THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE'S "NOTICE ON THE QUESTION OF WINTER VACATION FOR SCHOOLS"

February 8, 1969

As the colleges, high schools and primary schools are currently busily engaged in struggle-criticism-transformation and the purification of class ranks, it is essential to make arrangements for the graduates to go to the countryside. In view of this, no winter recess will be held for colleges, secondary schools and primary schools. As to whether winter recess should be allowed the junior middle schools or not, the decision may be taken, by the provincial, municipal or autonomous region revolutionary committee, or by the responsible unit of each city and each *hsiang* as conditions may merit. For primary schools in different places, no unified measure will be drawn up and the responsible unit may make its own arrangements in the light of local climate and production seasons. If urban primary schools start their winter vacation, the duration of such should be shortened to half a month to one month. The teachers and workers and employees will all have no winter vacation but continue to carry into greater depth the work of struggle-criticism-transformation and purifying the class ranks, so that good preparations may be made to start the new term.

The CCP Central Committee
February 8, 1969

3–5–1

LIN PO-CHU PASSES AWAY

May 29, 1960

The passing away of Comrade Lin Po-chu was announced today by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party. The announcement reads:

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party is grieved to announced that Comrade Lin Po-chu, member of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party and Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress, passed away at 10.34 a.m. on May 29, 1960 in Peking after failing to respond to medical treatment for heart disease. He was 75 years of age.

Comrade Lin Po-chu was one of the earliest members of the Chinese Communist Party and one of China's outstanding statesmen. In his early years Comrade Lin Po-chu joined the Tung Meng Hui (Revolutionary League) led by Sun Yat-sen. He joined the Chinese Communist Party in 1921.

Comrade Lin Po-chu played an active role in connection with Dr. Sun Yat-sen's acceptance of the Communist Party's proposals and decision, to carry out the three cardinal policies of alliance with Soviet Russia, cooperation with the Communist Party and help to the workers and peasants as well as the work of reorganizing the Kuomintang. After Chiang Kai-shek's betrayal of the revolution, he took part in the Uprising in Nanchang, Kiangsi Province, on August 1, 1927. He took office as Minister of National Economy and Minister of Finance of the Workers' and Peasants' Democratic Central Government at the revolutionary base in Kiangsi. He was Chairman of the Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia Border Region Government from 1937

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, May 29, 1960.

PART IV

COMMUNICATIONS OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

4–2–1

MESSAGE OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

July 5, 1957

We thank you for informing us through Comrade P. F. Yudin of the resolution passed at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from June 22 to 29 on the anti-Party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov. We believe that this resolution, passed unanimously at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, will help to further the unity and consolidation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of China will consistently unite closely with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to struggle together for further strengthening the great fraternal alliance between China and Soviet Union, for lasting world peace and for the triumph of the cause of Marxism-Leninism.

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 5, 1957.

JOINT MESSAGE OF GREETINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL PEOPLE'S CONGRESS, THE STATE COUNCIL AND THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO THE SOVIET UNION ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

November 4, 1957

The message was addressed to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It reads:

On the 40th anniversary of the great October Socialist Revolution, we, on behalf of all the Chinese people, send our greetings to you and all the Soviet people — the foremost forces of the world socialist revolution and the staunchest friends of all the oppressed nations.

Under the banner of the great Lenin, the people of the Soviet Union created the world's first Socialist Republic. The victory of the October Revolution marked the beginning of the advance of humanity from the old, corrupt capitalist world to the new socialist world. In the past 40 years, under the leadership of the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the great Soviet people have conquered multitudinous difficulties, defeated a whole series of enemies and successfully carried out socialist construction. They have built their motherland from an economically backward country into a first-rate, strong, industrialised world power. All this shows that the socialist system, which has already become a reality in the Soviet Union, is the most progressive, the best and most rational system with the greatest vitality.

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, November 5, 1957.

No revolution in history has been able to exert so tremendous an influence on the development of world history as the October Revolution has done. The existence of the Soviet Union and the striking evidence of its growing strength have vigorously attracted all the exploited and oppressed peoples and carried the idea of socialism deeper and deeper into the hearts of people. Since the Second World War, from Asia to Europe, about a thousand million people, travelling along the road opened up by the October Revolution, have freed themselves from the yoke of capitalism and united themselves into the powerful camp of socialism. This socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union has become the great bulwark of defence of world peace, the safeguard of international justice and the support of the cause of human progress.

Profound friendship has existed between the Chinese and the Soviet people. The Soviet Union gave us genuine sympathy and support in our protracted revolutionary struggle. Since the founding of the People's Republic of China, it has rendered immense assistance to the construction of our country. We are deeply indebted to you for your assistance.

The Sino-Soviet alliance established in 1950 is the greatest international alliance in human history. China and the Soviet Union are two powerful countries in the world, with their more than 800 million people united as one. The firm alliance forged between our two countries has not only added greatly to the superior strength of the socialist camp, but also dealt a telling blow to the policy of aggression and war of the imperialist bloc. All our might is forever dedicated to strengthening the unity between China and the Soviet Union, strengthening the unity of the socialist camp, fighting for lasting world peace and opposing imperialist aggression.

May the people of the Soviet Union win still greater victories in their construction in the economic and cultural fields!

Long live the Great October Socialist Revolution!

Long live the unity and friendship of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union!

Long live the great internationalist banner of Marxism-Leninism!

Proletarians of the world and all peace-loving people of the world unite!

4–2–3

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO THE 21ST CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

January 23, 1959

To the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.
Dear Comrade Delegates:

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, on behalf of all the Chinese people and members of the Chinese Communist Party, extends warm fraternal congratulations to the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and pay sincere and heartfelt tribute to the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people.

Since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people, under the correct leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party headed by Comrade Khrushchev, have achieved a series of great successes in building Communism and made many important contributions to the common struggle to safeguard peace and avert war in unity with the peace-loving countries and peoples the world over. The recent successful launching of a cosmic rocket by the Soviet Union has once again demonstrated that Soviet science and technology have reached glorious heights.

Now, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in accordance with its great program for building Communism, has put forward a 1959 to 1965 plan for the development of national economy. The fulfillment of this plan will lay down a firm material and spiritual foundation for the transition to Communism in the Soviet Union and enrich the treasury of Marxism-Leninism with valuable experience gained in building Communism. Moreover it will further alter the balance of forces in the world to the still greater advantage of the

---

Source: NCNA — English, Moscow, January 28, 1959.

noble cause of securing world peace and human progress, this great 7-year plan has further demonstrated the immeasurable superiority of socialism over capitalism and that socialism will undoubtedly outstrip capitalism in peaceful competition.

The Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have always been an illustrious example for the proletariat in all lands and for all progressive mankind. We believe that inspired by the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the proletariat in all lands and all progressive mankind will struggle for the great cause of world peace and human progress with immensely increased confidence.

Since the Moscow meetings of the representatives of Communist and workers parties of various countries held in 1957, both the unity of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and the unity of the international Communist movement with the Soviet Communist Party as its center have greatly increased, in up-holding and developing Marxism-Leninism, in supporting and encouraging each other in every struggle, and in learning from each other and exchanging experience. Considerable new achievements have been made by all the socialist countries and the Communist Parties in the various countries in their own work and struggles. Although imperialists and modern revisionists are still playing the underhand game of attempting to undermine the internationalist unity of the proletariat, this game will certainly meet, as before, with shameful failure.

At the present time, imperialism is suffering severe blows from the economic crisis and social conflicts. Its colonial system is further disintegrating and within itself the trend toward disintegration grows. Socialism and the national independence movement and the struggle in defense of world peace, which socialism supports, have flowed together to become an irresistible current. The deathbed struggles of the imperialists and all other reactionaries will never save them from final extinction.

The Chinese people under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party are now working all out, aiming high and achieving greater, faster, better and more economical results in building socialism. In the past year, unprecedented victories have been won in China's economic and cultural construction. These victories have further strengthened the confidence of the Chinese people in speeding up the development of socialist construction. The Chinese people have received consistent brotherly assistance and support from the Soviet Union in their struggle to reconstruct and safeguard their coun-

try. In the name of the Chinese people, we express our heartfelt thanks to the people, the government and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

We wish every success to the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union! May new, great victories crown the efforts of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in leading the Soviet people in their struggle to build Communism and defend world peace.

Mao Tse-tung,
Chairman of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of China,
January 23, 1959

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO THE 22ND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

October 14, 1961

To the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union.

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, on behalf of all the Chinese Communists and all the Chinese people, extends warm, fraternal greetings to the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and its whole-hearted respects to the great Communist Party and people of the Soviet Union.

Since the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people under the leadership of the Central Committee of the CPSU headed by Comrade Khrushchev have achieved brilliant successes in the extensive building of communism.

Industry and agriculture in the Soviet Union have developed tremendously. The material and cultural living standards of the Soviet people have risen constantly. Manned Soviet spaceships have on two occasions travelled through outer space and successfully returned to earth, thereby contributing brilliantly to man's conquest of the universe. The great achievements of the Soviet people in communist construction have undisputably shown the unparalled superiority of the socialist system to the capitalist system.

The new program which is about to be adopted at this Congress of your Party sets forth the Soviet people's grand plan of building communism. We are sure that the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party, will gain ever greater victories in the struggle to build communism.

Source: NCNA — English, Moscow, October 19, 1961.

The Soviet people have made outstanding contributions to the preservation of world peace, the relaxation of international tension, the fighter for general disarmament, the realization of peaceful co-existence among countries with different social systems, the support for the liberation struggles of the various oppressed nations and peoples and the strengthening of the might of the socialist camp.

All the achievements that have already been gained and will be gained by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party are a source of incalculable inspiration to the people of the whole world who are striving for world peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism.

Close unity and friendship have always existed between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and peoples. This unity and friendship between our two Parties and peoples, based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, are of the utmost importance for the victory of the common cause of the people throughout the world in opposing imperialism, defending world peace and fighting for human progress. The unity and friendship between our two Parties and peoples are eternal, long tested and indestructible.

We whole-heartedly wish the 22nd Congress of the CPSU every success. May the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party, achieve great, new successes in the struggle to build communism, defend world peace and promote human progress.

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live the great and glorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

Long live the eternal and indestructible unity and friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples!

Long live the great unity of the people of the world!

Long live Marxism-Leninism!

Mao Tse-tung,
Chairman of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of China,
October 14, 1961

STATEMENT OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE TALKS AND RELATIONS BETWEEN THE CCP AND THE CPSU

July 1, 1963

(1) In accordance with the agreement reached between the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the two parties will begin to hold talks in Moscow on July 5.

The Central Committee of the CCP has decided that its delegation in the talks will be composed of the following:

Head of the delegation: Teng Hsiao-ping, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CCP.

Deputy head of the delegation: Peng Chen, member of the Political Bureau and of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP.

Members of the delegation: Kang Sheng, alternate member of the Political Bureau and member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP; Yang Shang-kun, alternate member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP; Liu Ning-i, member of the Central Committee of the CCP; Wu Hsiu-chuan, member of the Central Committee of the CCP; and Pan Tzu-ti, alternate member of the Central Committee of the CCP.

(2) The Central Committee of the CCP has instructed the delegation of the CCP that in the talks with the delegation of the CPSU, it should adhere to our party's consistent stand of persevering in principle and in unity; it should expound our party's views on the general line of the international communist movement and on some related questions of principle in accordance with the letter of June 14 of the Central Committee of the CCP in reply to the Central Committee of the CPSU; it should firmly defend the fundamental

---

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 1, 1963.

principles of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960; it should safeguard the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement; and it should defend the interests of the cause of the liberation of the oppressed peoples and nations, the cause of opposition to imperialism and of the struggle for world peace, and the cause of the proletarian world revolution.

(3) The letter of the Central Committee of the CCP of June 14 was a reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of March 30. In its letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU systematically presented its own views on the question of the general line of the international communist movement and accused us of making "groundless attacks" on the CPSU. In its reply, the Central Committee of the CCP in turn expounded its views, and put forward its proposal, concerning the general line of the international communist movement and some related questions of principle. This was only natural and conduces to a full exchange of ideas in the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties.

It is highly regrettable that, contrary to the way the Central Committee of the CCP has acted, the Central Committee of the CPSU has not published the letter of the other side in its newspapers and has not let its party members and people learn the views of the CCP. The statement of the Central Committee of the CPSU of June 18, the resolution of the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU of June 21 and Comrade Khrushchev's speech at the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU described the constructive views of the Central Committee of the CCP as "groundless and slanderous. . . attacks", announced that they "categorically rejected" them, and launched direct and unreasonable attacks on the CCP. Subsequently, the government of the Soviet Union demanded the immediate recall of five persons, — staff members of the Chinese Embassy in the Soviet Union or Chinese research students there, thus extending the ideological differences between the two parties to the sphere of state relations.

The Central Committee of the CCP is compelled to point out solemnly that the series of measures taken by the Central Committee and leaders of the CPSU constitute a serious step in further worsening Sino-Soviet relations and in manufacturing a split in the international communist movement.

In view of the fact that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties are due to take place soon, the Central Committee of

the CCP will not reply for the time being to the attacks on our party made by the Central Committee and leaders of the CPSU, but reserves the right to reply.

(4) Despite the steps taken by the Central Committee and leaders of the CPSU in further worsening the relations between the Chinese and Soviet parties and between the two countries, the Central Committee of the CCP will still send its delegation to Moscow as scheduled to take part in the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties. It is doing so for the sake of the common interests of the Chinese and Soviet parties and peoples, for the sake of the common interests of the socialist camp and the international communist movement, and in accord with its consistent stand of persevering in principle, strengthening unity, eliminating differences and waging a common struggle against the enemy.

It is the sincere hope of the Central Committee of the CCP that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties will yield positive results, that Sino-Soviet relations will be improved and that the unity of the international communist movement will be strengthened — all on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the Declaration of 1957 and the Statement of 1960, and on the basis of the principle of independence and equality and the principle of reaching unanimity through consultation among fraternal parties. This is indeed the common aspiration of all the communists and all the revolutionary people of the world.

STATEMENT OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATEMENT OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF JULY 4, 1963

July 5, 1963

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has learned of the statement issued on July 4 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party cannot agree to the distortions, accusations and attacks which are made in this statement by the Central Committee of the CPSU against the statement of July 1 by the Central Committee of the CCP.

Since the delegation of the CCP is about to leave for Moscow for the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties, the Central Committee of the CCP has instructed the delegation to make the necessary comments at the talks with regard to the distortions, accusations and attacks by the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Despite the fact that on July 4 the Central Committee of the CPSU has once again issued this kind of statement, the Central Committee of the CCP, in accordance with its consistent stand of perseverance in principle, the strengthening of unity and the elimination of differences in the interests of the common struggle against the enemy, has instructed the delegation to exercise the greatest patience and make the greatest efforts at the talks to strengthen the unity of the Chinese and Soviet parties and of the two countries, the unity of the socialist camp and that of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

The Central Committee of the CCP hopes that the outcome of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet parties will be advantageous

---

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 5, 1963.

to the preparations for convening a meeting of representatives of all the communist and workers' parties and advantageous to the great struggle of the people the world over against imperialism and for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism.

STATEMENT OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATEMENT OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF JULY 9, 1963

July 10, 1963

On July 9, 1963, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued a statement in which the accusation is made that the Peking rally of various Chinese institutions welcoming the five comrades who were recalled at the unreasonable demand of the Soviet Government was an attempt to fan unfriendly feeling towards the Soviet Union among the Chinese people and to exacerbate situation with regard to the talks between the CCP and the CPSU. It drew the conclusion that "a deliberate campaign is being carried on" in China "to aggravate seriously the Soviet-Chinese relations, disregarding the dangerous consequences of this policy."

The talks between the CCP and the CPSU are now in progress, and people are justified in hoping that the Sino-Soviet differences will be discussed calmly at the talks. Certainly, we did not expect that the Central Committee of the CPSU would consider it necessary to unleash a new public attack on the CCP and thus force us to make a public reply. We cannot but regret this state of affairs.

The accusation in the statement by the Central Committee of the CPSU against the CCP is totally unjustified. Communists must respect the facts and be reasonable. Who is it that has taken a series of measures to worsen Sino-Soviet relations before and during the Sino-Soviet talks, thus aggravating the situation with regard to the talks?

The letter of the Central Committee of the CCP dated June 14 was a reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU dated March 30. In its letter, the Central Committee of the CPSU raised

---

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 10, 1963.

the question of the general line of the International Communist Movement and systematically expounded its own views. Since the Central Committee of the CPSU raised this question, which is a most important one, it was certainly necessary for the Central Committee of the CCP systematically to present its own views on this question. At the same time, despite our disagreement with the views expounded by the Central Committee of the CPSU in its letter, we nevertheless published it in full so as to acquaint our Party members and the Chinese people with the views of the Central Committee of the CPSU. This is the normal position which should be taken in handling relations between fraternal parties. It is also beneficial to the mutual understanding and trust of the people of China and the Soviet Union and beneficial to the elimination of differences and the strengthening of unity. However, the Central Committee of the CPSU not only failed to publish the letter of reply of the Central Committee of the CCP, but, in a series of resolutions and statements and in speeches by its leaders, vilified it as a "slanderous and groundless attack" on the CPSU. Is it not in itself a slander against the CCP to refuse to let people know what our letter of reply actually said, while at the same time obsessively attacking the letter as a "slander" against the CPSU and raising a colossal uproar?

The letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of March 30 was distributed by Soviet institutions and personnel in China before its publication in the Chinese press. On previous occasions, they had distributed documents of CPSU leaders and of the organ of the Central Committee of the CPSU attacking the CCP by name. It is inconceivable that the Soviet comrades should have thought that the CCP agreed with the contents of these documents. Of course we disagreed. But we have always maintained that it is normal and reciprocal activity for the official institutions and personnel of one socialist country stationed in another to distribute the public documents of their own Government and Party, and consequently we have never interfered with such activity. Nevertheless, the Central Committee of the CPSU regarded the normal activity of the Chinese institutions and personnel in the Soviet Union in distributing the letter of reply of the Central Committee of the CCP as violating Soviet sovereignty and interfering with Soviet internal affairs. Such logic is absolutely untenable. If it were valid, would not China have long ago become a state without sovereignty? It is preposterous for the Soviet Government to demand the recall of the persons concerned on the excuse that Chinese institutions and personnel in the Soviet

Union distributed the letter of reply of the Central Committee of the CCP. China, for its part, treasures Sino-Soviet unity and is refraining from taking corresponding measures against Soviet institutions and personnel in China. China's self-restraint is obvious to all. The Chinese institutions concerned held a meeting in Peking in order to welcome the five comrades recalled at the Soviet Government's unreasonable demand, to explain the facts and express the desires to strengthen Sino-Soviet unity. This was the least China could do within her sovereign rights and was also a good thing to do. We cannot understand why the Central Committee of the CPSU has gone to the extent of arbitrarily attacking this meeting. Can it be that the comrades of the CPSU are asking us to declare these five comrades to be undesirable in China too?

The CCP and the CPSU are equals, and no genuine unity can be achieved by adopting an attitude of "allowing the magistrate to burn down houses, while forbidding the common people even to light lamps." The consistent stand of the CCP regarding the Sino-Soviet differences is: persevere in principle, strengthen unity, eliminate differences and wage a common struggle against the enemy. We practise what we preach and our deeds are at one with our words. The cause for concern at present is rather the fact that the Central Committee of the CPSU has not only extended the ideological differences between the two parties of China and the Soviet Union to the sphere of State relations, but is also whipping up a campaign against the CCP all over the Soviet Union through meetings and resolutions of Party organizations at various levels and through innumerable speeches and articles. People cannot help asking, how far are the comrades of the CPSU prepared to extend the Sino-Soviet differences?

The unity of the CCP and the CPSU and the unity of China and the Soviet Union are in the fundamental interests of the people of both countries. At present, our comrades and friends throughout the world are eagerly hoping that the Sino-Soviet talks will yield positive results and that Sino-Soviet unity will be preserved and strengthened. Only the U.S. imperialists, the reactionaries of all countries and the Tito group of renegades are counting on the failure of the Sino-Soviet talks and on a split between the CCP and the CPSU. Sino-Soviet unity is of the greatest importance. One must never do anything to pain those near and dear to us and gladden the enemy. We sincerely hope that the comrades of the CPSU will join us in striving gradually to eliminate the differences, strengthen unity and wage a common struggle against the enemy on the basis of

Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

STATEMENT BY A SPOKESMAN OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON AN OPEN LETTER OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON JULY 14, 1963

July 19, 1963

On July 14 the Soviet paper *Pravda* published an open letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to its Party organizations at all levels and to all its members. At the same time, it published the June 14 letter of reply of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the CPSU.

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

The Central Committee of the CCP has decided to republish its letter of reply of June 14 in the *People's Daily* simultaneously with the publication of the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU of July 14 so that the members of the CCP and the Chinese people may know the views of both sides and compare and study them. Other national, provincial and city papers will also publish the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

In addition, the Central Committee of the CCP has decided to broadcast to the whole world in many languages both our letter of reply of June 14 and the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU dated July 14.

The reason why we are doing so is that, while our letter was

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 19, 1963.

broadcast as early as mid-June, some people might not have heard it then, or very possibly some of the people opposed to our position and our views did not want to listen to it. Now that we are re-broadcasting our letter, we hope that people in both categories, and especially those who are opposed to us, will listen in patiently so that our opponents will have the material at their disposal for making criticisms which are up to the mark. To speak frankly, so far the criticisms are not up to the mark and not convincing. There is only one reason we are broadcasting the July 14 open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU — it is a remarkable piece of work. To quote a Chinese poem: "A remarkable work should be enjoyed together and doubts analyzed in company." When the Soviet Union broadcast this remarkable work, a great number of revolutionary comrades and people throughout the world probably did not want to listen in or lacked the patience to do so. We advise them not to take such an attitude but to listen in patiently, study it carefully and publish it, so that the two materials, the negative as well as the positive, can be compared, for a more correct analysis and criticism can only be made in this way. Materialism cannot be developed without criticizing idealism, nor can dialectics without criticizing metaphysics. And to criticize, one must master the material of one's opponents. The open letter of the CPSU is superlative material for learning by negative example.

The Central Committee of the CCP believes that the fact that the Central Committee of the CPSU has finally published our letter of June 14 in its press is an event to be welcomed. We hope that just as we have published the documents of the Central Committee of the CPSU, so it will publish more of the relevant documents of the Central Committee of the CCP, including the seven articles we have issued since last December and our statements of July 1, 5 and 10 as well as the present statement, in order that the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people may know all the views of the CCP.

From July 15, after the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU was published, the Soviet papers *Pravda* and *Izvestia* and other national and local papers have printed one editorial after another to boost the open letter and attack the CCP, and they have also been using the form of signed articles and readers' letters for the same purpose. At the same time, the press of Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and other countries and, one after another, the Communist Party papers in Italy, France, etc. have been expressing support for the open letter of the CPSU and

attacking the CCP. We shall publish in our press all the statements of any importance opposing the CCP and answer them when necessary.

The Central Committee of the CCP believes it is good that the Central Committee of the CPSU has publicly given utterance to what it has wanted to say. It is better to have spoken out than not to have spoken. Marxist-Leninists are people who respect facts and reason. The more the truth is debated, the clearer it becomes. The Sino-Soviet differences can eventually be resolved if the facts are respected, the truth is not concealed and matters are not distorted, and if one adheres to Marxism-Leninism instead of departing from it.

After the publication of the open letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the imperialists, headed by the U.S., and the Indian reactionaries and the Yugoslav revisionist clique have acclaimed it with one voice and vilified the CCP. Such statements deserve attention. We shall select the prize ones and publish them for all the members of our Party and all the Chinese people to appreciate.

COMMUNIQUE ON TALKS BETWEEN THE CCP AND CPSU DELEGATIONS IN MOSCOW

July 5–20, 1963

Talks were held between the Delegation of the Communist Party of China and the Delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow from July 5 to 20, 1963. Taking part in the talks were:

On the CCP side — Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping (Head), member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CCP; Comrade Peng Chen (Deputy Head), member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP; Comrade Kang Sheng, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee and member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP; Comrade Yang Shang-kun, alternate member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CCP; Comrade Liu Ning-yi, member of the Central Committee of the CCP; Comrade Wu Hsiu-chuan, member of the Central Committee of the CCP; and Comrade Pan Tzu-li, alternate member of the Central Committee of the CCP.

On the CPSU side — Comrade M. A. Suslov (Head), member of the Presidium of the Central Committee and member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Comrade V. V. Grishin, alternate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Comrade Y. V. Andropov, member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Comrade L. F. Ilyichev, member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Comrade B. N. Ponomaryov, member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU; Comrade P. A. Satyukov, member of the Central

---

Source: NCNA — English, Peking, July 21, 1963.

Committee of the CPSU; and Comrade S. V. Chervonenko, member of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

In the course of the talks, both sides expounded their own views and stand on a series of important questions of principle concerning contemporary world developments, the international communist movement and Sino-Soviet relations.

Upon the proposal of the Delegation of the Communist Party of China both sides reached the agreement to have a recess in the work of the delegations and to continue the talks some time later. The place and time for the continuation of the talks will be agreed upon by the Central Committee of the CCP and the Central Committee of the CPSU after further consultation.

LETTER OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF FEBRUARY 20, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

February 20, 1964

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Dear Comrades,

We have learnt from a number of quarters that the Central Committee of the CPSU recently sent to fraternal Parties a letter which is directed against the Communist Party of China. This letter distorts the facts of the current public polemics in the international communist movement, manufactures lies slandering the Chinese Communist Party and instigates a so-called "struggle against the great-power and Trotskyite views and the factional and disruptive activities of the Chinese leaders". This letter has not, however, been sent to the Chinese Communist Party, from which it has been kept a secret.

It must be noted in all seriousness that, while crying for a halt to public polemics under the pretence of desiring unity, the leaders of the CPSU are engineering a new campaign against the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties behind the back of the Chinese Communist Party and are unscrupulously engaging in sectarian, factional and divisive activities. Throughout the recent years the leaders of the CPSU have been wearing one face in public and another in private, and saying one thing and doing another. Your vicious two-faced tactics are a gross violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties laid down in the 1960 Statement as well as of proletarian internationalism.

You have launched the present campaign against the Chinese

Source: *Seven Letters Exchanged Between the Central Committees of the Communist Party of China and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1964.

Communist Party on the new pretext that the CCP has not yet replied to your letter of November 29, 1963. But we would like to ask: Why were you free for a long time to act wilfully and refuse to accept the advice of fraternal Parties against bringing inter-Party differences into the open before the enemy and their proposal for a halt to public polemics, whereas the CCP must regard the letter from the leaders of the CPSU as God's will and give an immediate and affirmative reply or else be charged with the major crime of insubordination? Why are you privileged to publish thousands of lengthy articles and other items attacking us, whereas we may not make any reply to set the facts straight and distinguish truth from falsehood? A journey has to be made step by step, and problems have to be solved one by one. Your letter will be answered in due course. Your self-important and domineering attitude in maintaining that you can attack whenever you please and that we must stop as soon as you cry halt has fully exposed your inveterate habit of great-power chauvinism and posing as the "father party".

The present grave act of the leaders of the CPSU to create a split has once again brought to light the intrigue you have been carrying on in behalf of a sham unity and a real split.

The Communist Party of China has been consistent in its stand of firmly defending the purity of Marxism-Leninism, upholding the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, and on these foundations safeguarding the unity of the international communist movement, the unity of the socialist camp and the unity of the Chinese and Soviet Parties and our two peoples. This stand of ours will never change. We obey the truth and the truth only and will never trade in principles.

The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party delegated Comrade Peng Chen, member of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat, to convey our views orally to Comrade Chervonenko, the Soviet Ambassador to China, on the afternoon of February 18.

We would like in all seriousness to repeat our request that the Central Committee of the CPSU send us a copy of the letter directed against the CCP, which it has recently addressed to fraternal Parties. We shall make our reply after studying this letter.

With fraternal greetings,

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China

LETTER OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF FEBRUARY 27, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

February 27, 1964

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received your letter of February 22, 1964. The characteristic feature of this letter is the prodigality of the abuse — such as "unseemly", "a clumsy attempt to lay one's own fault at somebody else's door", "rude" and "ridiculous" — with which you try to evade the questions of substance which we raised in our letter of February 20, 1964. This is really a poor performance.

You accuse us of behaving like "the real culprit crying 'stop thief' ". In fact, it is you who are playing the trick of "the real culprit crying 'stop thief' " to divert attention and steal away because you have been caught red-handed in sectarian, factional and divisive activities and confronted with irrefutable evidence. But however much you may quibble and sophisticate, you cannot deny the following facts. First, you have actually sent a letter behind our backs to fraternal Parties, a letter which is specifically directed against the Chinese Communist Party. Second, you are actually planning behind our backs to take "collective measures" from which the Chinese Communist Party will be excluded, and to go a step further in splitting the international communist movement.

In our letter of February 20, we point out that you "are unscrupulously engaging in sectarian, factional and divisive activities", that you adopt "vicious two-faced tactics", and that you have the

---

Source: *Ibid.*

"inveterate habit of great-power chauvinism and posing as the 'father party' ". Your most recent letter proves that these criticisms completely fit the facts and are entirely correct.

Have you not repeatedly professed a desire to improve relations and uphold unity? If you really have such a desire, you ought to admit that right is right and wrong is wrong. One had better be honest. This is the only way to bring about a real settlement of problems. There is no other alternative.

You begin your letter with the assertion that you have the "right not to answer at all" the letter of the Central Committee of the CCP to the Central Committee of the CPSU, whereas we have repeatedly made it clear that we will answer your letter of November 29, 1963 in due course. We have advised you against impatience because we have not yet completed our reply to your numerous attacks. Whereupon you have flown into a rage as if we had committed a monstrous crime. Please think the matter over calmly: can this be described as treating fraternal Parties as equals?

Far from examining your own errors and publicly acknowledging and correcting them in all seriousness according to Lenin's teachings, you deny facts, call white black and turn on us by slanderously accusing us of factional activities. You even produced the Belishova case of June 1960 as an important piece of evidence against us. But you have lifted a rock only to crush your own toes. Our exchange of views with the responsible comrades of a fraternal Party on the international communist movement was above-board, entirely normal and beyond reproach. On the other hand, your intrigues on the question of Belishova cannot stand the light of day. You made Belishova your tool for subverting the leadership of a fraternal Party and country and for disrupting the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. The Albanian comrades have exposed your intrigues and handled the Belishova case in the proper way.

It is the leaders of the CPSU themselves who have been conducting "the most genuine behind-the-scenes factional activity against a fraternal Party". As early as January 1960, that is, five months before the Belishova case, you delegated Comrade Mikoyan to meet the leading comrades of Albania in an effort to engineer activities against the Chinese Communist Party. Instances of such behind-the-scenes factional activity on your part were cited by Comrade Kapo, head of the Albanian delegation, in Comrade Khrushchev's presence on June 24, 1960, at the Bucharest meeting of representatives of the

fraternal Parties of the socialist countries.

Yet acting like "knights for a day", you state in your letter that you will "publish documents" and "openly state our views". Moreover, you declared on September 21, 1963 that you would give us a "most resolute rebuff". Have you not played enough of such tricks? Have you not divulged enough information? Were these to be enumerated, we could cite a wealth of facts beginning from the 20th Congress of the CPSU. You are well aware of this and we do not need to waste our ink. Now you are again making an empty threat, and, to be blunt, this can only frighten people with weak nerves. In our opinion, all your bluster simply reminds one of a paper tiger. It is like a pewter-pointed spear. Please produce all the magic weapons in your treasure box for our enlightenment — the "most resolute rebuff", the "open statement of our views", "collective measures" against the CCP, documents and materials, and what not.

If you do not fear the truth and the masses and if, instead of treating them as rabble, you have faith in the political consciousness and discernment of the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people, we propose that our two Parties reach an agreement, by which each side will, on an equal basis, publish in its own press the documents, articles and other material both sides have published or will publish in criticism of each other.

You accuse us of committing a blunder by "demanding"* instead of "*requesting*" that you send us a copy of your letter of February 12. In Chinese usage, these two words do not imply as big a difference as you describe. But since you take it so seriously and even make it an excuse for refusing to give us the letter of February 12, which is directed against the CCP, well then, we are now complying with your wish and *request* that you send us a copy of the letter which you gave the other fraternal Parties on February 12. It is our earnest hope that you will do so.

With fraternal greetings,

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China

---

* Following the Chinese usage, this word was translated into "request" and not "demand" in the English version of the February 20 letter of the Central Committee of the CCP to the Central Committee of the CPSU. — *Translator*

LETTER OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF FEBRUARY 29, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

February 29, 1964

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union
Dear Comrades,

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

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

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

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

The views we have expressed in our reply of June 14, 1963 to the letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, that is, our proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement, and in our articles about the international communist movement pub-

---

Source: *Ibid.*

lished both before and after that reply, are in full accord with Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement.

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

1. THE QUESTION OF THE SINO-SOVIET BOUNDARY

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

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

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

The delegations of our two governments started boundary negotiations in Peking on February 25, 1964. Although the old treaties relating to the Sino-Russian boundary are unequal treaties, the Chinese Government is nevertheless willing to respect them and take them as the basis for a reasonable settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary ques-

tion. Guided by proletarian internationalism and the principles governing relations between socialist countries, the Chinese Government will conduct friendly negotiations with the Soviet Government in the spirit of consultation on an equal footing and mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. If the Soviet side takes the same attitude as the Chinese Government, the settlement of the Sino-Soviet boundary question, we believe, ought not to be difficult, and the Sino-Soviet boundary will truly become one of lasting friendship.

2. THE QUESTION OF AID

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. THE QUESTION OF THE SOVIET EXPERTS

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

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

But in spite of our objections you turned your backs on the principles guiding international relations and unscrupulously withdrew the 1,390 Soviet experts working in China, tore up 343 contracts and

supplementary contracts concerning experts, and scrapped 257 projects of scientific and technical cooperation, all within the short span of a month.

You were well aware that the Soviet experts were posted in over 250 enterprises and establishments in the economic field and the fields of national defence, culture, education and scientific research, and that they were undertaking important tasks involving technical design, the construction of projects, the installation of equipment, trial production and scientific research. As a result of your peremptory orders to the Soviet experts to discontinue their work and return to the Soviet Union, many of our country's important designing and scientific research projects had to stop halfway, some of the construction projects in progress had to be suspended, and some of the factories and mines which were conducting trial production could not go into production according to schedule. Your perfidious action disrupted China's original national economic plan and inflicted enormous losses upon China's socialist construction.

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

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

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

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

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

4. THE QUESTION OF SINO-SOVIET TRADE

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

Your sudden withdrawal of all the Soviet experts working in China upset the schedules of construction and the production arrangements of many of our factories, mines and other enterprises and establishments, and had a direct impact on our need for the import of complete sets of equipment. Such being the case, did you expect us to keep on buying them just for display?

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

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

Indeed, but for China's efforts the volume of Sino-Soviet trade would have decreased even more. Take this year for example. China has already put forward a list of 220 million new roubles' worth of imports from the Soviet Union and 420 million new roubles' worth of exports to the Soviet Union. But you have been procrastinating

unreasonably, continuing to hold back goods we need while trying to force on us goods we do not need. You say in your letter, "In the course of the next few years the USSR could increase its export to China of goods in which you are interested. . . ." But your deeds do not agree with your words.

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

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

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

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

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

All these actions of yours are wrong.

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

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

5. THE QUESTION OF STOPPING PUBLIC POLEMICS

The public polemics were provoked by you. We maintained that differences in the international communist movement should be settled through inter-Party discussions. But you insisted on bringing them into the open. Beginning with the 22nd Congress of the CPSU,

you imposed public polemics on the entire international communist movement in violation of the principles guiding relations among fraternal Parties as laid down in the 1960 Statement, and you asserted that to do so was to "act in Lenin's manner". What you did was a bad thing. You created difficulties for fraternal Parties and rendered a service to the imperialists and reactionaries. Now, with the extensive unfolding of the public debate, the truth is becoming clearer and clearer and Marxism-Leninism is making more and more progress. What was a bad thing is becoming a good thing.

In the course of this great debate, the Communists, proletarians, working people, revolutionary intellectuals, and other people who have an interest in opposing imperialism and reaction have become more discerning and increasingly awakened politically, and their revolutionary enthusiasm and theoretical level have been greatly enhanced. The effect of the public debate is the opposite of what you intended. It leads more and more people away from the bad influence of the baton and makes them think over problems independently. Thus, as with the other debates in the history of the international communist movement, the present debate is undoubtedly the prelude to a new revolutionary upsurge.

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

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

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

In your letter you state that "it would be correct not to concentrate attention on the problems on which there are differences between us but to let them wait until the heat of passion has cooled, to let time do its work". Again, you seem to have forgotten that as far back as October 10, 1960 we pointed out in our written statement at the drafting committee of the twenty-six fraternal Parties that "as to the questions on which unanimity cannot be achieved for the time being, it would be better to leave them open than to reach a forced solution" and that "time will help us eliminate the differences". You then categorically rejected our proposal. In your letter of November 5, 1960 to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, which you circulated during the 1960 meeting of the fraternal Parties, you declared, "To wait for the 'verdict of history' would be a grave error fraught with serious consequences for the entire communist movement...." But now you suddenly make a turn of 180 degrees on this question and say that we should let the differences wait. What are you up to? To put it plainly, you are merely resorting to this trick to deprive us of the right to reply, after you yourselves have heaped so much abuse on the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

While the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties were in progress in Moscow, despite our repeated sincere advice you published your Open Letter to Party Organizations and All Communists in the Soviet Union on July 14, 1963 in order to curry favour with U.S. imperialism and to reach an agreement with it on the monopoly of nuclear weapons. You then launched an anti-Chinese campaign on an unprecedented scale. According to incomplete statistics, between July 15 and the end of October 1963 the Soviet press carried nearly two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items.

Meanwhile, under your influence the leaders of the fraternal

Parties of socialist countries — the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party — have also published a great number of articles and other items against China.

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

You also say in your letter that the difficulties of other fraternal Parties should be taken into account. We have always given full consideration to the difficulties of other fraternal Parties. It was for this very reason that we repeatedly advised the leaders of the CPSU against bringing the controversy into the open. But following the leaders of the CPSU, the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties of many capitalist countries, for example, the Parties of France, Italy, Belgium, Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Austria, West Germany, Greece, Portugal, Britain, the United States of America, Canada, Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Australia, Ceylon, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Turkey, Iran, Jordan and Algeria — as well as the Dange clique, who are renegades from the Indian proletariat — published many articles attacking the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist parties, and some adopted resolutions, issued statements or open letters to Party members, or even unscrupulously attacked or expelled comrades adhering to the Marxist-Leninist stand. Did they ever take their own difficulties into account when they were doing all this? Did you ever take their difficulties into account when you were supporting them in all this?

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

Even after your letter of November 29, 1963 you and your followers did not stop your anti-Chinese propaganda. You attacked us by name in the *Pravda* articles, "Why Mislead?" and "The Soviet-

Chinese Treaty — Fourteen Years", in the *Izvestia* article "An Important Document", in "The World in a Week" in the magazine *Za Rubezhom,* and in many other articles and items. In addition, you have recently published books against China, such as *Talks on Political Subjects, Our Leninist Party, A Treaty that Purifies the Atmosphere . . ., The Leninist Teaching of the Party and the Contemporary Communist Movement* and *The General Crisis of Capitalism and Foreign Policy,* in which you make comprehensive and concentrated attacks on the Chinese Communist Party. You have also distributed pamphlets attacking China through your embassies abroad and your delegates to international mass organizations. As for the articles and other items your followers have published in the meantime, we shall not dwell on them here.

Moreover, since November 29, 1963 you have raised acute controversial questions and provoked debates at the Warsaw meeting of the World Peace Council, the Prague meeting of the Executive Bureau of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Berlin meeting of the Bureau of the Women's International Democratic Federation, the Budapest meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Union of Students, and at a number of other international meetings. At these meetings, while we, together with the delegates from other countries, were actively promoting the struggle of the people of the world for peace, supporting the national liberation movement and calling for a united front against U.S. imperialism, you on your part extolled U.S. imperialism and created splits by insisting on adopting resolutions in support of the tripartite treaty by which you allied yourselves with the United States against China.

All this provides ample proof that you say one thing and do another and that your cry for an end to public polemics is utterly false and demagogic.

While you have published so many articles and other items against China, we have so far printed only seven articles in reply to your Open Letter. We have not yet completed our reply to the important questions you raised in the Open Letter, and have not even started to reply to the questions you raised in your other anti-Chinese articles. In all our articles we have adduced facts and used reasoned arguments. How can it be said that they are "shaking the friendship and unity of the peoples of the socialist community and weakening the anti-imperialist front"? Do not these phrases neatly fit your own voluminous and unreasonable material and your countless lies and slanders?

You have used every conceivable term of abuse in attacking the Chinese Communist Party and called us a host of names such as "dogmatists", "left adventurists", "pseudo-revolutionaries", "newly-baked Trotskyites", "nationalists", "racists", "great-power chauvinists", "sectarians", "splitters", and people "falling into the company of the forces of imperialist reaction", "having an itch for war" and "assuming the role of right-flank man in the line-up of the American 'maniacs', West German revanchists and French extremists". In short, according to you the Chinese Communists are undoubtedly one hundred per cent arch-reactionaries. If so, we would like to ask: How can such fine fellows as you, who call yourselves one hundred per cent Marxist-Leninists, talk of unity with those bad fellows whom you consider more hateful than the enemy? How are you going to wind up the whole affair? Do you propose to come forward with a public statement admitting that all your attacks on the Chinese Communist Party are lies and slanders and removing all the labels you have stuck on it? Or will you insist that we accept your verdict, give up the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism and kowtow to your revisionist line?

It is now perfectly clear that our differences with you involve the questions of whether or not to adhere to the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and whether or not to adhere to the revolutionary principles of the Declaration and the Statement, as well as a whole series of important questions of principle, such as the following:

Are the U.S. imperialists the sworn enemies of the people of the world, or are they sensible emissaries of peace? Are they overlords who determine the destiny of mankind?

What is the reliable way to prevent the imperialists from unleashing a world war and to safeguard world peace?

To defend world peace and serve the interests of revolution, should we unite the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolutionaries among the national bourgeoisie, and all other forces of the world that can be united, and form the broadest possible united front in a common struggle against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys? Or should we pin all our hopes on U.S.-Soviet collaboration?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(2) The Chinese Communist Party consistently advocates and actively supports the convening of a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties. Prior to the meeting adequate preparations should be made, and difficulties and obstacles should be overcome. Together with the other fraternal Parties, we will do everything possible to ensure that this meeting will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

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

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

Unite Under The Banner of Marxism-Leninism!

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China

LETTER OF THE CCP CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF MAY 7, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

May 7, 1964

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Dear Comrades,

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has received the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union dated March 7, 1964.

In your letter you talk glibly about your desire for "the speediest possible settlement of existing differences" and "the cessation of the public polemics between Communist Parties" and about your willingness to do your utmost "to help strengthen the unity of the communist movement". But the facts show the complete falsity of your fine words. Both before and since the delivery of your letter, you have never ceased your attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist Leninist parties. At every single meeting of the international democratic organizations in the last few months, you have energetically preached and pushed your wrong line and conducted activities against China. Already in the middle of February this year, that is, three weeks before your letter of March 7, you made an anti-Chinese report and adopted an anti-Chinese decision at the Plenum of your Central Committee, at which six thousand people were present, declaring that you would "publicly explain" the "mistakes" of the CCP and "come out openly and strongly" against it.

All this clearly reveals that in writing the letter of March 7 you were simply playing a two-faced game. Under the guise of "deep concern for the settlement of the differences and for the unity of the

---

Source: *Ibid.*

international communist movement", you were diligently preparing a new onslaught against the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal Marxist-Leninist parties and hatching a big plot for openly splitting the socialist camp and the international communist movement.

We have given you repeated explanations of our consistent stand on public polemics. Since you have ignored our repeated advice, obdurately provoked and extended the public polemics and made massive public attacks upon us and other fraternal Parties, we and the other fraternal Parties are of course entitled to make public replies according to the principle of equality among fraternal Parties. It is our right to reply as much as you attack us.

Our press has not yet finished replying to your Open Letter of July 14, 1963. We have not yet started — to say nothing of completing — our reply to the more than two thousand anti-Chinese articles and other items which you published after your Open Letter and to the great number of resolutions, statements and articles in which scores of fraternal Parties have attacked us. How can we be asked to give up our right of public reply when you have issued such a mass of resolutions, statements, articles, books and pamphlets attacking the Chinese Communist Party without ever publicly revoking them?

On many public occasions, including international meetings, you have violated the fundamental theories of Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement by spreading and pushing your general line of "peaceful transition", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful coexistence", and have set your minds on uniting with U.S. imperialism, the common enemy of the people of the whole world, to oppose the national liberation movement, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to undermine the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. You have tried to impose your erroneous line on fraternal Parties and on the international democratic organizations. How can you expect us and all other Marxist-Leninists to keep silent about these foul deeds of yours and about such important questions of principle affecting the future of the world revolution and the destiny of mankind? And how can you expect us to refrain from exposing and publicly opposing your revisionist and divisive errors and from publicly stating our position and views?

You said earlier that in starting the public polemics at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU you were "acting in Lenin's manner", yet you

say now in your letter that to refrain from public polemics is "the behest of V. I. Lenin". Which of your two statements is correct? If you really want a cessation of the public polemics, does that not mean your 22nd Congress was wrong? And are you ready to admit your mistake?

The anti-Chinese report and decision of the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU published on April 3, 1964 and the ensuing events make it all the more clear that your call for a cessation of the public polemics was intended solely to gag us so that you could have a free rein to push ahead with your revisionist and divisive line.

Regarding the question of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and a meeting of representatives of all fraternal Parties, the proposal we made in our letter of February 29, 1964 was as follows: The talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties should be resumed in October so as to make preparations for a meeting of representatives of all fraternal Parties; in order to make further preparations for the meeting of representatives of all fraternal Parties, the two-Party talks should be followed by a meeting of representatives of seventeen fraternal Parties; the meeting of representatives of all fraternal Parties should be convened after the completion of preparations, so that it will be a meeting of unity on the basis of the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

In your letter of March 7, 1964 you disagree with this reasonable proposal of ours and charge us with deliberate stalling. You want the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties to be held in May, the preparatory meeting of representatives of fraternal Parties in June-July and the international meeting of all fraternal Parties in autumn this year.

At first glance you are most eager and enthusiastic. But it is not for the purpose of eliminating differences and strengthening unity that you have put forward this pressing timetable. On the contrary, more and more facts testify that it is a step in your plot to accelerate an open split in the international communist movement.

On February 12 this year you sent a letter directed against the Communist Party of China to fraternal Parties and behind our backs. Your letter of February 22, 1964 to us divulged that in that anti-Chinese letter you had called for a "rebuff" to us and threatened to "take collective measures". At the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 14-15 this year you decided to "come out openly and strongly against the incorrect views and dangerous actions

of the leadership of the CCP". This means that you have pushed the cartridge into the chamber and are ready to press the trigger. In such circumstances, is it not utterly hypocritical of you to suggest that Sino-Soviet talks be held in May this year for "the speediest possible settlement of existing differences"?

We would like to ask the comrades of the CPSU: Why were you in such a great hurry? Was it not your intention, upon our rejection of your proposal for holding the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties in May 1964, to use it as a pretext for brazenly and unilaterally calling an international meeting and effecting an open split?

The consistent stand of the Chinese Communist Party is to uphold unity and oppose a split. We have worked unswervingly for the elimination of differences and the restoration of unity. At the same time, we are fully aware that our difference with you is a grave one involving a whole series of fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism. It began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU and was aggravated at the 22nd Congress and later. It is obviously impossible for such long-accumulated differences of principle to be solved overnight. Time and patience are needed.

When in our letter of February 29, 1964 we proposed that the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties should be resumed in October this year, our chief consideration was to have seven months for doing a number of things by way of preparation. For instance, we would have to receive a copy of the letter of February 12, 1964 which you sent to fraternal Parties and acquaint ourselves with its contents; we would like to see the magic weapons you threatened to use, such as "openly stating our views", "publishing documents and material", giving "the most resolute rebuff" and applying "collective measures"; and we would have to answer your attacks and react to your new magic weapons. All this would take time.

It is regrettable that to date you have still groundlessly refused to give us a copy of your letter of February 12, 1964 to fraternal Parties in spite of our repeated requests. It must be understood that this is a letter attacking us, and since you have given it to many fraternal Parties, why do you particularly deny it to us? We have the right to ask you to send us a copy. Now we again request you to send us the letter. If you go on refusing, our request will stand for ten thousand years.

As for your magic weapons, at least you have produced a few beginning with April 3 this year. It seems that you have now

warmed up and have a lot more to say. But we still do not know what other magic weapons you have and what your "most resolute rebuff" and "collective measures" really are.

In these circumstances, how can the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and the international meeting of fraternal Parties be successful? What will there be to say except for quarrels ending up in a fruitless adjournment, or a final open split with each side going its own way? Can it be that you are resolved to have an open split?

Comrades! We are against a split. Before all your vaunted magic weapons are produced, before each side's case and intentions are made clear, and before full preparations are completed, the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and of an international meeting of fraternal Parties can only lead to a split, and to this we cannot agree.

Judging by present circumstances, not only is it impossible to hold the two-Party talks in May, but it will also be too early to hold them in October. We consider it more appropriate to postpone them till some time in the first half of next year, say May. And if either the Chinese or the Soviet Party then considers that the time is still not ripe, they can be further postponed.

The timing of the preparatory meeting for the meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties will depend on the results of the talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties. The composition of the preparatory meeting can be decided through consultation among fraternal Parties, but we still consider it appropriate for the preparatory meeting to consist of the seventeen fraternal Parties proposed in our letter of February 29, 1964, namely, the Parties of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam, and the Parties of Indonesia, Japan, Italy and France.

In principle we are not against increasing the number of participants in the preparatory meeting. But we cannot agree with the proposal, put forward in your letter, that it should be increased from seventeen to twenty-six fraternal Parties. For the situation now is vastly different from that in 1960. There are two Parties in some of the countries mentioned in your list. In Australia, for instance, there is a Party represented by E. F. Hill and another by L. L. Sharkey. The former is a Marxist-Leninist and the latter a revisionist Party. A similar situation obtains in Brazil. Obviously you and we

differ as to which of these Parties should attend the meeting. In another case, that of India, the Dange clique have degenerated into pawns of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and into renegades from communism. How can the Dange clique of renegades be allowed to participate in a meeting of fraternal Parties? In our opinion, if the membership of the preparatory meeting is to be increased, the first consideration should be given to those fraternal Parties which uphold Marxism-Leninism and which are waging heroic revolutionary struggles.

As for the meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties, we hold that it must be a meeting of unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and that it should definitely not become a meeting for a split. Therefore, ample preparations have to be made and it should not be called in a hurry. This is our consistent attitude and it is also the attitude of many other fraternal Parties, including some which have ideological differences with us. In the past you, too, approved of this attitude. In your letter to us of November 29, 1963, you agreed that conditions should be created so that the meeting "will lead not to a split in the world communist movement but to the genuine unity and solidarity of all the fraternal Parties and all the forces of peace and socialism". If you do not want an immediate open split, you should not be in too much of a hurry to call the international meeting in the coming autumn. We advise you to think this over calmly: it would be better to hold the international meeting of fraternal Parties later rather than earlier, or even not to hold it, in these circumstances.

There is now no international organization like the Third International nor any body like the permanent bodies of the Third International which were entitled to call international meetings. In these circumstances, it would be wrong and impermissible for one or more Parties to make a unilateral decision to call a meeting of representatives of all Communist and Workers' Parties in violation of the principles of consultation and the attainment of unity among the fraternal Parties. To do so would be illegitimate and entirely wrong and would lead to grave consequences. This is clear to you, to us and to all the other Communist and Workers' Parties. If, in arrogant disregard of the advice of our Party and of many other fraternal Parties, the Central Committee of the CPSU should cling to its own course, hurriedly convene such a meeting by calling together those Parties that support its wrong, revisionist and divisive line, and treat it as a meeting of representatives of all the Communist and Workers'

Parties of the world, you would then be strongly condemned by the working class, the revolutionary people and all genuine Marxist-Leninist parties throughout the world, you would cast to the four winds the banner of unity which you profess to uphold, and would have to bear the responsibility for a split. Do you want to do this? Do you want to put yourselves in such an inextricable predicament? We are saying this in all sincerity and clearly pointing to where interests or dangers lie, so do not say that you have not been forewarned.

We maintain that a series of preparatory steps are necessary in order to make the international meeting of fraternal Parties a success, and that these should include the holding of talks between the Chinese and Soviet Parties and of bilateral or multilateral talks among fraternal Parties, the convening of a preparatory meeting by fraternal Parties and the reaching of unanimous agreement at this meeting. Judging by present circumstances, it may require perhaps four or five years, or even longer, to complete these preparations.

Our views are based on deep concern for the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We hope that they will receive your serious and earnest consideration.

Furthermore, we would like to ask you to reconsider the proposal we made in our letter of February 27 this year, namely, that our two Parties reach an agreement, by which each side will, on an equal basis, publish in its own press the documents, articles and other material which both sides have published or will publish in criticism of each other. Although you rejected this proposal in your letter of March 7, 1964, you failed to give any really tenable reason. You have one-sidedly published many statements vilifying the Chinese Communist Party, and yet you prevent the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people from reading our replies and becoming acquainted with our actual position and views; this is indeed a deliberate attempt to inflame hostility between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. If you have real faith in the members of the CPSU and the Soviet people as well as in yourselves, you will find no reason whatever not to reach an agreement with us on this question.

The documents of the February Plenum of your Central Committee and the *Pravda* editorial of April 3, 1964 divulged information from the letters exchanged between the Central Committees of the Chinese and Soviet Parties since November 1963 and distorted the facts, in an attempt to delude the members of the CPSU, the Soviet people, and people everywhere else unfamiliar with the true state of

affairs. In order to clarify matters and give the true picture, the Central Committee of the CCP deems it necessary to publish in full all the letters exchanged between the Chinese and Soviet Parties since November 1963. These comprise: the letters of the Central Committee of the CPSU dated November 29, 1963, and February 22 and March 7, 1964, and the letters of the Central Committee of the CCP dated February 20, 27 and 29 and May 7, 1964. We hope that you will be able to do likewise and will publish the full text of this exchange of letters between our two Parties in your own press.

With fraternal greetings,

The Central Committee of the
Communist Party of China