recently visited China and their Chinese hosts are well pleased with the results of the visit. Keen and friendly rivalry in track and field events brought out several new national records for their countries. In badminton, honours were divided evenly 4-4 in matches played in Canton, Peking and Shanghai.

Track & Field. In the friendly competitions held in Canton, Peking and Shanghai, Chinese athletes improved five national records while the visitors equalled two and broke six Indonesian records. The new Indonesian records included Agung Ngurah Manik's 66.91 m. in the men's javelin throw.

At the Shanghai meet, Liu Ching-feng, China's champion at the First GANEFO, won the photo-finish men's 100 metres by bare inches from Indonesia's Joede Pesak Oroh and Mohamed Sarengat. All three were timed at 10.6 sec. At the Peking competition the men's 200 metres and the men's 110 metres hurdles had spectators on their feet cheering. In the 200 metres China's Chen Chia-chuan won the event from Indonesia's Joede Pesak Oroh, winner of this event at the First GANEFO, in 21.9 sec. China's Tsui Lin, a newcomer to hurdles, won the high hurdles in 14.4 sec. from Kao Chi-chiao, the First GANEFO's champion, and Indonesia's Mohamed Sarengat, who was runner-up at the First GANEFO.

Badminton. The Indonesian badminton team was a strong one. It included members of Indonesia's GANEFO and world championship Japan Cup line-ups and they brought sparkling play to the courts which delighted Chinese spectators.

Their first match in Peking on June 28 drew a capacity crowd to the Peking Gymnasium. Highlight of the evening was the men's doubles between Indonesia's Tan Yoe Hak and Unang, and China's Fu Hansun and Hou Chia-chang. It was a hard-hitting match with long rallies. The rapid-fire attack of the Chinese players carried the day.

Minarni and Retno Koestijah, the Indonesian women's doubles pair which won all its matches in China, defeated China's Chen Chia-yen and Chen Li-chuan (15:8, 15:3) that evening.

PALAEONTOLOGY

Shisha Pangma Expedition Found Rare Fossils

The heroic summiteers of the Shisha Pangma climb continue to hold the limelight but now the scientific team attached to the expedition are coming in for their share of public attention. Excavating in Tingri County, Tibet, scientists with the expedition, it is reported, made an important find of a number of gigantic palaeovertebrate fossils dating back 150 to 200 million years. They are being sent to Peking for further study.

Liu Tung-sheng, geologist in charge of the excavations, says that these fossils may be a hitherto unknown species of giant reptile of the Triassic period (c. 250 million years ago) or of the Jurassic period (c. 150 million years ago). They were located at a height of 4,400 metres above sea level on the slopes of Supe Hill in Tingri County, in strata of blackish green shale and sandstone. One fossil was found in an oval lense of sandstone, three metres long and two metres wide. It is composed of eight vertebrae of a spinal column, more than ten ribs and a number of flat bones which have not yet been identified. The biggest vertebra has a diameter of 24 cms, while the longest of the ribs is 230 cms.

Many marine fossils, including starfish, nautilus, ammonites and other molluscs, were found together with the reptilian fossil bones. These and other signs indicate that the strata where the fossils were located were formed by marine sedimentation in the Mesozoic age.

Specialists regard the discovery of these fossils as of great value to the study of ancient forms of life. They also give fresh clues about the ancient geography of this part of Tibet and how the Himalayan ranges were formed.
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Progress in Pediatrics

Big strides in pediatrics, the special branch of medical science that deals with preventing and treating children's diseases, are being made in socialist China. Prior to liberation in 1949 the vast majority of the population was condemned to living conditions which inevitably resulted in this country having one of the world's highest rates of infant and child mortality. This has now become a thing of the past.

Diseases once common to children, which annually took a large toll of young lives, have been brought under control and in some cases almost completely wiped out. In China's capital child mortality is now less than one-fourth what it was in 1950.

Last month's national congress on pediatrics provided a wealth of encouraging statistics. The congress reported that small-pox has been wiped out while such endemic diseases as kala-azar (black sickness or dum-dum fever) in north China and schistosomiasis (a fluke infestation) in the Yangtse valley provinces have been virtually eliminated among children. Other dread diseases like poliomyelitis, tuberculosis and measles have to a large extent been brought under control.

The use of a made-in-China live, oral anti-polio vaccine has met with great success. Last year over 30 million under-sevens in urban areas were given this vaccine either in liquid form or as “candy.” As a result the number of polio cases has plummeted. In Shanghai alone in 1963 there were 92.3 per cent fewer cases than in 1959.

Extensive use of BCG vaccine has sharply curtailed tuberculosis cases. Deaths among children from this killer disease in Peking last year were reduced to 1.6 per cent of the 1949 figure.

Various kinds of measles virus vaccine are being used with heartening results. This spring under 3 per cent of those susceptible contracted this disease and the death rate was extremely low.

Toxic dysentery, a disease common among children under two, is a form of bacillary dysentery that often causes death due to circulatory or respiratory collapse within 24 hours. This is being successfully treated by induced hibernation or hypothermia, a method developed by a Peking hospital. By this method the hospital has drastically lowered the mortality rate from 33 per cent to one per cent.

Recently, in 1,000 cases improved methods of treatment for acute intestinal intussusception have achieved a recovery rate of 95 per cent.

Child surgery, a post-liberation development, is performed in more than a hundred provincial and city hospitals. There are now 27 modern children's hospitals with 20 times as many beds as before 1949. Their work is supplemented by the pediatric departments of the general hospitals. More and more production brigades in rural people's communes are setting up mother and child health centres. This is of immense importance because the bulk of China's children live in the villages.

Leading Cadres at Grass-Roots

Responsible cadres in Szechuan Province's transport departments have boosted transportation efficiency by moving out of their offices and taking to the roads and waterways, aboard lorries, boats and barges. This is in keeping with the national policy that all leading cadres should take a direct part in physical labour when possible.

All responsible cadres of transport departments in Szechuan now spend a third of each month working at the lowest administrative level as crew members on boats and lorries, in maintenance and repair depots, as deliverymen, etc. The remainder of the work month is equally divided between the office and inspection tours.

The aim is to avoid bureaucracy, keep leaders in touch with the rank and file and the actual working conditions of departments they head. Working at the grass-roots, leaders have an excellent opportunity to familiarize themselves with and study actual methods and conditions of work, and make improvements.

For example, a senior bureau chief worked with a team transporting live pigs. Purpose: to study prevention of pigs dying on the road or losing weight. After his trip he summed up his findings and with transport crews worked out a method that now ensures their live cargo arriving in good order. This was only one of the problems solved with a resultant rise in efficiency.
areas meeting recently in Sining, capital of Chinghai Province, stressed the need for concrete measures for scientific management of wildlife and for controlled hunting. The meeting called on all hunters to observe strictly State Council rules on the protection and proper disposal of fauna.

The reason for controls and conservation measures is primarily economic. Each year these vast areas yield huge quantities of fur, pelts, feathers, fats, antlers, musk, bear gall and other valuable animal products. Here, too, live the precious Giant Panda, wild yak, wild camel, the stone marten and the Golden Monkey.

Chinghai Province in northwest China already has 12 areas listed as animal sanctuaries and nine species of animals on the protected list. Plans for Chinghai call for the preservation, protection and judicious use of the province's rich natural resources. The area is roughly 721,000 sq. km, and higher than 3,000 m. above sea level. Three times the size of Britain, Chinghai has more than 240 species of birds and 50 species of animals. This is the home of the Mongolian gazelle, argali, Tibetan antelope, lynx, bear, wild ass, musk deer, white-lipped deer, white-eared pheasant, blue-eared pheasant and snow pheasant. Many highly prized Chinese medical preparations and exotic plummages come from this province.

Hunting in the Chinghai region is now supervised by a provincial hunting control committee assisted by county hunters' associations. Set seasons and listed protected animals ensure fair game and give animals threatened with extinction a chance to multiply. Farms set up to propagate the rarer and more economically valuable species, such as the musk and white-lipped deer, have been successful in their work. Annually, large quantities of antlers and musk have come from deer scientifically managed and raised as renewable resources on preserves.

Old Shepherd Honoured

A DOUBLE celebration honouring an old shepherd took place in early June at the Shanxi Agricultural College in Taiyuan. The event marked college sheepman Pan Erhsiao's 67th birthday and 60 years of sheep herding. The four-hour reception was attended by the college president, vice-presidents and hundreds of students and faculty members.

Flanked by posters bearing greetings for the occasion, the old man, sitting on the stage in front of his own portrait in the centre, made a speech comparing his present lot with his suffering and travail of old. "The first 50 years of my life were spent in pre-liberation society. I lived no better than an animal," he told his audience.

Forced to tend sheep at seven, Pan worked for a landlord. He spent his childhood following the flock, sleeping with the sheep to keep alive in the bitter winters of north China.

In 1928 when a school owned by a big Kuomintang official bought the flock of sheep, Pan, then 31 years old, was thrown in as part of the chattel. Unable to support himself because of miserable pay, the shepherd was never able to marry even though he worked tending sheep for the next two decades.

Liberation of Shanxi Province and the school in 1946 found Pan Erhsiao a hungry and shabby old bachelor without a relative to his name. The school became the Shanxi Agricultural College and Pan was given a sheepskin coat, warm boots and clothing and moved into a brick house fit for a human being.

New life and new opportunities sparked the old shepherd to put to use his over-half-a-century's experience. Perhaps his most outstanding achievement was in getting his ewes to lamb twice a year. Within a few years the college flock multiplied from 13 sheep to more than 400.

Pan refused retirement at 60 although his pension, apart from a tidy bank account, would have enabled him to live comfortably. In consideration of his age, the college now gives him light work and relies on his valuable advice based on his long experience.

New Pagoda for Buddha's Tooth

THE tooth-relief of Buddha has been moved from the 700-year-old Guangji Monastery in Peking to the newly built Sara Pagoda in the Western Hills on the capital's outskirts. In honour of this solemn occasion, Buddhists from many lands attended the religious ceremonies at both sites. While traditional incense burning took place, the sound of ancient religious music filled the air and monks, nuns and lamas recited sutras.

Completed last year, the 150-foot-high pagoda is 100 metres from the site of the old Thousand-Buddha Pagoda in which the tooth had been kept for over eight centuries before the pagoda was destroyed by the armed forces of the eight imperialist countries that invaded Peking in 1900. Years later the religious relic was taken inside the city to the Guangji Monastery for safekeeping.

Buddhist delegates from Cambodia, Ceylon, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Mongolia, Nepal, southern Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam were present to mark the rites. These guests made offerings and paid homage to the ancient relic now housed in the same pagoda as the 12 grains of Buddha relics presented by the King of Nepal.
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