

45-40

**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**

**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**

# 中共中央和苏共中央来往的七封信

\*

外文出版社出版（北京）

1964年袖珍本第一版

编号：（英）3050—938

00025

3—E—594pc

*Printed in the People's Republic of China*

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE CPSU OF MARCH 7, 1964 TO  
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
CPC

## CONTENTS

LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC OF MAY 7, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU	3
LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC OF FEBRUARY 20, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU	19
LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC OF FEBRUARY 27, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU	23
LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC OF FEBRUARY 29, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU	29
LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU OF NOVEMBER 29, 1963 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC	61
LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU OF FEBRUARY 22, 1964 TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPC	79



The documents of the February Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU published by the leaders of the CPSU on April 3 this year and the *Pravda* editorial of the same date divulged information from the letters exchanged between the Central Committees of the CPC and the CPSU 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 its letter of May 7, 1964, the Central Committee of the CPC notified the Central Committee of the CPSU that, in order to clarify matters and give the true picture, the Central Committee of the CPC deemed it necessary to publish in full all the letters exchanged between the Chinese and Soviet Parties since November 1963.

The letter of the Central Committee of the CPC of May 7, 1964 to the Central

Committee of the CPSU, its earlier letters of February 20, 27 and 29, 1964, and those of the Central Committee of the CPSU of November 29, 1963 and February 22 and March 7, 1964, to the Central Committee of the CPC are herewith reproduced.



**LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE CPC 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 CPC 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 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 CPC". 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