

43-46
**THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT
OF THE DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP OF
THE CPSU AND OURSELVES**

COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU AND OURSELVES

**— COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU**

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*) and *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*)

**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1963**

Printed in the People's Republic of China

CONTENTS

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU AND OURSELVES

— Comment on the Open Letter of the Central Committee
of the CPSU

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* (People's
Daily) and *Hongqi* (Red Flag)

(September 6, 1963)

3

Appendix I

OUTLINE OF VIEWS ON THE QUESTION OF PEACE-
FUL TRANSITION

(November 10, 1957)

58

Appendix II

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION OF THE COM-
MUNIST PARTY OF CHINA AT THE BUCHAREST
MEETING OF FRATERNAL PARTIES

(June 26, 1960)

63

Appendix III

THE FIVE PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT OF THE
DIFFERENCES AND ATTAINMENT OF UNITY CON-
TAINED IN THE LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COM-
MITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IN
REPLY TO THE LETTER OF INFORMATION OF
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

(September 10, 1960)

68

ANNOUNCEMENT

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

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

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

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU was published in full on July 20 in *Renmin Ribao* and other national papers and in all provincial and municipal papers throughout China. It was also broadcast in full by Chinese radio stations.

In the Soviet national papers, the Open Letter was followed by nearly 300 articles attacking

China. *Renmin Ribao* has published extracts from a number of these articles.

Starting today, the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* and the journal *Hongqi* are publishing a succession of articles commenting on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU;

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

September 6, 1963

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE CPSU AND OURSELVES

— COMMENT ON THE OPEN LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao*
(*People's Daily*) and *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*)

September 6, 1963

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

Now Moscow, Washington, New Delhi and Belgrade are joined in a love feast and the Soviet press is running an endless assortment of fantastic stories and theories attacking China. The leadership of the CPSU has allied itself with U.S. imperialism, the Indian reactionaries and the renegade Tito clique against social-

ist China and against all Marxist-Leninist parties, in open betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, in brazen repudiation of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement and in flagrant violation of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance.

The present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve a whole series of important questions of principle. In its letter of June 14 to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the CPC systematically and comprehensively discussed the essence of these differences. It pointed out that, in the last analysis, the present differences within the international communist movement and between the Chinese and Soviet Parties involve the questions of whether or not to accept the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement, whether or not to accept Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, whether or not there is need for revolution, whether or not imperialism is to be opposed, and whether or not the unity of the socialist camp and the international communist movement is desired.

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

In our article "Whence the Differences?" (*Renmin Ribao* Editorial, February 27, 1963), we dealt with the origin and growth of the differences in the international communist movement in general outline. We deliberately refrained from giving certain facts concerning this

question, and particularly certain important facts involving the leadership of the CPSU, and left the leadership of the CPSU some leeway, though we were ready to provide a fuller picture and to thrash out the rights and wrongs when necessary. Now that the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU has told many lies about the origin and development of the differences and completely distorted the facts, it has become necessary for us to set forth certain facts in order to explain the matter in greater detail.

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

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

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

THE DIFFERENCES BEGAN WITH THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

There is a saying, "It takes more than one cold day for the river to freeze three feet deep." The present dif-

ferences in the international communist movement did not, of course, begin just today.

The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU spreads the notion that the differences in the international communist movement were started by the three articles which we published in April 1960 under the title of "Long Live Leninism!" This is a big lie.

What is the truth?

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

To be specific, it began with the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956.

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

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

The criticism of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the CPSU was wrong both in principle and in method.

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

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

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

ing class of the world and all progressive mankind. It was therefore natural that the name of Stalin was greatly honoured throughout the world.

It was necessary to criticize Stalin's mistakes. But in his secret report to the 20th Congress, Comrade Khrushchov completely negated Stalin, and in doing so defamed the dictatorship of the proletariat, defamed the socialist system, the great CPSU, the great Soviet Union and the international communist movement. Far from using a revolutionary proletarian party's method of criticism and self-criticism for the purpose of making an earnest and serious analysis and summation of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he treated Stalin as an enemy and shifted the blame for all mistakes on to Stalin alone.

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

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

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

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

Khrushchov pictured the U.S. Government and its head as people resisting the forces of war, and not as representatives of the imperialist forces of war. He said, ". . . the advocates of settling outstanding issues by means of war still hold strong positions there [in the United States], and . . . they continue to exert big pressure on the President and the Administration." He went on to say that the imperialists were beginning to admit that the positions-of-strength policy had failed and that

"symptoms of a certain sobering up are appearing" among them. It was as much as saying that it was possible for the U.S. Government and its head not to represent the interests of the U.S. monopoly capital and for them to abandon their policies of war and aggression and that they had become forces defending peace.

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

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

The questions raised by the leadership of the CPSU at the 20th Congress, and especially the question of Stalin and of "peaceful transition", are by no means simply internal affairs of the CPSU; they are vital issues of common interest for all fraternal Parties. Without any prior consultation with the fraternal Parties, the leadership of the CPSU drew arbitrary conclusions; it forced the fraternal Parties to accept a *fait accompli* and, on the pretext of "combating the personality cult", crudely interfered in the internal affairs of fraternal

Parties and countries and subverted their leaderships, thus pushing its policy of sectarianism and splittism in the international communist movement.

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

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

It is impossible for the leadership of the CPSU to shut out the heavens with one palm. Let the facts speak for themselves.

On many occasions in internal discussions after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee of the CPC solemnly criticized the errors of the CPSU leadership.

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

On October 23, 1956, on receiving the Soviet Ambassador to China, Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out, "Stalin deserves to be criticized, but we do not agree with the method of criticism, and there are some other matters we do not agree with."

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

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

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

In their many internal discussions with comrades of the CPSU, leading comrades of the Central Committee

of the CPC also systematically set forth our views on the international situation and the strategy of the international communist movement, with direct reference to the errors of the 20th Congress of the CPSU.

These are plain facts. How can the leadership of the CPSU obliterate them by bare-faced lying?

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

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

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

Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the Chinese Communist Party has continued to display the portrait